

Xenophon in Arrian's *Cynegeticus*

Philip A. Stadter

FOR THOSE who follow, earlier writers are models and quarries of ideas and modes of expression—and rivals. The Greek writers of the second century of our era felt heavily the weight of their heritage, and their prose is marked by a mixture of imitation and rejection, tradition and originality, which in poetry we associate with the Alexandrines.

One of the writers most characteristic for this mixture, as well as one of the most eminent, was Flavius Arrianus of Nicomedia. Subtly and effectively he imitated the great historians—Herodotus, Thucydides, but most of all Xenophon, whom he chose to mimic in different ways not only in his *Anabasis of Alexander*, but in his recollections of Epictetus, his *Tactica* and his *Cynegeticus*. This last work, although minor in size and less serious in subject, is of special value for illustrating Arrian's blend of imitation of Xenophon with emulation.

In the *Cynegeticus*¹ Arrian is at his most personal, treating a subject which he clearly loves and has enjoyed for a lifetime: hunting. The best previous prose handbook on hunting—the only one we know—had been written five hundred years before. Xenophon's *Cynegeticus* was a classic in Arrian's day, one of the great works of their noble past which the second-century Greeks, just emerging into a renaissance of letters, held up as models for imitation.² And yet excellent as it was in Arrian's eyes, it was fundamentally flawed: Xenophon's account simply did not fit the hunting practice of his own day. Trajan, Hadrian and the noble circles around them delighted in hunting, but they hunted from horseback, and with the fast Celtic dogs, *vertragi*,

¹ There is an excellent edition of the *Cynegeticus* by A. G. Roos in *Flavii Arriani quae exstant omnia, II: Scripta minora et fragmenta*² (Leipzig 1968) 76–102. See also the transl. and comm. by W. Dansey, *Arrian on Coursing. The Cynegeticus of the Younger Xenophon* (London 1831), and the transl. in D. B. Hull, *Hounds and Hunting in Ancient Greece* (Chicago-London 1964). For a full account of hunting in Arrian's day, see J. Aymard, *Essai sur les chasses romaines, des origines à la fin du siècle des Antonins (Cynegetica)* (BEFAR 171, Paris 1951) 155–96.

² The problem of the authenticity of part or all of the Xenophontine *Cynegeticus* is irrelevant here: Arrian accepted the whole work as authentic, including the very dubious first chapter.

not known in classical times. Xenophon's precise instructions for men hunting on foot, using nets, snares and caltrops, were useless to Arrian and his friends.

In taking up the challenge of writing a treatise on hunting suitable to his own age and its practices, Arrian did not reject outright his classical predecessor, but chose to complement his work and interweave Xenophon's treatise with his own, giving new life to the classic—and insuring classic status for his own treatise. The two authors were bonded not only by a common interest in hunting, but by a common citizenship at Athens and even a common name, for Arrian too was called Xenophon, and constantly refers to the earlier writer as 'my namesake' or 'that other Xenophon'.³ These ties render a study of the manner in which Arrian has used his namesake's essay necessary and rewarding.

The debt to his predecessor is asserted at once, not only in the title—which, after all, was dictated by the subject—but by the first word *Ξενοφῶντι τῷ Γρύλλου λέλεκται*. The opening chapter continues with a summary of the contents of Xenophon's book. The order of the summary is roughly Xenophon's own, but reasonably enough, some items have been shifted. Xenophon's general statements at the beginning and end on the value of hunting for training youth (Xen. 1, 12) are combined in one notice (Arr. 1.1),⁴ and the sentence on hares (Xen. 5) is moved before that on hounds (Xen. 3–4, 7–8), so that the two sections in Xenophon fall under a single heading in the summary (Arr. 1.2). An accurate report, though misleading if one wished to reconstruct the shape of the original from it alone.

This précis of Xenophon, of course, is preparatory to pointing out the omissions which make the present work necessary—ignorance (certainly not negligence) of the Celtic breed of hounds, and of Scythian and Illyrian horses. This gap Arrian will fill, all the more so since he shares already so much with Xenophon—name, city, and common interests in hunting, generalship and philosophy (Arr. 1.4). He further justifies his course by citing the master himself (Arr. 1.5): "Since he himself thought it was necessary to write down what had

³ Arr. *Cyn.* 1.4. His full name was Flavius Arrianus Xenophon: see P. A. Stadter, "Flavius Arrianus: The New Xenophon," *GRBS* 8 (1967) 155–61. He was not only an Athenian citizen (though born in Nicomedia) but an archon for 145/6.

⁴ Xen. 13 against the sophists is omitted, though *θεοφιλεῖς* at Xen. 13.17 is picked up by *θεοφιλεῖς* at Arr. 1.1.

been insufficiently stated by Simon concerning horsemanship, not from any rivalry toward Simon, but because he decided it would be useful for men.”

There is no difficulty in demonstrating Xenophon’s ignorance of Celtic hounds or any hounds as fast as they, not only *a priori* in that the Celts were not known to the Greeks at that time, but from his own words. “For he says that whenever hares are caught by hounds, they are caught contrary to their bodily characteristics or by chance.” Moreover, the whole account of the use of nets (Xen. 6.5–25) shows, to Arrian’s mind, that his predecessor had no knowledge of the Celtic way of hunting, which does not require nets.⁵ Once the need for his supplement has been demonstrated, Arrian sets out in straightforward fashion to describe modern hunting. The Celtic hounds, *vertragi*, are described in chapters 4 and 5.7–7, the chase in 15–18, hunting with Scythian and Libyan horses in 23–24, and the particular rules for training and breeding *vertragi* in 25–32. Uses of Celtic hounds other than that favored by Arrian are more briefly described in 19–22. But Arrian does not put Xenophon behind him as he describes the practices of his own day. The old master accompanies him on his way, as is apparent from citations and numerous echoes. It is by considering these that we may become aware of the complexities of Arrian’s relation to the classical writer.

There are seven citations of Xenophon in *Cynegeticus* (1.5, 2.2, 16.6, 22.1, 24.2, 25.4, 30.2–31.2), not counting the initial summary of Xenophon’s treatise (1.1–3) and general references (2.4, 3.5, 21.2). Some merely paraphrase Xenophon’s text, as at Arrian 24.2, the account of Cyrus the Younger’s attempts to catch wild asses taken from *Anabasis* 1.5.2.⁶

At other times Arrian quotes extremely precisely:

ARRIAN 30.2

κράτιστον ἔαν ὑπὸ τῆ τεκούσῃ καὶ μὴ ὑποβάλλειν ὑφ’ ἑτέραν κύνα· αἱ γὰρ θεραπείαι αἱ ἀλλότριαι, ἤπερ καὶ ὁ Ξενοφῶν ἐκεῖνος ἀποφαίνει, οὐκ εἰσὶν αὔξιμοι· τὸ δὲ τῶν μητέρων καὶ τὸ γάλα ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα.

XENOPHON 7.3

... ὑπὸ τῆ τεκούσῃ ἔαν καὶ μὴ ὑποβάλλειν ὑφ’ ἑτέραν κύνα· αἱ γὰρ θεραπείαι αἱ ἀλλότριαι οὐκ εἰσὶν αὔξιμοι· τὸ δὲ τῶν μητέρων καὶ τὸ γάλα ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ αἱ περιβολαὶ φίλαι.

⁵ Arr. *Cyn.* 3.1–5 explains that there is a Celtic manner of hunting with nets, using Segusian dogs, which Xenophon’s description would fit, but this doesn’t interest him.

⁶ For other examples of paraphrase see 22.1, 25.4.

Apart from the transfer of *ἐάν* before *ὑπὸ* and the omission of the last phrase, Arrian's quotation is absolutely accurate. As he continues in this same passage, however, the Nicomedian becomes freer: *ἤδη πλανᾶται τὰ κυλάκια* is found in Xenophon, the next phrase *χρῆ γάλακτι ἀνατρέφειν* is a paraphrase. Proceeding further, on the ill effects of heavy foods, the quotations of Xenophon are slightly adapted: *τὰ σκέλη* is placed before *διαστρέφουσιν*, *ἐμποιοῦσι* becomes *ἐμβάλλουσιν*, and the last phrase *καὶ τὰ ἐντὸς ἄδικα γίγνεται* is omitted (Arr. 31.1; cf. Xen. 7.4). Continuing, the relation of Arrian's text to Xenophon's remains loose: *τὰ ὀνόματα δὲ ὅτι βραχέα καὶ εὐανάκλητα θετέον ταῖς κυσίν* answers to Xenophon's *τὰ ὄντα δ' ὀνόματα αὐταῖς τίθεσθαι βραχέα, ἵνα εὐανάκλητα ᾖ*. Xenophon's list of forty-seven names is referred to, but omitted (Arr. 31.2; cf. Xen. 7.5). In the extended passage (Arr. 30.2–31.2) the author runs from verbatim quotations through mixed quotation and paraphrase to paraphrase and finally general reference.

In paraphrasing, the author can be made to seem to say what actually he did not. An example is the above-mentioned citation of Xenophon's *περὶ ἵππικῆς* 1.1 at Arr. 1.5: *ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος, ὃ Σίμωνι περὶ ἵππικῆς ἐνδεῶς λελεγμένα ἦν, ψῆθη δεῖν ἀναγράψαι, οὐχὶ ἔριδι τῇ πρὸς Σίμωνα, ἀλλ' ὅτι ὠφέλιμα ἐς ἀνθρώπους ἐγίγνωσκεν*. The citation appears to be a close paraphrase of Xenophon, making it seem that Xenophon's intention, like Arrian's was to complement, not duplicate, the work of his predecessor. The text of the *περὶ ἵππικῆς* reveals, however, that Xenophon expected that his essay would overlap much of what Simon said—gaining thus more authority—and the need to fill gaps was only a partial reason for the work. Moreover, Xenophon is silent on the two important themes of *ἔρις* and *ὠφέλεια*: Arrian was no doubt right to infer these themes in the introduction, but they are not explicitly present.⁷

Even verbatim citations can by the slightest change modify the sense of the original. Arrian writes that according to Xenophon, hares were caught *παρὰ φύσιν σώματος . . . ἢ τύχῃ χρησάμενοι*: Xenophon had said, *παρὰ φύσιν τοῦ σώματος, τύχῃ δὲ χρώμενοι* (Arr. 2.2, Xen. 5.29). Whereas Xenophon had seen *φύσις* as conquered by *τύχη*, Arrian saw the two situations as distinct: something could disturb the body, or luck could intervene. In Arrian 31.2 Xenophon's (*ὀνόματα*)

⁷ Arrian's words, *ὠφέλιμα ἐς ἀνθρώπους*, recall another similar expression of his, *ὠφέλεια ἢ ἐς ἀνθρώπους* at *Anab.* 7.30.3, although of course Xenophon also frequently spoke of utility.

βραχεία, ἵνα εὐανάκλητα ἦ (Xen. 7.5) becomes βραχεία καὶ εὐανάκλητα. The final clause is made paratactic, a slight but real change. These cases suffice to demonstrate that it is impossible to establish the nature or the limits of one of Arrian's citations without recourse to the original text. The citation may be only a few words, taken out of context, as Arr. 22.1, or more elaborate, beginning some words before the actual verb of quotation, as Arr. 30.2. The introductory verb gives no help: λέγει at 24.2 introduces a free summary, at 2.2 a very close paraphrase; οὐ ξύμφημι and ξυγχωρῶ at 16.6 introduce a combination of paraphrase and emphatic verbatim quotation. Other expressions—χρῆ πειθομένους τῷ ἐμῷ ὁμωνύμῳ . . . (22.1), χρῆ πείθεσθαι αὐτῷ (31.2), αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος . . . ᾤθη (1.5), τοῦτο . . . παραινεῖ (25.4), ἀποφαίνει (30.2), ξυμβουλεύει (31.1) introduce the whole gamut of references, from general summary to verbatim quotation.⁸

Actual citations do not define the debt of one ancient author to another,⁹ and Arrian is no exception. Comparison with Xenophon's text reveals numerous cases where the earlier author is tacitly present. Arrian opposes allowing the hounds to eat the hare: πονηρὸν μάθημα κυνὶ γενναίᾳ λαγωοῦ ἐσθίειν (Arr. 25.9). Xenophon uses the same expression of the practice of 'skirting' when the hound avoids the hunt: γίνονται ἔκκυνοι, πονηρὸν μάθημα (Xen. 7.10). The later author has picked up a striking phrase and used it for a different matter. The context, however, is similar: in both cases, the phrase is used to reinforce the last point in the training of young hounds.¹⁰

Borrowing on a quite different scale is found in Arrian's description of the qualities to look for in a *vertragus*. The list of physical features (Arr. 4–6) moves from head to tail to feet: some sixteen items, plus considerations on color, hair and sex. The *vertragus*, tall, very fast, hunting by sight rather than by scent,¹¹ was a markedly different beast from the Laconian hound of Xenophon: indeed that difference

⁸ Note that the two anonymous references in 28.1, εἰ χρῆ πείθεσθαι ἀνδράσιν κυνηγετικοῖς and λόγος [ἐκτίν], do not refer to Xenophon. They presumably refer to oral lore among hunters and handlers of hounds.

⁹ For an extreme case, see D. A. Russell, *JRS* 53 (1963) 21–28, on Plutarch's use of Dionysius of Halicarnassus in his *Coriolanus*.

¹⁰ Training is treated by Xen. 7.6–10, by Arr. 25.1–9. Other cases: Arr. 16.1, on hares living in the open, cf. Xen. 5.21; Arr. 17.3–4, on the hare running over rough country, cf. Xen. 5.18.

¹¹ On the *vertragus*, for which our chief source is Arrian, see O. Keller, *Die antike Tierwelt* I (Leipzig 1909) 101–03; and G. Rodenwaldt, "Vertragus," *JdI* 48 (1933) 204–25 with figs. 3–10. The *vertragus* was similar to the modern greyhound.

justified Arrian's decision to write. Yet Arrian has chosen to follow Xenophon's description of the Laconian hound point by point, feature by feature.¹² This silent dialogue with his predecessor is signalled only by λέξω καὶ αὐτὸς at Arr. 4.1. The 'new Xenophon' takes pleasure in preserving as frequently as possible the adjectives used by Xenophon: the neck, for instance, described by the earlier writer as μακρός, ὑγρός, περιφερῆ (Xen. 4.1), Arrian characterizes in identical terms: τράχηλος δὲ μακρός τε ἔστω καὶ περιφερῆς καὶ ὑγρός (Arr. 5.8). Since the two types of hound are not in fact similar, however, he must frequently contradict Xenophon's words. Occasionally this is only a question of new adjectives: the ears of the Laconian hound are μικρά, λεπτά, ψιλὰ ὀπισθεν, those of the *vertragus* μεγάλα . . . καὶ μαλθακά, but in other cases Arrian states his position firmly, in determined opposition to his mute and anonymous interlocutor. Xenophon's opinion on the shape of the head was clear: the hounds should have κεφαλὰς ἐλαφράς, σιμάς, ἄρθρώδεις, ἰνώδη τὰ κάτωθεν (Xen. 4.1). Arrian, writing of the greyhound, says ἐχέτωσαν δὲ τὰς κεφαλὰς ἐλαφράς καὶ ἄρθρώδεις· εἰ δὲ γρυπαί¹³ ἢ σιμαὶ εἶεν, οὐ παρὰ μέγα διοίσει τοῦτο· οὐδ' εἰ τὰ ὑπὸ τοῖς μετώποις ἰνώδη ἔχοιεν, οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἐν μεγάλῳ ποιητέον, ἀλλ' αἱ βαρुकέφαλοι μόναι πονηραί, καὶ ὅσαις παχέα τὰ ῥύγχη καὶ μὴ ἐς ὄξυ ἀλλὰ ἀθρώως ἀπολήγοντα (Arr. 4.4). Arrian converses with a reader familiar with Xenophon, or with Xenophon himself, carefully considering every point raised by that author, and insisting on his own considerations.¹⁴

The warmest and most personal passage of *Cynegeticus* was precipitated by just such a reaction to Xenophon. That huntsman had insisted that a good hound must have black eyes (Xen. 4.1), and condemned those with grey or clear eyes (*χαροποί*) as inferior (Xen. 3.2, 3). On the contrary, Arrian writes, for *vertragi* a fiery yellow like that of lions or lynxes is most desirable, black comes second, and third grey. "The grey eyes are not at all bad, and they are not a sign of

¹² Xen. 4.1. Arrian omits only the forehead (*μέτωπα*) and the thighs (*μηριαίαι*). O. Manns, *Über die Jagd bei den Griechen II* (Progr. Wilhelms-Gymn. Cassel 1889) 10–17, sets out a comparison in parallel columns of the main features of the hounds of Xenophon and Arrian.

¹³ Xenophon had listed *γρυπαί* as defective, 3.2.

¹⁴ Note also Arrian's explicit contradiction of Xenophon (Xen. 7.7) at Arr. 25.4. A *vertragus* cannot be trained with the methods prescribed for dogs working by scent, he states, and paints a picture of a young greyhound exposed to the method advocated by Xenophon. He also recommends ages for beginning the training of hounds different from those of Xenophon (Arr. 25.1 and 26.1, contrast Xen. 7.6).

inferior hounds, if they also happen to be clear and bright. In fact, I myself have raised a hound, grey-eyed as grey can be . . .” There follows an ecstatic portrait of this his favorite hound, both as hunter and companion, with especial emphasis on its intelligence and friendliness. At the end (Arr. 5.1–6) he cannot contain himself. “So I do not hesitate even to set down his name, so that something of him may survive: ‘Xenophon of Athens had a dog, Horme by name, very fast, very intelligent, and very special’.”¹⁵

The two types of hound were different, and so the physical features described naturally differ. But Arrian’s account is also fuller, more tactile, closer to the dog than Xenophon’s bare list of adjectives. The neck is not only long and supple, but “if you pull the dog backwards with its collar, the neck will seem to bend double” (Arr. 5.8); tails are long but also shaggy with hair, flexible, curved, with the tip more shaggy (Arr. 5.9). The rationale for preferring large animals over small and hind legs larger than forelegs are carefully considered (4.2–3, 5.10–11).

These elaborations are more than citations or echoes; they point to a new spirit running through the *Cynegeticus* which effectively distinguishes Arrian’s book from Xenophon’s. Arrian shows a sensitivity of feeling toward his hounds which manifests itself in a multitude of ways quite alien to Xenophon. Nowhere in that author can we parallel the enthusiastic description of the *vertragus* (Arr. 3.7): “In appearance the noblest of them are a thing of beauty in their eyes, in their whole body, in their hair and color. The pied color stands out so well in the pied hounds, and the solid color shines in those which are solid colored: it is the sweetest sight to a hunter.”¹⁶ The intimate portrait of his own dog, Horme, which has just been referred to, has been described as “das vielleicht feinste Stück Tierpsychologie der antiken Literatur.”¹⁷ Warmth towards his hounds pervades Arrian’s treatment, and accounts for the inclusion of many passages where he expands on Xenophon or introduces wholly new material. For him an account of physical features was not enough: the hunter

¹⁵ Horme was probably male, despite the feminine pronouns used. *κύων* in Xenophon and Arrian is regularly feminine, but Arrian considered male dogs much more valuable: see Arr. 32.1–2.

¹⁶ Color is another feature on which Arrian takes a position strongly in contrast with Xenophon: solid colors were not a sign of inferior breeding, nor was there anything *θηριώδες* about them, as Xenophon had stated (Arr. 6.1 and Xen. 4.7–8).

¹⁷ Rodenwaldt, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.11) 218.

must consider the *γνώμη* of his hound as well. The chief 'spiritual' quality was *φιλανθρωπία*: hounds which dislike humans should be avoided, and even those which distinguish and respond affectionately to their handlers are not as desirable as those which are friendly to all (Arr. 7.1, 3).¹⁸ Their behavior when released and at play must be considered, how they respond to their trainer's words, and their whole carriage (7.4–7). Arrian watches the way they eat (8.1–2) and would like them to sleep with a man, so that he can notice whether they are sick, or need water, or to be let out (9.1–3). Xenophon mentions that the hounds need a rubdown after a chase (Xen. 6.26), but Arrian describes how the hands should be placed and moved on each part of the body (10.1–4).¹⁹ He considers the condition of a bitch in heat, why it is dangerous for her to go out then, and how one can judge when she is ready to hunt again (Arr. 31.3–5).

The chase itself is described by Arrian chiefly to explain the special technique to be used with *vertragi* as opposed to Laconian hounds, but here as well the difference in attitude of the two authors is manifest. For Xenophon hunting is a healthy exercise and a pleasure, but he never loses sight of his object, the quarry, which should be hunted out carefully wherever it hides (Xen. 6.24–25). Arrian, on the contrary, presents himself as a sportsman and animal lover, who finds it crude to hunt hares for meat (Arr. 25.4) and insists that the joy for true hunters (*οἱ γὰρ τῆ ἀληθείᾳ κυνηγετικοί*) is in watching the chase when there is real competition between hare and hound (15.2, 16.4).²⁰ The hunt is ruined if the hounds are slipped too soon and terrify the hare into freezing (15.1, 21.3). On the contrary, hunters rejoice when a hare escapes, and some attempt to call off the hounds and rescue a hare which has run well. *ὥστε πολλάκις ἤδη ἔγωγε ἐφ' ἵππου ἐφομαρτῶν τῷ δρόμῳ καὶ ἀλόντι ἐπελθὼν ζῶντα ἀφειλόμην, καὶ ἀφελόμενος καὶ δῆσας τὴν κύνα ἀφήκα διαφυγεῖν τὸν λαγών· καὶ εἰ ὕστερος ἀφικόμην ἢ ὥστε διασῶσαι, ἔπαισα τὴν κεφαλὴν, ὅτι ἀνταγωνιστὴν ἄρα ἀγαθὸν ἀπώλεσαν αἱ κύνες* (16.5). This emotional outburst leads directly to an attack on Xenophon. In one of the few passages where the latter reveals any joy in hunting,

¹⁸ Cf. Arr. 5.2: *Horme* was *πραοτάτη* and *φιλανθρωποτάτη*. In the following sentences much is made of his friendliness.

¹⁹ In *De re equestri* 5.5–6.3 Xenophon describes in some detail how to rub down and wash a horse: Arrian probably refers to this at Arr. 10.1 *ὄφελος κυνὶ καὶ τρῦμις . . . οὐ μείον ἢ ἵππῳ*.

²⁰ There is another mark of greater 'gentility' in Arrian's idea of a hunt in his discouragement of shouting while following the pack (16.8), although Xenophon had recommended it.

concluding the description of the habits of the hare, he writes, “so delightful is the animal (the hare in motion), that to see a hare tracked, found, pursued and caught is enough to make any man forget his heart’s desire” (Xen. 5.33). Arrian reacts strongly (16.6): “On this point alone I do not agree with my namesake: I admit that whoever should see the beast found, chased and pursued would ‘forget his heart’s desire’; but to see it caught, I assert, is a sight neither sweet nor impressive, but rather disgusting, and one would not, for this at any rate, ‘forget his heart’s desire’.” Arrian approves of Xenophon’s joy in the chase; he is struck by the phrase ἐπιλάθοιτ’ ἂν εἶ του ἐρώη, but he cannot swallow that one word ἀλικκόμενον. Yet at the same time he criticizes, he is fully aware that his situation is not comparable to that of Xenophon and cannot be judged on the same terms (16.7): “But perhaps that Xenophon should be excused in thinking that the sight of a captured hare was such a great thing, since he did not know of fast hounds.”²¹

The conclusion of Arrian’s treatise represents a final instance of his respect for and independence of his predecessor, “It is not without the gods’ help that a hunter comes into possession of a truly fine male hound,” he writes, and he insists that every hunter should sacrifice and pay first fruits to Artemis Agrotera (32.2–33). Although he began his treatise by saying that dogs and the hunt are the gifts of Apollo and Artemis, Xenophon had rarely spoken of the gods in the body of the *Cynegeticus*, recommending only a quick prayer to Artemis and Apollo before beginning the hunt (Xen. 6.13). Yet in general he is remarkable for his piety, as attested throughout his *Anabasis*, and especially in the gracious description of the sanctuary he established to Artemis at Scillus (*Anab.* 5.3.4–13). More relevant, however, is the sense of the need for the constant help of the gods expressed in his *Hipparchicus*. In that manual on the management of cavalry, Xenophon begins, “The first duty is the sacrifice to the gods . . .,” and throughout the work interjects the phrase *cὺν θεῶν*.²² Xenophon himself remarks the frequency of this expression and defends it in the last paragraph of the treatise (9.7–9): the soldier needs the help of the gods. The notion of dependence on the favor of the gods was congenial

²¹ Note that Arrian’s situation is different in another way: belonging to a super-wealthy élite, he can have hares raised or procured for him with which to train his young hounds (Arr. 25.1). Xenophon had to train his hounds on the hunt (Xen. 7.6–10).

²² E.g. *Eq.mag.* 5.14, 6.1, 7.3 (twice), 7.14, 9.2.

to Arrian, who heard it also from his master Epictetus.²³ Yet the last chapters of the *Cynegeticus* (33–36) are by far the fullest and most direct statement by Arrian of this concept, which he sees as applicable to all men engaged in activity—to sailors, farmers, artisans, rhetors and belle-lettrists, lovers, as well as to hunters—“I assert that nothing good for man is brought to fulfillment without the gods” (Arr. 35.1). Homer is cited in witness, and the treatise ends with a final exhortation to the hunter to honor the gods before and after the hunt. Arrian is correcting the omission of Xenophon. The god’s help is needed not only in war, as Xenophon had emphatically written (*Eq. Mag.* 9.8–9), but also in the hunt. Moreover, even in the worship of the gods, the passage of time has suggested improvements. Arrian hunts with Celtic hounds unknown to Xenophon; he also honors Artemis according to the Celtic custom and recommends that his readers do the same (Arr. 34–35.1). Respect for the classical past does not hinder sensible innovations, and even a barbarian can teach Greeks how fittingly to honor their gods.²⁴

The *Cynegeticus* ends as it began, respectful of the past yet self-assured and independent. Xenophon was one of the classics of Athenian literature, a paradigm for later writers both in style and in content. Arrian is no exception: he obviously admires Xenophon’s work and has studied it with painstaking thoroughness, as shown by the accuracy of the citations and the numerous implicit references. But he goes further, and in this his greatness is revealed, even in so minor an effort as the *Cynegeticus*. The classical author is a model but is not perfect. His knowledge of hunting was thorough in as far as it went, but new times have brought new experience.²⁵ Arrian has that invaluable sense of historical perspective so often lacking in writers who look back on a classic past: he is aware that he lives in a different world and can contribute something new to human understanding. This view is present throughout the work and is its *raison d’être*. But nowhere is it clearer than where Arrian recalls a scene from Xenophon’s

²³ Cf. Epict. *Diss.* 3.22.2 and 53; *Anab.* 6.28.6, 7.30.3; *Per.* 11.2. The attitude of Hadrian may have been similar: see W. den Boer, *Mnemosyne* SER. IV, 8 (1955) 126.

²⁴ In this case, and throughout the *Cynegeticus*, one is reminded of Arrian’s praise of the Romans, and Hadrian in particular, for their readiness to incorporate foreign customs and especially military practices into their institutions (*Tact.* 33, 44).

²⁵ We may contrast Pollux, who, though writing at least a generation after Arrian (*ca* 164–178), makes no reference to *vertragi* and repeats Xenophon’s description of the Laconian hound with no suggestion that its use was no longer in fashion (5.57ff).

Anabasis. Cyrus the Younger, a son and brother of the great king of Persia, found it impossible to capture the wild asses of the Syrian desert with his horses unless he set up relay stations, and wore them out riding a series of horses (Xen. *Anab.* 1.5.2). Yet in his own day, Arrian notes, eight-year-old Libyan boys riding bareback and without bridles could ride down such wild asses and lead them docilely home (Arr. 24.2–3). The contrast is so dramatic that it prompts Arrian to a rhetorical outburst (24.5): “This is how those hunt who have good dogs and good horses, not tricking the animals with snares, nets, nooses, cunning or traps but challenging them openly. How different the spectacles are! The one resembles piracy or theft, the other a war fought out with all one’s strength. The one kind of hunter approaches his prey as a pirate stealthily sails up; the other conquers openly, as the Athenians conquered in the sea battle at Artemisium or at Salamis and Psyttaleia or off Cyprus.” This passage is not just a praise of greyhound hunting, it is a statement of the superiority of the present to the past because of the superior animals the modern hunter has at his disposal. The same enthusiasms for modern innovations which we encounter at the end of the *Tactica*,²⁶ the same self-assurance in comparing oneself on equal terms with the great writers of the past that impresses us in the *Anabasis*²⁷ are present here. Arrian knows Xenophon, respects him, cites him frequently and accurately, shapes his own work around the earlier, and nevertheless contradicts firmly, inserts his own opinions, and exults in practicing a form of hunting he considers immeasurably superior to that of his namesake.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL
March, 1976

²⁶ See *Tactica* 44.

²⁷ Most notably, *Anab.* 1.12.2–5.