

of life," Tobin; "la giusta gioia della vita," Rapisarda)? Is *vita* the life eternal which the Sheep are joyfully anticipating? Anyhow the word seems superfluous and damaging to the antithesis *tristes gemitus* // *pia gaudia*. Read *iuncta* (*iūcta*)?

IX: 2. 393 ff.

395 haec ego debueram factis tibi tradere, lector,
 ut pondus verbis vita probata daret.
sed quia neglegimus miseri quaecumque monemur
 et satis est levius *discere* quam facere,
tu si commendes animo demissa per aurem
 omnia quae scriptis sunt numerata meis,
constanter dicam, caeli statione receptus
 discuties saevae vincula dura necis.

Lines 395 ff. offer a non sequitur. The reward promised to those who master the poet's precepts will not be forthcoming *because* these are easier to learn than to practice. Postulating a common confusion between *et* and *haec* we get: "sed quia neglegimus miseri quaecumque monemur, / haec satis est levius discere quam facere." But since Orientius is explaining why he does not practice what he *preaches*, perhaps *dicere* should replace *discere*.

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY
Harvard University

THE FLIGHT OF HARPALOS AND TAURISKOS

While the famous flight of Harpalos, son of Machatas, to Athens in 324 B.C. has been the subject of much controversy, relatively little has been said about his enigmatic "first flight" of 333, recorded only by Arrian.¹ E. Badian's attempt at "find[ing] a rational explanation"² to the problems presented by the inadequacies of Arrian's abbreviated account represents another move to view this and similar episodes "against the background of Alexander's Court,"³ an admirable approach under most circumstances. In the case of Harpalos' first flight, however, Badian's method appears to have led to overanalysis and to conclusions, admittedly hypothetical, that fail to convince.

Arrian relates that Harpalos, the imperial treasurer, was induced by an evil man, Tauriskos by name,⁴ to flee from his post shortly before the battle at Issos. No reason is given for the sudden flight, but it seems clear that the two were, and certainly had been at the time immediately preceding their departure, up to some sort of mischief; the nature of this mischief remains to be determined. Harpalos, for the time, settled in the Megarid; Tauriskos went on to join Alexander of Epeiros and afterward lost his life in Italy under unknown circumstances. The imperial treasury was subsequently divided between two men, Philoxenos and Koiranos,⁵ but Alexander is said to have desired greatly the return of Harpalos,

1. Arr. 3. 6. 4-7.

2. E. Badian, "The First Flight of Harpalus," *Historia* 9 (1960): 246.

3. Badian, "Harpalus," *JHS* 81 (1961): 16.

4. H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (Munich, 1926), vol. 2, no. 740, s.v. Ταυρίσκος.

5. Berve, *Alexanderreich*, vol. 2, nos. 793, 441, s.vv. Φιλόξενος, Κοίρανος.

his boyhood friend. More than a year later, Harpalos, apparently won over by the entreaties of Alexander, returned to the court and was promptly reinstated as sole administrator of the treasury. The incident requires clarification.

Badian concludes that Harpalos had learned of Alexander's intention to replace him with Philoxenos and Koiranos, and, taking it as a sign of disfavor, fled. Badian writes, "This invites comparison with what happened to the Hetaeric cavalry after the death of Philotas: the command he had held was divided between his enemy Hephaestion and Clitus, since Alexander . . . did not want one man to have such power again."⁶ Examination of the literary and historical contexts of Harpalos' first flight exposes the weakness of this view. Arrian relates how Alexander graciously repaid his boyhood companions for their loyalty when on his account they were exiled from Philip's court, rewarding each friend according to his capabilities.⁷ Of Harpalos he writes (3. 6. 6): "Ἀρπαλον δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν χρημάτων, ὅτι αὐτῷ τὸ σῶμα ἐς τὰ πολέμια ἀχρεῖον ἦν, [κατέστησεν]. At a time when Alexander was attempting to exert his authority over an army that was still greatly controlled by the Macedonian nobility, he could not afford to alienate his own friends with policies detrimental to their interests. The "simplest explanation . . . that Alexander, *for some reason* [my emphasis], had decided to remove Harpalus from his post and give it to two minor figures,"⁸ is no explanation. Harpalos had been awarded the position of treasurer⁹ on account of his friendship with Alexander and his physical condition, the precise nature of which is unknown. There is no evidence that the appointment of Philoxenos and Koiranos was the cause and not, in fact, the result of Harpalos' flight; nor is the comparison with the case of Philotas and the command of the Companion cavalry a particularly fitting one. The experience of the Philotas affair had taught Alexander the wisdom of limiting the power of his military commanders. But such a comparison implies a pattern, a policy on Alexander's part. Since the division of the command of the Companions was a result, and since it belonged, in relation to the first flight of Harpalos, to the future, it does not support Badian's hypothesis concerning the time of appointment of Philoxenos and Koiranos.¹⁰ In fact, the entire political climate of Alexander's court at this time weighs heavily against Badian's suggestion. To turn the treasury over to two minor officials in the place of one prominent man is an act of distrust and caution; surely this was not Alexander's attitude before the battle of Issos. Or are we to assume that the man who was busily "extricating himself from the stranglehold of Parmenio's family and adherents"¹¹ had now also developed a paranoia concerning the commands exercised by the men whom he considered his closest friends?

Clearly there is need of a more reasonable solution. The answer, as it seems,

6. Badian, "The First Flight of Harpalus," p. 246.

7. Arr. 3. 6. 5-6.

8. Badian, "The First Flight of Harpalus," p. 246.

9. The exact time of his appointment is unknown. It appears that Harpalos became treasurer during the campaign, when the capture of "Persian" cities had caused much booty to be collected.

10. Badian's claim ("The First Flight of Harpalus," p. 246) that Philoxenos was Harpalos' enemy can be misleading; note the comparison with the case of Philotas, who was replaced by "his enemy Hephaestion." Philoxenos surely became Harpalos' enemy only after the latter's reinstatement deprived him of the post that he had held briefly with Koiranos.

11. Badian, "The Death of Parmenio," *TAPA* 91 (1960): 329.

is to be found in the affiliations between Harpalos and the obscure Tauriskos and in the former's character. Harpalos was, as later events were to show, a man of weak moral fiber: easily drawn into excesses by the prospects of personal enrichment and physical self-gratification, he was quick to seek refuge from prosecution in headlong flight. There seems little doubt that, when Arrian says (3. 6. 7) that Harpalos was persuaded by Tauriskos (*ἀναπεισθεὶς πρὸς Ταυρίσκου ἀνδρὸς κακοῦ* "Ἀρπαλὸς φεύγει ξὺν Ταυρίσκῳ"), this was persuasion not only to take flight but also to commit the crime that necessitated the flight. Undoubtedly the crime was one that involved Harpalos' official position: perhaps, at the suggestion of Tauriskos, who may have befriended him for this very purpose, Harpalos absconded with a sizable amount of money. As an adherent of the royal house of Elimiotis, Harpalos may have had personal contacts with Alexander of Epeiros and his family, and it was perhaps in hope of gaining political asylum, or at least of mitigating his crime, that he sent Tauriskos to Epeiros. Unsuccessful in his intrigues there, Tauriskos was sent to Italy where he perished by accident or, possibly, by design.¹²

Harpalos, however, remained unmolested in the Megarid. Perhaps his lack of fear was prompted, at first, by the failure of Alexander to take action against him and by the hope of safety through the efforts of Tauriskos. It may also be that Alexander made his first entreaties to Harpalos very shortly after his departure. Certainly Harpalos had committed no heinous crime. Tauriskos was a man of no significance, intent on enriching himself and clearly expendable. Harpalos, on the other hand, in view of his noble lineage and his past friendship and devotion to Alexander, could be forgiven his prodigal ways, indeed even reinstated in his former office. There is no reason to suppose that Alexander did not earnestly desire Harpalos' return, for his devotion to his acknowledged friends is frequently attested. Little did he suspect that he would be twice burned by the faithless Harpalos.

For Harpalos, the experience of his first flight was an encouragement to attempt greater monstrosities. Perhaps while he was in the Megarid he made his first contacts with the family of Phokion¹³ and developed a taste for the ways of the Attic *hetairai*, women like Glykera and Pythionike,¹⁴ who were to contribute to his ultimate demise. Similarly, Alexander's willingness to forgive and his apparent disappearance over the Indian horizon spurred Harpalos on to greater extravagances and debaucheries: "while the cat is away, the mice will play." What the famous Harpalos affair reveals about Harpalos as a man provides a valuable insight into the obscurities of his first flight.¹⁵

WALDEMAR HECKEL

University of British Columbia

12. On the activities of Alexander of Epeiros in Italy, see E. N. Borza, "The End of Agis' Revolt," *CP* 66 (1971): 231-32.

13. See Plut. *Phokion* 21.

14. Plut. *Phokion* 22; Diod. 17. 108; Paus. 1. 37. 5. According to Athenaios 595E-596A, his relationship with Pythionike was the subject of an unusual satyr play, Python's *Agon*. See B. Snell, *Szenen aus griechischen Dramen* (Berlin, 1971), pp. 104-137.

15. I withhold judgment on Peter Green's view (*Alexander of Macedon* [Harmondsworth, 1974], p. 222) that "Harpalos may, in fact, have been on a secret mission to watch the political situation in Greece, with defection as his cover-story."