ERRORS IN ARRIAN

Arrian is regarded as the most authoritative of the extant sources for the reign of Alexander the Great. It is his work that is usually chosen to provide the narrative core of modern histories, and very often a mere reference to 'the reliable Arrian' is considered sufficient to guarantee the veracity of the information derived from him. What gives Arrian his prestige is his reliance on contemporary sources, Ptolemy and Aristobulus. It is recognized that Arrian's narrative is based primarily upon Ptolemy, and, as long as Ptolemy is regarded as an impeccable mine of facts for Alexander's reign and Arrian's work is accepted as a faithful reproduction of Ptolemy, the *Anabasis Alexandri* stands out as a uniquely authoritative record of Alexander's reign. Indeed Arrian's text has been thought to retain the original wording of Ptolemy, itself supposedly copied from a hypothetical court journal kept by Eumenes of Cardia. In that case Arrian's *Anabasis* is only two removes from the actual archives of Alexander.[1] The first of these tenets of belief, the factual reliability of Ptolemy, has recently been under attack. Not only has it been virtually disproved that Ptolemy constructed his history from archival material, but it appears that he inserted his own propaganda to exaggerate his personal achievements under Alexander and to discredit those of his rivals.[2] It is the second tenet, the faithfulness of Arrian's reproduction of his sources, that I wish to examine, and I shall try to prove that Arrian was prone to the errors of misunderstanding and faulty source conflation that one would expect in a secondary historian of antiquity.

We should first examine what Arrian says about his historiographical aims, both in the *Anabasis* and elsewhere. In the *Anabasis* Arrian makes it quite plain that his work is designed as a literary showpiece. Alexander's achievements, he says, have never been adequately commemorated in prose or verse. The field is

[1] The most impressive monument to this approach, and indeed its *reductio ad absurdum*, is E. Kornemann, *Die Alexandergeschichte des Königs Ptolemaios I von Aegypten* (Leipzig 1935). For Kornemann the vast majority of Arrian's narrative was a verbatim transcript of Ptolemy, whose material was derived in its turn from the court archives. See the impressive review by H. Strasburger, *Gnomon* 13 (1937), 483–92, rightly protesting against the undervaluation of Arrian's own contribution. Even Strasburger, however, took for granted 'der aktenmässige Grundstock' of Arrian, which he agreed went back to Ptolemy (486). The belief in court Journals as the ultimate and official source of the tradition in Arrian goes back to Droysen (*Geschichte des Hellenismus* i.[2] 2. 383–6), but the theory was most fully argued by U. Wilcken, ὑπομνηματισμοί, *Philologus* 53 (1894), 80–126, esp. 117: 'es sei mir erlaubt, in kurzen Zügen die Hypothese hinzustellen, dass die Ephemeriden Alexanders die Hauptquelle für die Memoiren des Königs Ptolemaios I gewesen sind, die wiederum den Grundstock der Anabasis

Arrians bilden'. This statement by Wilcken became canonical for German scholarship (see the bibliography by J. Seibert, *Alexander der Grosse*, 1972, 5–6; 230–1). In English literature the most decisive statements are to be found in the work of Sir W.W. Tarn, who for all his scepticism of German Quellenkritik wholly accepted its basic premiss, that Ptolemy used the Journal (cf. *Alexander the Great* ii. 1–2; 263–4; 374).

[2] For recent attacks on the theory that the 'Royal Ephemerides' were Ptolemy's principal source see L. Pearson, *Historia* 3 (1954/5), 432–9; E. Badian, *Studies in Greek and Roman History* (1964), 256–8; A.E. Samuel, *Historia* 14 (1965), 1–12; A.B. Bosworth, *CQ* 65 (1971), 117–23. On Ptolemy's view of his own role see C.B. Welles, 'The Reliability of Ptolemy as an Historian', *Miscellanea Rostagni* (Turin 1963), 101–16; and J. Seibert, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Ptolemaios I (Münch. Beitr.* 56: 1969), 1–26. For propaganda against contemporaries see R.M. Errington, *CQ* 63 (1969), 233–42.

therefore open for him to do for the Macedonian king what Pindar had done for the Deinomenid tyrants and Xenophon for the march of the Ten Thousand.[3] Throughout his work Arrian is proudly conscious of his stylistic mastery, and he assumes a wide public. He openly claims the first place in Greek literature and at the outset he states that his history will stand comparison with anything previously written about Alexander.[4] Arrian is of course concerned with veracity, and he seems convinced that his choice of sources guarantees the truth of his account. Indeed a by-product of his work will be to stop the transmission of popular fantasies from generation to generation.[5] Literary considerations, however, are paramount. Arrian claims superiority to *all* Alexander historians, not merely the inferior stylists of the early Hellenistic period but also writers of his own age. Arrian's fellow countryman, Dio Cocceianus of Prusa, had written an eight-volume work περὶ τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου ἀρετῶν, and we can be sure that it had an encomiastic bias.[6] Alexander's achievements had, then, been praised in prose by the leading Bithynian orator and stylist of the previous generation. Arrian intended to do better.

It is unwise to exaggerate the importance in Arrian's eyes of his work on Alexander. The subject attracted him, he says, because it was a field worthy of his talents.[7] He does not imply that his preoccupation with Alexander was of long standing. When he says that for him his country, family, and public offices have always been οἵδε οἱ λόγοι, he is referring not so much to his specific work on Alexander (i.e. 'this treatise') but to the totality of his literary production (i.e. 'these writings of mine'). The parallels from Arrian's usage elsewhere suggest that when he refers to a single monograph he describes it in the singular as a λόγος, not in the plural.[8] Arrian speaks as a writer assured of his literary mastery and reputation; he is actually doing a service for Alexander.[9] Now we know indirectly that Arrian did not regard his work on Alexander as his major literary

---

[3] Arr. 1. 12. 2–3. Arrian has in mind Thucydides' famous strictures of histories of the *pentekontaetia* (Thuc. 1. 97. 2), on which the passage is patently modelled (note the verbal echo τὸ χωρίον τοῦτο ἐκλιπὲς ξυνέβη).

[4] Arr. *praef.* 3; cf. 7. 30. 3.

[5] 6. 11. 2: οὐδὲ ἀφήσει παραδιδοῦσα καὶ ἐφεξῆς ἄλλοις τὰ ψευδῆ, εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ τῆσδε τῆς ξυγγραφῆς παύσεται.

[6] 'Suda', s.v. Δίων ὁ Πασικράτους (=FGrH 153 F 6). No fragments have survived, but the references to Alexander in Dio's Orations are generally favourable (cf. A. Heuss, *Antike und Abendland* 4, 1954, 90–4). On any chronology of Arrian's literary development Dio's work must have preceded the *Anabasis*. Dio had been born about A.D. 40 and may not have outlived Trajan. It would be useful to know whether Arrian had any acquaintance with Plutarch's work on Alexander. The biography itself may have been published between 110 and 115 (C.P. Jones, *JRS* 56 (1966), 69; J.R. Hamilton, *Plutarch Alexander*, 1969, xxxvii), perhaps not too long before the

Anabasis (for this chronology see *CQ* 66, 1972, 163–85). The earlier speeches, *De Alexandri fortuna aut virtute*, were certainly available to Arrian, but he may not have been as familiar with the lesser works of Plutarch as he was with Dio of Prusa.

[7] 1. 12. 4: οὐκ ἀπαξιώσας ἐμαυτὸν φανερὰ καταστήσειν τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργα.

[8] e.g. *Ind.* 43.14: οὗτός μοι ὁ λόγος ἀναγεγράφθω. *Tact.* 32.3: τόδε μοι ἔσται τέλος τοῦ λόγου τοῦ τακτικοῦ. For further discussion see A.B. Bosworth, *CQ* 66 (1972), 148.

[9] That is the entire tenor of the historiographical excursus (1. 12. 3–5). Alexander has never achieved even the renown of the Ten Thousand despite the multitude of his historians and the greatness of his achievements. That gap Arrian will fill. Admittedly he concedes at 1. 12. 5 that the greatness of his subject will give him supremacy in Greek letters (cf. G. Schepens, *Ancient Society* 2, 1971, 262–3), but he takes for granted his ability to produce the definitive history of Alexander's reign.

task. In the preface to the *Bithyniaca* he claimed that it was the history of Bithy-
nia that occupied his attention from the outset of his historical career. The
preparation had taken an excessive time because of his inexperience in the field,
and in the interim he had published monographs on Dion and Timoleon and also
his work on Alexander.[10] The history of Alexander was in a sense preparatory,
but hardly a stylistic exercise, as Schwartz thought. In the *Anabasis* Arrian
proudly asserts that he heads the field of Greek literature, and nothing in his
writing suggests stylistic immaturity. Arrian stresses in the *Bithyniaca* that it was
the preparation (παρασκευή) that was time-consuming. What this implied is clear
from Lucian's treatise on historiography: the primary work of collecting inform-
ation and shaping it in the correct proportions in a rough first draft, or ὑπόμνημα.
The stylistic embellishment was a later, more important, task.[11] The history of
Bithynia involved a vast coverage from mythological times until the death of
Nicomedes IV Philopator in 74 B.C. There was a mass of material, mostly com-
piled during the Hellenistic period,[12] and the process of selection and assimilation
must have been difficult. It is hardly surprising that Arrian turned to more
limited periods of non-contemporary history in order to gain expertise in the
creating of a unitary, seamless narrative from disparate primary sources.

   We can now understand the peculiarity of the *Anabasis*. Stylistically it is the
work of a mature and skilful writer, steeped in the models of the classical period
and with all the figures of the schools at his command. At the same time Arrian
is relatively inexperienced in the selection and juxtaposition of material from his
primary sources, and it is here that we may expect to find misunderstandings due
to over-hasty reading and doublets arising from imperfect conflation of the two
narratives. Such errors are commonplace in Livy, an author who, like Arrian,
wrote non-contemporary history,[13] and it would be naïve to suppose that Arrian
was free from error at this early stage of his historical development. In what
follows I shall illustrate the two most characteristic types of error, misunderstand-
ing of a single source and imperfect reconciliation of variant traditions. I shall
then approach two important problems of Alexander's reign, one new and one
old, and show how the whole aspect of the question can change once it is accepted
that Arrian's technique is fallible.

I

   In the autumn of 335 Alexander returned to Macedonia after the destruction
of Thebes and the demand for the surrender of the Athenian statesmen. Once in

[10] *Bithyniaca* F. 1.3 (Roos): μετὰ γὰρ τὰ
περὶ Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ Τιμολέοντα καὶ Δίωνα,
μετὰ τὰς περὶ αὐτοὺς ἱστορίας, ἥδε αὐτῷ ἡ
συγγραφὴ ἐξεπονήθη, καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς μὲν ἀφ'
οὗ γράφειν ἴσχυσε, ταύτην ἐνστήσασθαι καὶ
συντάξαι τὴν ὑπόθεσιν βουληθέντι, τῆς δὲ
παρασκευῆς τῷ ἐνδεῶς αὐτὸν ἔχειν
παρατεινάσης τὸν χρόνον. For discussion
of text and interpretation see *CQ* 66 (1972),
178–80.

[11] Lucian, *De hist. conscr.* 52: πάντων
δὲ ἤδη παρεσκευασμένων καὶ ἀπροοιμίαστον
μέν ποτε ποιήσεται τὴν ἀρχὴν κτλ. For the
ὑπόμνημα see Lucian 48 with Arrian, *Ep. ad
L. Gellium* 1–4 (Roos, *Arriani scripta minora*
196). Cf. Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.50: πάσης μοι

τῆς πραγματείας ἐν παρασκευῇ γεγενημένης
. . . οὕτως ἐποιησάμην τῶν πράξεων τὴν
παράδοσιν.

[12] e.g. the *Bithyniaca* of Asclepiades of
Myrlea (*FGrH* 697); Alexander Polyhistor's
περὶ Βιθυνίας (*FGrH* 273 F 12–13; 125);
Menecrates' history of Nicaea (*FGrH* 701);
and the monograph on the Kings of Bithynia
by Nicander of Chalcedon (*FGrH* 700).

[13] Cf. P.G. Walsh, *Livy* (1961), 141 ff.;
esp. 146–8. For more startling examples of
what a secondary author could do with a
respectable source see the discussion of
Diodorus' use of Polybius by R. Drews,
AJP 83 (1962), 384–5.

Macedon, says Arrian, he conducted the sacrifice to Olympian Zeus which King
Archelaus had instituted and held the Macedonian Olympia at Aegae (καὶ τὸν
ἀγῶνα ἐν Αἰγαῖς διέθηκε τὰ Ὀλύμπια).[14] Arrian explicitly locates the Olympia
at the old capital of Aegae, and he is clearly wrong. Every other source which
refers to the Macedonian Olympia stresses that they were held at Dium, a city
well to the south of Aegae, less than a mile from the foot of Mt. Olympus.[15]
The Olympia were held regularly at Dium, for, when Scopas and his Aetolians
devastated the city in 219 B.C., among the items destroyed were the instal-
lations for the festival.[16] We cannot even reckon on the possibility of an irregular
celebration at Aegae in 335, for Diodorus also describes the return to Macedonia
and says explicitly that at Dium Alexander carried out elaborate sacrifices and
held the nine-day festival in honour of Zeus and the Muses which Archelaus had
established.[17] This festival for Zeus and the Muses was in fact the Macedonian
Olympia; that is plainly stated by the scholia to Demosthenes. There can be no
doubt that in 335, as in other years, the Olympia were held at Dium. Dio
Cocceianus mentions a similar tradition that after the battle of Chaeronea Philip
and Alexander sacrificed to the Muses at Dium and held the Olympian festival.[18]
The tradition is consistent and points to an error in Arrian.

    The error did not arise from source conflation, for immediately after his
reference to the Olympia held at Aegae Arrian mentions a variant tradition that
Alexander held a festival in honour of the Muses.[19] The festival was of course
the Olympia at Dium. Arrian found references in his two sources to the Olympia
and to the festival for the Muses, and he inferred erroneously that they were
different ceremonies. The reference to the Olympia at Aegae must be taken from
a single source, and the error is either one of misunderstanding by Arrian or a
mistake on the part of his primary source. If that source was, as is generally
thought, Ptolemy, the error is incomprehensible. Even if the passage derives from
Aristobulus, serious difficulties remain, for Aristobulus was a resident of Cassan-
dreia in Macedonia, and he ought to have been well informed about the Olympia.
The misunderstanding is most probably Arrian's own. Now it is striking that
Archelaus' name appears in Arrian only in the context of the sacrifice to Olympian
Zeus; in the Diodoran tradition he is associated rather with the establishment of
the Olympia. It seems implausible that a sacrifice to Olympian Zeus was first
instituted by Archelaus, who reigned as late as 413–399 B.C. As the chief god of

----

[14] Arr. 1. 11. 1.

[15] Schol. Dem. 19. 192: τὰ Ὀλύμπια δὲ
πρῶτος Ἀρχέλαος ἐν Δίῳ τῆς Μακεδονίας
κατέδειξε · ἤγετο δ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἐννέα, ὡς φάσιν,
ἡμέρας, ἰσαρίθμους ταῖς Μούσαις. Cf. Steph.
Byz., s.v. Δῖον. These and other references
are quoted in full by W. Baege, De Mace-
donum sacris (Diss. Hal. xxii.1: 1913),
10–11. Once he had collected the refer-
ences Baege saw at once that Arrian's state-
ment about Aegae was mistake (p.8 'errore
auctoris'; so F. Geyer, RE xiv. 716: 'statt
"Aigai" muss "Dion" stehen'; J.N. Kalléris,
Les Anciens Macédoniens i, Athens 1954,
251, n. 2). For the site of Dium see Livy
44. 6. 15 with N.G.L. Hammond, A History
of Macedonia i (Oxford 1972), 125.

[16] Polybius 4. 62. 2.

[17] Diod. 17. 16. 3: θυσίας . . . συνετέλεσεν
ἐν Δίῳ τῆς Μακεδονίας καὶ σκηνικοὺς ἀγῶνας
Διὶ καὶ Μούσαις οὓς Ἀρχέλαος πρῶτος κατέ-
δειξε. For the equation of the Olympia with
the games in honour of the Muses see Schol.
Dem. 19. 192, quoted above.

[18] Dio, Orat. 2. 2: ἐν Δίῳ τῆς Πιερίας
ἔθυον ταῖς Μούσαις καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν
Ὀλυμπίων ἐτίθεσαν.

[19] Arr. 1. 11. 1: οἱ δὲ καὶ ταῖς Μούσαις
λέγουσιν ὅτι ἀγῶνα ἐποίησε. The λέγουσι
does not necessarily refer to the subsidiary
tradition; it merely means that the material
is taken from a source different from the
source of the preceding material, in this case
probably Aristobulus (cf. Schwartz, RE ii.
912; H. Strasburger, Ptolemaios und Alex-
ander, 23).

the Macedonian pantheon and the ultimate ancestor of the Argead house one
would expect Zeus to have been honoured with sacrifices from time immemorial.[20]
If, however, we accept the alternative tradition that it was the Olympia that
Archelaus established, we can explain the possible origin of the error. The Olympia
were celebrated some time after the Great Mysteries at Athens,[21] that is, after the
latter part of September. Very probably they inaugurated the Macedonian New
Year, which fell roughly in the middle of October; and the first month of the
Macedonian year was *Dios*, the month of Zeus.[22] It might be the case that until
the reign of Archelaus the New Year had begun with a ceremonial sacrifice to
Zeus in the old capital, Aegae. Archelaus then transferred the sacrifice to Dium
and associated it with the newly established festival for the Muses, the Olympia.
Arrian's source perhaps gave a brief history of the New Year celebrations, men-
tioning the original sacrifice at Aegae and the establishment of the Olympia by
Archelaus. If Arrian had been working hurriedly, he might easily have mis-
understood the passage and supposed that Archelaus established the sacrifice and
that the Olympia was held at Aegae. The passage is historically unimportant, but
it is a clear example of an error of misunderstanding and raises the possibility
that there may be similar mistakes in the account of more serious matters.

A more important issue is raised by Arrian's account of Alexander's adminis-
trative measures at Susa in December 331 (3. 16. 9). The satrap of Susiane who
had held office under Darius was confirmed in his position under the supervision
of a Macedonian general, Archelaus son of Theodorus. The citadel of Susa was
placed under a separate commander, named by Arrian Μάζαρον τῶν ἑταίρων:
'Mazarus, one of the *hetairoi*'. Now Mazarus is a suspiciously Iranian-sounding
name, reminiscent of Mazares the Mede mentioned by Herodotus,[23] and the
aftermath of Gaugamela is a remarkably early time to find an oriental assimilated
into the Macedonian court élite. It is true that Persians who had surrendered in
the early years of the campaign, men like Mithrines and Amminapes, were
honoured with satrapies in the year following Gaugamela,[24] but there is no
suggestion that they had been made *hetairoi*. Berve was therefore forced to con-
clude that, despite his name, Mazarus was a prominent Macdonian.[25] Curtius,
however, gives a version of the Susa appointments which is fuller than Arrian's.
Abulites' confirmation as satrap is mentioned, as is the appointment of

---

[20] For full references to the cult of Zeus
in Macedonia see Baege, op. cit. 1–20. The
eponymous hero Macedon was said to have
been a son of Zeus (Hesiod F 7 (O.C.T.)), and
the Macedonian royal house was doubly
descended from Zeus thanks to its Heraclid
lineage (cf. Arr. 3. 3. 1–2).

[21] Cf. Arr. 1. 10. 2; Plut. *Camillus* 19.10.
The news of the destruction of Thebes reached
Athens at the time of the Great Mysteries,
which were held between 15 and 24 Boedro-
mion (*IG* ii². 1078. 11 ff.; S. Dow, *HSCP* 48,
1937, 111–20), roughly between 20 and 30
September according to the Julian calendar.
Soon afterwards Alexander marched north
to Macedonia.

[22] For discussion of the Macedonian

calendar see Beloch, *GG* iv². 2. 26 ff.;
A.E. Samuel, *Greek and Roman Chronology*
(Munich 1972), 139 ff. On the importance
of the name *Dios* see Kalléris, *Les Anciens
Macédoniens* i.158.

[23] For Mazares the Mede see Herodotus 1.
156.2; 157.3; 160–1.

[24] Mithrines was made satrap of Armenia
immediately after Gaugamela (Arr. 3. 16. 5;
Diod. 17. 64. 6; Curt. 5. 1. 44), and Am-
minapes was appointed to Parapamisadae im-
mediately after the death of Darius (Arr. 3.
22. 1; cf. Curt. 6. 4. 25).

[25] Berve, *Das Alexanderreich* (Munich
1926), ii.246, no. 486, following F. Justi,
Iranisches Namenbuch (1895), 201, and
O. Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen* (1906), 181.

Archelaus with an army 3,000 strong.[26] Curtius adds that a certain Callicrates
was put in charge of the treasuries, a piece of circumstantial information which
has not been challenged. He also mentions the citadel commander and his garrison
of 1,000 veterans, but he names him not Mazarus but Xenophilus. Now Xeno-
philus is a known figure. In 317/16 he was treasurer and garrison commander of
the citadel of Susa, and in that role he supported Eumenes against Antigonus.[27]
According to Curtius, Xenophilus was appointed by Alexander as early as 331.
Faced with the undeniable fact that Xenophilus was indeed citadel commander
of Susa later on, scholars have usually assumed that Curtius' source erroneously
anticipated his appointment; he was, it is argued, Mazarus' successor, appointed
late in Alexander's reign.[28]

It is more likely that Arrian is wrong. Curtius' record of the appointments at
Susa, we have seen, is far fuller than that of Arrian. In general Arrian's narrative
of the period between Gaugamela and the firing of Persepolis is extremely com-
pressed and scrappy. The so-called vulgate tradition gives much fuller detail, par-
ticularly where appointments are concerned. If we compare the accounts of
Alexander's settlement at Babylon, we find much the same information in Arrian
and Curtius.[29] Curtius, however, is much more interested in the citadel. Agathon,
he says, was appointed citadel commander with a garrison of 700 Macedonians
and 300 mercenaries, while the previous Persian commander, Bagophanes, was
deprived of office but retained in Alexander's entourage.[30] These arrangements
are unrecorded by Arrian, but there is no reason to doubt them. The palace
fortress to the north of Babylon had been the headquarters of the Persian garrison
and dominated the city.[31] Alexander must have placed his own forces in control,
and the names and numbers in the vulgate tradition seem quite unexceptionable.
At Babylon a Persian citadel commander was replaced by a Macedonian, and the
same must have been true at Susa. Now Curtius reports the installation of a
Macedonian (or Greek) named Xenophilus, who is attested in that role thirteen
years later, whereas Arrian names an otherwise unknown *hetairos* with the Iranian
name Mazarus. It is surely best to assume another misunderstanding on Arrian's
part. His source presumably mentioned both the Persian commander, who can
only have been Mazarus, and his Macedonian successor, Xenophilus. Arrian's
narrative is compressed and superficial at this point, and, if he was working at
speed, he might well have conflated the two men, so transforming Darius'
garrison commander into a *hetairos* of Alexander.

If it is accepted that Mazarus held the citadel of Susa under Darius, a possible
solution emerges for a famous numismatic problem. Barbarian imitations of Attic

---

[26] Curt. 5. 2. 16—17: 'Susa urbem
Archelao et praesidium III milium tradidit,
Xenophilo arcis cura mandata est mille
Macedonum aetate gravibus praesidere arcis
custodiae iussis, thesaurorum Callicrati tutela
permissa, satrapea regionis Susianae restituta
Abulitae.'

[27] Diod. 19. 17. 3; 48. 1; 48. 6.

[28] So Berve ii.282, no. 578; Lehmann-
Haupt, *RE* iiA. 143; Chr. Habicht, *RE* ixA.
1565—6. A.T. Olmstead, *A History of the
Persian Empire* (Chicago 1948), 518—20,
attempted a conflation of Arrian and Curtius.
Mazarus, he rightly inferred, was the Persian
commander of the citadel, retained by Alex-

ander; Zenophilus (*sic*) was over the citadel.
Olmstead wisely does not try to explain how
the functions of the two men differed.

[29] Curt. 5. 1. 43—4 (supplementary
material in Diod. 17. 64.5, derived from the
common source); Arr. 3. 16. 4.

[30] Curt. 5. 1. 44: 'Bagophanem, qui arcem
tradiderat, se sequi iussit.' Bagophanes is
mentioned earlier in Curtius' elaborate des-
cription of the surrender of Babylon (5. 1. 20),
by far the fullest and best extant account of
the proceedings.

[31] For a good description see F. Schacher-
meyr, *Alexander in Babylon* (SB. Wien, Phil.-
Hist. Kl. cclxviii.3: 1970), 49—63.

owl tetradrachms are a common phenomenon in the fourth century B.C. One
large group, dating from the latter part of the century, presents particular
problems.[32] The provenance of these coins is invariably Babylonia, and they
bear the Aramaic superscription of the striking authority, a name which Newell
interpreted as 'Mazakes'. Similar imitations with the same superscription and
the same peculiar monogram (🏳) have been found in Egypt, and Newell rightly
concluded that they were struck by Mazaces, the last Persian satrap of Egypt,
in order to pay the Greek mercenaries levied before Issus.[33] Less happily, he
assumed that Mazaces was rewarded by Alexander for his surrender and given an
autonomous territory in Babylonia, where he struck the imitation tetradrachms.
Such an enclave of independence in Alexander's empire, with rights of coining
included, is virtually inconceivable, and Badian quite justly dismisses the theory
as 'a numismatists' myth'.[34] The interpretation of the Aramaic superscription is
by no means certain. Newell himself stresses 'the uncertainty inherent in so many
Aramaic letters', and in the last century Six had read the name as 'Mazdad' or
'Mazdar', assuming that the coins were struck by Mazarus, whom he believed to
have been Alexander's citadel commander in Susa.[35] Once more the theory in-
volved an anomaly. It is hard to envisage a Macedonian subordinate of Alexander
issuing imitations of Athenian tetradrachms in his own name. But, once we
assume that Mazarus held the citadel under Darius, the difficulties disappear. The
barbarian imitations in Babylonia were issued at the same time as those from
Egypt and with the same object, as payment fro the vast number of Greek mercen-
aries in Persian service before Issus and Gaugamela. Mazarus, like Xenophilus in
317/16, presumably had the treasures of Susa in his charge,[36] and he was the
obvious person to supervise the striking of coins for the army. Such activity is
certainly more plausible in the confusion of the latter years of Darius III than in
the reign of Alexander, when the mints were rigidly controlled and a standard
regal coinage enforced. If the legend on the Egyptian and Babylonian imitations
is similar, it is explained by the similarity of the two names; both Mazaces as
satrap of Egypt and Mazarus as citadel commander at Susa struck tetradrachms
for the army and inscribed a virtually identical monogram.[37]

[32] The definitive discussion is by E.T.
Newell, 'Miscellanea Numismatica: Cyrene to
India', *Numismatic Notes and Monographs*
82 (1938), 82–8. Newell's conclusions have
been accepted by A.R. Bellinger, *Essays in
the Coinage of Alexander the Great* (1963),
65–6, and G. Le Rider, *Schweizer Münz-
blätter* 85 (1972), 1–7.

[33] Newell, op. cit. 72–5.

[34] E. Badian, *Greece and Rome* 12
(1965), 173, n. 4. The evidence for indepen-
dent coinages in Alexander's reign is very
slender. Even in Phoenicia local issues were
superseded by the royal coinage, the only
concession being that the kings of Aradus and
Byblus added their own monogram (Bellinger,
Essays, 50–6). The nearest parallel would be
the lion staters of Mazaeus, which may have
been issued while Mazaeus was satrap of
Babylonia under Alexander. But the very
uniqueness of these issues has evoked doubts
about their attribution to Alexander's reign
(Badian, op. cit. 173, apparently followed

by R. Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great*, 1973,
528). It is, however, a far cry from the satrap
of Babylonia issuing his own coinage to the
petty ruler of some unnamed city striking
his own imitations of Attic tetradrachms.

[35] J.P. Six, *Num. Chron.* 1884, 141–3
Newell, 88, n. 172, observes that Mazarus
as a mere *phrurarch* could not have struck
his own coins under Alexander; that is true,
and a conclusive argument against his own
attribution. On his hypothesis Mazakes was
at best under-governor, not a satrap.

[36] Compare Curtius' description of
Bagophanes, the Persian citadel commander
of Babylon: 'arcis et regis pecuniae custos'.

[37] Even if the Aramaic legend is proved
to read 'Mazdak' (which, given the difficulty
of reading, is very unlikely), the issuer of the
coins may still be identified as the Persian
commander at Susa. Arrian's text is not
infallible in these matters; at 3. 22. 1 all
manuscripts read Μαξαίου for Μαξάκου, and
there *may* be a corruption at 3. 16. 9.

It should now be clear that it is unwise to insist on the precise wording of Arrian when that wording produces contradictions and conflict with other evidence. Arrian is prone to misread and misinterpret his primary sources, and the smooth flow of his narrative can obscure treacherous quicksands of error. There is a good example at 1. 6. 11, where Arrian claims that Alexander pursued his Illyrian opponents from the city of Pellion μέχρι πρὸς τὰ ὄρη τῶν Ταυλαντίων. This can only mean one thing; the pursuit continued 'as far as the mountains of the Taulantians'.[38] The Taulantians lived in the hinterland of Epidamnus/ Dyrrhachium, and their territory probably extended as far inland as modern Elbasan.[39] Wherever one locates the site of Pellion, the mountains of the Taulan- tians were some 100 kilometres from the battle site. A pursuit of those dimen- sions is, I think, impossible. Alexander launched his surprise attack on the Illyrian camp with a force of infantry, the Agrianians, hypaspists, and two phalanx battalions. He attacked before the rest of the army had caught up, and there is no hint of any cavalry support.[40] What is more, only part of the enemy took to flight. A substantial group under King Cleitus withdrew to the city and prepared to stand siege.[41] It seems incredible that Alexander should have divided his army and taken his infantry on a pursuit several days long. Once more it is easiest to assume a minor misunderstanding on Arrian's part. The narrative of the battle ends somewhat abruptly, for Arrian was no doubt keen to move on to the next major episode, the fall of Thebes, and he could have abbreviated his source misleadingly. Ptolemy need have said only that the pursuit was taken across the plain to the mountains which faced Taulantian territory (as opposed to those facing Macedonia). Arrian clumsily abbreviated his expression as 'the mountains of the Taulantians' and so created a pursuit of 100 kilometres.

II

So far the errors dealt with have been misunderstandings of a single source. There are, however, more complex problems created by faulty manipulation of two or more sources. At the outset Arrian states categorically that his two principal sources are Ptolemy and Aristobulus. Where they agree he will record the common version as the absolute truth; in case of disagreement he will select the more plausible version, making use of all memorable material.[42] Arrian does

[38] So N.G.L. Hammond, *JHS* 94 (1974), 85, n. 34. Hammond is committed to taking Arrian's wording in deadly earnest because of a belief that his account is taken ultimately from a day-to-day diary compiled under Alexander and transmitted in an abbreviated but substantially correct form. (pp. 77–8).

[39] Thuc. 1. 24. 1; Ps.-Scylax 26; Eratos- thenes ap. Steph. Byz., *s.v.* Δυρράχιον; Strabo 7. 7. 8 (326). For the boundaries of the Taulantian kingdom see Hammond, *ABSA* 61 (1966), 247.

[40] Arr. 1. 6. 10 οὐ προσμείνας ὁμοῦ γενέσθαι πάντας. Hammond, *JHS* 94 (1974), 85, translates τοῖς ἀμφὶ Ἀλέξανδρον at 1. 6. 11 as 'Alexander's Own Cavalry', so conjuring

a cavalry force out of thin air. The expression merely means 'Alexander's men' and does not imply the presence of cavalry. Compare 1. 28. 5, where οἱ ἀμφὶ Ἀλέξανδρον refers to a battle line composed exclusively of infantry.

[41] 1. 6. 11: Cleitus first took refuge in the city but then left to join Glaucias and the Taulantians. The siege must have been raised at the news of the revolt of Thebes (so Hammond 86). Arrian, however, says nothing of the circumstances of the Mace- donian withdrawal.

[42] *Praef.* 1: ὅσα δὲ οὐ ταὐτά, τούτων τὰ πιστότερα ἐμαὶ φαινόμενα καὶ ἅμα ἀξιαφηγ- ητότερα ἐπιλεξάμενος.

not commit himself to record all divergences. Indeed he very rarely records dis-
agreement, and gives variant traditions only when he considers them memorable
in themselves. Usually he reproduces without comment the version which seems
to him the more credible. There are accordingly two main areas where error is
likely. Arrian may reproduce only one version, but he has read both, and there
are occasional traces of contamination, both deliberate and inadvertent. The
alternative, rejected tradition creeps in to infect the version chosen for reproduc-
tion. Secondly Arrian is not always aware when his sources are retailing the same
episode. An incident may be placed by Ptolemy and Aristobulus at different points
in the narrative or described with very different details. In these circumstances
Arrian may use both descriptions from both sources and retail them as separate
incidents. Both types of error can be traced, and I shall discuss some typical
instances.

In his detailed description of the Macedonian battle line at Gaugamela Arrian
reviews in order the six phalanx battalions and states that the battalion of Amyn-
tas son of Philippus was commanded in his absence by his brother, Simmias.[43]
Amyntas' patronymic is clearly wrong. He and his brothers are mentioned
repeatedly in the history of Alexander's reign, and their father's name is elsewhere
unequivocally attested as Andromenes.[44] There have accordingly been repeated
attempts to emend away the offending name. Readers of Abicht's Teubner
edition or Robson's Loeb edition will be unaware that Arrian's manuscripts read
anything other than Ἀνδρομένους.[45] But it is quite impossible to explain how
the textual corruption arose. Nothing in the context suggests a reason for the
scribe to have substituted Φιλίππου for Ἀνδρομένους. The mistake can only be
attributed to Arrian himself, and it is easy to see how it occurred. The vulgate
tradition of Gaugamela includes a description of the Macedonian line. The
phalanx commanders are the same as in Arrian, with one exception: the battalion
of Amyntas was commanded in his absence by Philippus, son of Balacrus.[46] Now
we can explain the error in Arrian. His source for the Macedonian line of battle
was most probably Ptolemy, and it was his version that Arrian followed. But he
must have collated the Ptolemaic version against that of Aristobulus, and, although
he accepted Ptolemy's statement that Simmias commanded Amyntas' battalion,
he was aware of the variant tradition placing it under Philippus, son of Balacrus,
and the name of Philippus slipped in erroneously as the patronymic of Amyntas.
It seems to me a clear case of source contamination.

The same appears to have happened in Arrian's review of the Macedonian line
at the Granicus (1. 14. 1–3). Here Arrian rather annoyingly lists the two halves
of the army from the wing to the centre, giving first the right and then the left.
The battalion of Philippus, son of Amyntas (a person otherwise obscure),[47]
occupied a central position in the line and is therefore mentioned at the end of

[43] Arr. 3. 11. 9: ἐπὶ δὲ ἡ Ἀμύντου τοῦ
Φιλίππου · ταύτης δὲ ἡγεῖτο Σιμμίας κτλ.
[44] Arr. 1.8.2; 1. 14. 2; 3. 16. 10; 3. 27. 1;
Curt. 5. 1. 40; cf. Berve ii.26, no. 57.
[45] The emendation appeared in two works
both published in 1668, J. Palmarius, Exercit-
ationes in optimos auctores Graecos, 238, and
the edition of the Anabasis by N. Blancardus.
It was subsequently followed by all editors

except Roos, who observed, 'Arriano error
imputandus'.
[46] Diod. 17. 57. 3; Curt. 4. 13. 28
(Phaligrus Balacri—the emendation Philippus
is guaranteed by Diodorus).
[47] Along with Meleager he led the train
of booty sent back from the Danube in 335
(Arr. 1. 4. 5). He is not mentioned after the
battle of the Granicus.

both lists. Craterus' battalion, however, is also mentioned twice, but in different positions. In the review of the right half of the line it is placed between the battalions of Coenus and Amyntas, and it appears again as the battalion at the extreme left of the phalanx.[48] Once more there have been attempts to delete one of the references to Craterus' battalion,[49] but then it becomes impossible to explain the intrusion. There is no reason whatsoever to suppose a scribal gloss. The most probable solution is again source contamination by Arrian. Both Ptolemy and Aristobulus presumably gave full descriptions of the battle line and differed over the position of Craterus' battalion. One placed it in the mass of the phalanx and the other at the extreme left, the position it was to occupy at Gaugamela and Issus.[50] Arrian has absorbed both versions without reconciling the contradiction.

The account of the Granicus battle line is taken principally from Aristobulus. There are striking eccentricities when we compare it with other descriptions of major battles. The term used to refer to the Macedonian phalanx battalions is φάλαγξ, not τάξις, the regular expression used in Arrian's narrative. This is a rare usage, not however confined to Arrian, and it seems to have been a technical term in the Hellenistic period.[51] The terminology for the hypaspists is also obscure; they are called οἱ ὑπασπισταὶ τῶν ἑταίρων. Elsewhere it is only the Macedonian cavalry who are termed *hetairoi* and there is no indication that the class included infantry. Arrian may be making a mistake, misreading *pezhetairoi*, the generic title of the Macedonian infantry. Arrian's usage in other passages, however, suggests that *pezhetairoi* referred only to the six battalions of the phalanx, excluding the hypaspists.[52] The terminology used for the Macedonian infantry at the Granicus is, to say the least, exceptional and indicates a source other than that regularly used in Arrian's battle descriptions, in other words, not Ptolemy but Aristobulus.

The terminology in the army list is not only unusual but varied. The most striking instance is the oscillation between πρόδρομοι and σαρισσοφόροι to refer to the cavalry under the command of Amyntas, son of Arrhabaeus. The same contingent is referred to in both instances, for its commander is the same and it is associated with the Paeonians and the *ile* of Socrates.[53] The change of terminology is hardly due to Arrian himself, for the references to the cavalry of Amyntas are relatively widely spaced and there is no stylistic reason for variation. Both

[48] 1. 14. 2: ἐπὶ δὲ ἡ Κοίνου τοῦ Πολεμο-κράτους, ἐπὶ δὲ ἡ Κρατέρου τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου, ἐπὶ δὲ ἡ Ἀμύντα τοῦ Ἀνδρομένους. 1. 14. 3: ἥ τε Κρατέρου καὶ ἡ Μελεάγρου καὶ ἡ Φιλίππου ἔστε ἐπὶ τὸ μέσον τῆς ξυμπάσης τάξεως.

[49] So R. Köpke, *Jahrb. für class. Phil.* 99 (1869), 263–5; Droysen, *Kleine Schriften* ii. 222–3 (accepted in Roos's text). The author of the supposed gloss must have been erudite, for the name of Craterus' father is correctly given as Alexander (Arr. 1. 25. 9; *Ind.* 18. 5).

[50] Cf. 2. 8. 4; 3. 11. 10.

[51] φάλαγξ is used at 3. 9. 6, 5. 20. 3,

and 5. 21. 5 to refer to individual battalions. Polyaenus also refers to Perdiccas' battalion as μίαν ὁπλιτῶν φάλαγγα (4. 3. 27; cf. Arr. 3. 18. 5). For the general usage see Isidore, *Orig.* 9. 3. 46: 'proprie autem Macedonum phalanx, Gallorum caterva, nostra legio dicitur.'

[52] Cf. 1. 28. 3 (πεζέταιροι and hypaspists listed separately); so 7. 11. 3.

[53] Arr. 1. 14. 1 and 14. 6. The equation seems universally accepted; cf. Berve i.129; Tarn, *Alexander* ii.157; P.A. Brunt, *JHS* 83 (1963), 26; R.D. Milns, *JHS* 86 (1966), 167.

words are genuine Macedonian military terms,[54] and there is no possibility of deliberate archaizing by Arrian. The only explanation seems to me that Ptolemy and Aristobulus used different terms; σαρισσοφόροι is Aristobulus' term and πρόδρομοι Ptolemy's. This oscillation helps to detect a doublet in the description of the preliminaries to the battle. In the course of the approach to the Granicus Alexander sent out a party of scouts under the command of Amyntas, son of Arrhabaeus; they comprised four *ilai* of πρόδρομοι and the *ile* of Socrates (1. 12. 7). After a short passage describing the Persian council-of-war at Zeleia Arrian reverts to the Macedonian army. Alexander led his army in double column and sent scouts ahead under the command of Hegelochus, comprising the σαρισσοφόροι and 500 light infantry (1. 13. 1). It is possible that two groups of scouts were sent out, Hegelochus commanding the remnants of the πρόδρομοι/σαρισσοφόροι not included in Amyntas' command.[55] There is no suggestion from Arrian's wording that Hegelochus' men formed a second group, and it is striking that his terminology for the cavalry has changed. Arrian refers to the first group as πρόδρομοι and the second as σαρισσοφόροι. He has changed sources in the interim. He used Aristobulus' account of the Persian council-of-war (the names of the leaders given there differ slightly from those in the later casualty list),[56] and continued with Aristobulus for the debate between Alexander and Parmenion and for the battle order of the Macedonian army. The narrative switches back to Ptolemy for the actual attack (1. 14. 5). The two references to the scouts are taken from different sources, and it is possible that Ptolemy and Aristobulus disagreed over the composition and leadership. Arrian has failed to reconcile the divergence and so reported the mission of the scouting party twice over.

There are even more striking examples of Arrian's maladroit use of sources in the narrative of Alexander's Indus voyage in 325. At 6. 15. 5, just before his account of the invasion of the land of Musicanus, Arrian states that Craterus was sent out again with the army through Arachosia and Drangiana: καὶ Κράτερον μὲν ἐκπέμπει αὖθις ξὺν τῇ στρατιᾷ διὰ τῆς Ἀραχωτῶν καὶ Δραγγῶν γῆς. As it stands, the text refers to Craterus' commission to escort part of the infantry and the disabled veterans down the Helmand valley to Carmania. Unfortunately Arrian describes that commission very explicitly two chapters later (6. 17. 3), and in the intervening narrative he says that Craterus was given the task of fortifying the citadel of Musicanus' capital (6. 15. 7). It is impossible that Craterus could have been sent twice on his way, and Schmieder accordingly deleted διὰ

---

[54] σαρισσοφόρος does not occur in Greek literature before the Hellenistic period, and outside Arrian it does not denote a cavalryman (*pace* Tarn ii.157, n. 6, Didymus (col. xiii. 5–7) does not refer explicitly to a mounted σαρισσοφόρος). πρόδρομος is more frequent; its use to refer to the vanguard goes back to Herodotus. Diodorus, however, uses the word to refer to Thracian cavalry (Diod. 17. 17. 4; for discussion see Milns, *JHS* 86, 1966, 167), and it was certainly a technical term in Alexander's army.

[55] That appears to have been Berve's hypothesis (ii.164, no. 341). Hegelochus, he claims, was the commander of the πρόδρομοι temporarily placed under the wider command

of Amyntas. He seems, however, to conceive all the scouts as a single group. If Arrian's narrative is literally correct, there were two separate groups.

[56] At 1. 16. 3 Arrian mentions Mithrobuzanes, satrap of Cappadocia, and three relatives of Darius; Mithridates, Abrupales, and Pharnaces. None appears in the list of commanders at 1. 12. 8. Again at 2. 11. 8, a passage very probably from Ptolemy (*FGrH* 138 F 6), Atizyes is said to have been one of the commanders at the Granicus. His name does not appear at 1. 12. 8. Even Kornemann (op. cit. 103) agreed that the beginning of the report of the council-of-war must come from Aristobulus.

τῆς Ἀραχωτῶν καὶ Δραγγῶν γῆς as a scribal gloss. Craterus, he assumed, was ordered to accompany the fleet along the Indus bank, as he had done in the earlier stage of the journey (6. 15. 4). Schmieder's solution is attractively simple, and it has been universally accepted.[57] It is, however, untenable. In the first place, when the excision is made, Arrian's text does not have the meaning required by Schmieder. His language still implies that Craterus was sent away from Alexander and did not accompany the fleet. The verb ἐκπέμπειν is invariably used by Arrian to denote sending a person or contingent either temporarily or permanently from Alexander's court.[58] The closest parallel I can find for the sense required by Schmieder is a passage at the beginning of the Indus journey (6. 4. 1–2). Here Alexander sends out (ἐκπέμπει) two infantry columns to meet his fleet near the confluence of the Acesines and Hydraotes (cf. 6. 5. 5). The land forces go to the same destination but by a different route. That might have been true of Craterus' commission at 6. 15. 5, but we should still expect some qualification of destination or purpose. Schmieder's deletion leaves the text puzzlingly elliptical; Craterus is sent out, we know not where.

More seriously, the gloss posited by Schmieder is extremely sophisticated.[59] We have to assume that the scribe was aware of Craterus' mission to Carmania from his reading of 6. 17. 3 and inserted an erroneous note that the earlier mission of Craterus was through Drangiana and Arachosia, a note that was later absorbed into the text. It is a doubly sophisticated procedure in that the wording is changed. At 6. 17. 3 Arrian refers to the route as τὴν ἐπ' Ἀραχωτῶν καὶ Ζαραγγῶν, whereas in the supposed gloss the Zarangae are called by their synonym, Δράγγαι. It is surely unlikely in the extreme that a reader copying the route of Craterus from the later passage would have substituted the correct synonym for a people so obscure.[60] It is much easier to suppose that Arrian has included a doublet of Craterus' mission, placed by his two sources at different stages of the voyage down the Indus. Of these sources one referred to the Ζαράγγαι and the other to the Δράγγαι. We can detect the same oscillation of nomenclature in the earlier part of the narrative, which deals with the march of Alexander through Drangiana, the area around the Helmand Lakes in modern Sistan. This was the old Persian satrapy called Zranka or 'sea land'.[61] At 3. 25. 8

---

[57] The words are bracketed in every subsequent edition of Arrian, and modern historians who have noted the problem accepted the theory of a gloss without argument (e.g. Berve ii.224, n. 2; Kornemann, op. cit. 154, n. 132).

[58] e.g. 4. 18. 3: Σώπολιν δὲ . . . ἐς Μακεδονίαν ἐκπέμπει. 6. 17. 1: καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἐκπέμπει Πείθωνα . . . ξὺν στρατιᾷ ἀποχρώσῃ. Cf. also 1. 17. 2; 3. 29. 5.

[59] This seems typical of the glosses posited by Schmieder. For his performance

at 7. 11. 3 see Bosworth, CQ 67 (1973), 246–7.

[60] The change of nomenclature was immaterial to Schmieder, who had followed a suggestion of Blancardus and eliminated all forms other than Δράγγαι from his text. Once he had 'emended' 6. 17. 3 as τὴν ἐπ' Ἀραχωτῶν καὶ Δραγγῶν, he could present the supposed gloss as an exact copy.

[61] For discussion of the nomenclature and borders of the satrapy, see E. Herzfeld, The Persian Empire (Wiesbaden 1968), 331.

Alexander is said to have reached the palace of the Ζαραγγαῖοι, while in the resumptive note at 3. 28. 1 he refers to the people as Δράγγαι.[62] In the latter passage Arrian has patently changed sources, for after describing the settlement of the Ariaspae, the southern neighbours of the Drangae located on the Helmand river by the Arachosian border, Arrian gives a brief résumé of the journey from Prophthasia, including the submission of the Drangae, whose territory Alexander had already traversed. The variation in nomenclature is hardly due to Arrian himself; it is much more likely to be the result of divergence in his primary sources. Perhaps Aristobulus used the form Δράγγαι which appears to be the more common Hellenistic form,[63] and Ptolemy used the synonym Ζαράγγαι/ Ζαραγγαῖοι, the older form found in Herodotus, which is an exact translitter-ation of the Akkadian.[64] The same variation between 6. 15. 5 and 6. 17. 3 is con-firmation that the two passages are derived from different sources.

Ptolemy and Aristobulus placed the mission of Craterus at different points in the narrative. One located the starting-point near the southern tip of the Punjab and the other towards the Indus delta, in the vicinity of Patala. Both points were salient for the Bolan Pass, the principal route through the mountains into Arachosia and certainly the route taken by Craterus. There is one consider-ation which tells in favour of the northern location. If Craterus had been sent back from Patala he would have needed to retrace his steps up the Indus before branching off to the pass, whereas, if he had left Alexander immediately south of the Punjab, he merely needed to diverge westwards. For what he is worth, Justin supports the northern starting-point. The army column, he says, was sent to Babylonia between the territory of the Malli and the kingdom of Sambos;[65] that corresponds roughly to the first location in Arrian. Even if wrong, Justin con-firms that there was an alternative tradition about the starting-point of Craterus' march, a tradition which appears in the first part of the doublet in Arrian and also in Strabo's brief account of the return to the west.[65a] That a doublet exists can hardly now be doubted. Schmieder's sarcastic question, 'who would believe that Arrian after so few words forgot what he had just written?', is easily answered. The man who could place Craterus' battalion in different positions of the battle line, in consecutive paragraphs of his narrative of the Granicus, was perfectly capable of an inept doublet of Craterus' mission through Arachosia.

Immediately before the first reference to Craterus' march there is another

---

[62] For other references to the Drangae see 3. 21. 1; 4. 18. 3; 7. 10. 6. For the Zarangae see 6. 27. 3; 7. 6. 3.

[63] Used by the bematists (FGrH 119 F 2: both Strabo and Pliny), Nearchus (Strabo 15. 2. 5 (721)), and the vulgate sources (Diod. 17. 78.4; 81. 1; 105. 7; Curt. 6. 6. 36).

[64] This depends on the assumption, which seems general, that 6. 17. 3 is taken from Ptolemy. If it does in fact come from Aristo-bulus, the argument is unaffected; we then assume that Δράγγαι was Ptolemy's term.

[65] Justin 12. 10. 1–2. The convoy is said to have been led by Polyperchon, an obvious error. Polyperchon, however, may have been Craterus' lieutenant. He is not mentioned in Alexander's entourage after

this time, and he is later explicitly attested as Craterus' second in command for the later convoy of veterans from Opis (Arr. 7. 12. 4; Justin 12. 12.8; cf. Berve ii.326, no. 654).

[65a] According to Strabo 15. 2. 5 (721) Craterus began his march at the Hydaspes (ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὑδάσπου ἀρξάμενος). Even if the information is garbled in transition, it suits the northern point of departure rather than the area around Patala. A.E. Anspach, De Alexandri Magni Expeditione Indica (Leipzig 1903), 122, n. 389, suggested emending the text ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰνδοῦ ποταμοῦ, so offending blatantly against the principle of the lectio difficilior.

error. This occurs in the description of the establishment of the satrapy of
Southern India. As satrap of the territory between the Ocean and the confluence
of the Indus and Acesines Alexander appointed Oxyartes and Peithon.[66] Two
satraps in a single province are a unique phenomenon under Alexander, and
Krüger conjectured that Peithon was merely a general, the assistant and super-
visor of a native satrap. That will not do. Peithon is elsewhere attested satrap of
Southern India (6. 17. 1), and there is no hint that he had a colleague. What is
more, Oxyartes is undoubtedly the father-in-law of Alexander. He is mentioned
by name in the previous paragraph as the newly appointed satrap of Parapamisadae,
the district around the Kabul valley. The appointment is mentioned by the vulgate
as well as by Arrian.[67] Again the most popular course has been to delete Oxyartes'
name from the text at 6. 15. 4,[68] but there is no reason for any scribe to have
glossed Peithon's name with that of Alexander's father-in-law. The mistake is
certainly Arrian's own, and there are two possible explanations. The first is simple
misunderstanding. Both Oxyartes and Peithon retained their satrapies after the
distributions at Babylon and Triparadeisus. Both appear in the satrapy lists, and
the nomenclature of Peithon's satrapy is interesting; it comprised the parts of
India contiguous with Parapamisadae, Oxyartes' satrapy (τῆς Ἰνδῶν γῆς τὰ
ξύνορα Παραπαμισάδαις).[69] Indeed Oxyartes and Peithon are listed in sequence.
Now the satraps and satrapal boundaries confirmed for the east at Babylon were
those established by Alexander himself.[70] Arrian's source may have specified
that Alexander fixed a common boundary for Parapamisadae and Southern India,
and that Oxyartes and Peithon were satraps of the respective territories. Arrian
mentioned only Southern India, but he had Oxyartes' name on his mind and
added it inadvertently to the narrative.

There is another possibility, that the entire paragraph (6. 15. 4) is a com-
pressed doublet. Arrian's account of the journey from the Malli town to the
kingdom of Musicanus is extremely difficult to reconcile with the common
tradition of Curtius and Diodorus, explicitly derived from Cleitarchus.[71] In the
Cleitarchean version Alexander first travels with the fleet, Craterus leading the
shore army. He receives the submission of the democratically governed Sam-
bastae and moves to the next peoples, whom Diodorus terms the Sodrae and
Massani.[72] These peoples also submit, and Alexander ceremonially founds a city
in their territory. He then installs Oxyartes in Parapamisadae. The next event is
the invasion of Musicanus' kingdom. In Arrian's parallel account there is a brief
note about the departure of the fleet from the base camp at the junction of the
Hydraotes and Acesines (6. 14. 4). After a geographical excursus on the rivers of
the Punjab he mentions Alexander's next halt at the confluence of the Acesines

---

[66] Arr. 6. 15. 4: τῆς δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ξυμβολῶν
. . . ἔστε ἐπὶ θάλασσαν σατράπην ἀπέδειξεν
Ὀξυάρτην καὶ Πείθωνα ξὺν τῇ παραλίᾳ πάσῃ
τῆς Ἰνδῶν γῆς.
[67] Arr. 6. 15. 3; cf. Curt. 9. 8. 9–10.
[68] So Anspach, De Al. Magni Expeditione
Indica 115, n. 365; Beloch, GG iv². 1. 30,
n. 4. Oxyartes' name is bracketed in Roos's
edition.
[69] Arr. Succ. F 1. 36 (Roos); cf. Diod.
18. 39. 6; Dexippus FGrH 100 F 8. 5.
[70] Diod. 18. 3. 2; Curt. 10. 10. 4; cf.

Beloch iv². 2. 312–13.
[71] Diod. 17. 102; Curt. 9. 8. 10. At
9. 8. 5 Curtius cites Cleitarchus by name for
the casualties inflicted upon the Indians of
Sambos' kingdom (=FGrH 137 F 25). The
figure is germane to the narrative, and almost
certainly the passage is excerpted directly or
indirectly from Cleitarchus.
[72] Diod. 102. 4. Curtius 9. 8. 8 merely
refers to them as 'aliae gentes', but he places
the foundation of an Alexandria in their
territory.

and the Indus. Here he awaits the arrival of Perdiccas' army group, which had
subjugated the Abastani (6. 15. 1). This is Arrian's only reference to this mission
of Perdiccas, but the Abastani are presumably the Sambastae who are the first
to be mentioned in the vulgate version of the journey south.[73] Perdiccas may
have dealt with the tribes away from the river while Alexander received the sub-
mission of the people in the vicinity of the river.[74] According to Arrian the wait
at the confluence was protracted. While Alexander was there, additions arrived
for the fleet and he received the submission of various autonomous tribes includ-
ing the Ὀσσάδιοι who may be identical with the Massani of Diodorus.[75] Still at
the confluence he appointed Philippus satrap of Northern India and gave instruc-
tions for the foundation of a large city complete with dockyards. This is exactly
the point at which Diodorus and Curtius attest the foundation of an Alexandria.[76]
Arrian, it is true, says that Alexander merely gave orders for the foundation, but
he was on the site of the future city and presumably began the work of found-
ation as he had done at Alexandria Eschate.[77] Finally, as in Cleitarchus' version,
Alexander appointed his father-in-law satrap of Parapamisadae. At this point we
expect the invasion of Musicanus' kingdom. Instead Arrian seems to revert to an
earlier stage of the journey. Craterus and the land army march alongside the
river, as they do in the vulgate account of the departure from Malli territory.[78]
Next comes a reference to the arrival at the palace of the Sogdi, who look like
the Sodrae of Diodorus. Here too Alexander founds a city, again with dockyards,
and again there is a reference to the fleet; the ships which had been damaged
were refitted. Why, one asks, had that not been done at the confluence, where
Alexander had deliberately lingered to concentrate his forces? Why also should
a second Alexandria have been founded in such close proximity to the city at
the confluence? There is no hint elsewhere of two foundations in this area and
no trace of either city in later history.[79] The difficulties evaporate if we assume
a doublet in Arrian. His sources will have given different accounts of the journey
from the camp near the Malli town to the confluence of the Indus and Acesines,
recounting the march along the bank of the river and the foundation of an
Alexandria but with different details and different forms of the Indian names.
Arrian accordingly gave both versions consecutively as separate episodes. We
cannot assume too long a distance between the territories of the Malli and
Musicanus. In a survey of the tribes of Southern India, probably derived from

[73] Diod. 102. 1. Curtius 9. 8. 4 terms
them *Sabarcae*. In both sources they appear
as the people immediately south of the
Malli, which is the position of Arrian's
Ἀβιστανοί; it is usually inferred that the
same tribe is referred to by all three writers
(Anspach, op. cit. 112, n. 356; Berve ii.315,
n. 1).

[74] For the procedure, compare
Alexander's division of the army at the
beginning of the Indus Journey (Arr. 6. 4. 1;
6. 5. 5–7).

[75] The text at 6. 15. 1 is corrupt. There is
a lacuna which contained the name of a
second Indian tribe which surrendered to
Alexander. Roos supplied the name Σόγδοι
from the paragraph below (6. 15. 4), clearly

thinking in terms of a doublet.

[76] Diod. 102. 4; Curt. 9. 8. 8.

[77] Arr. 4. 1. 3; compare the foundation
of Alexandria in Egypt (Arr. 3. 1. 5).

[78] Arr. 6. 15. 4; cf. Diod. 102. 1; Curt.
9. 8. 3.

[79] Despite the similarities of wording
scholars have invariably believed in the
foundation of two separate Alexandrias;
cf. Droysen iii². 2. 230; Berve i.294;
V. Tscherikower, *Die hell. Städtegründ-
ungen* (*Philologus* Suppl. 19. 1: 1927)
109; Tarn ii.239. Tarn recognizes the scanti-
ness of the evidence and suggests that, even
if finished, both cities were swept away in
Chandragupta's conquest.

the contemporary Onesicritus, Strabo places the kingdom of Musicanus im-
mediately downstream from the land of the Malli;[80] unless there is a doublet in
Arrian's narrative the interval between the two districts becomes uncomfortably
large.

If there is a doublet in Arrian, we should expect the doublet to end with a
reference to satrapal appointments, and in particular a reference to Oxyartes'
installation in Parapamisadae. If such a reference occurred it would explain very
nicely the confusion about the double satrapy. Arrian had already mentioned
the appointment in Parapamisadae and felt no need to repeat it. He therefore
mentioned only Peithon's appointment to Southern India, but the name of
Oxyartes was clearly in his mind and it slipped in inadvertently. The confusion
would be all the easier if his source mentioned the common boundary of the two
satrapies. It is an error parallel to the substitution of Philippus for Andromenes
as the patronymic of Amyntas. This section of the narrative of the Indus voyage
is an outstanding example of maladroit conflation of primary sources. The errors
are blatant and striking, and it is useless to attempt to restore Arrian's credit by
the crude surgery of deleting the offending words.

III

So far the errors discussed have not in the main been of outstanding historical
importance. They were selected as illustrations of the type of error Arrian is
prone to commit and the criterion of choice was not the importance of the his-
torical issue. I wish now to deal with two problems where I believe that un-
detected errors in Arrian have had unfortunate repercussions upon the historical
interpretation of Alexander's reign.

The first concerns the early stages of the epic pursuit of Darius. On his march
north from Persepolis Alexander quickened his pace when the news reached him
in Paraetacene that Darius had decided to risk battle once more. The great train
conveying bullion from Persepolis was left behind with an escort, and the rest of
the army surged ahead equipped for battle. The speed quickened at the news that
Darius had given up hope of battle and resolved upon flight.[81] Finally at a dis-
tance of three days' march from Ecbatana a certain Bisthanes, allegedly a son of
Artaxerxes III Ochus,[82] reported that Darius had been in flight for five days with
the treasures of Media and a small army. According to Arrian, Alexander pro-
ceeded to Ecbatana and there dismissed his Greek forces, given them their full
pay and 2,000 talents bounty. Parmenion was given instructions first to convey
the Persepolis treasure to the citadel at Ecbatana and then lead a force along the
south Caspian coast to Hyrcania.[83] Then Alexander resumed his pursuit and led

---

[80] Strabo 15. 1. 33 (701). At the head of
the chapter comes the curious reference to
the 5,000 Indian cities, each the size of
Meropid Cos. This has been thought a topical
reference by Onesicritus, whose home, Asty-
palaea, was an immediate neighbour of Cos
(L. Pearson, *The Lost Histories of Alexander*,
1960, 106).

[81] Arr. 3. 19. 3—4.

[82] Bisthanes (Berve, no. 215) is only
mentioned by Arrian, and the emergence of a
son of Artaxerxes III Ochus as late as 330 is
a problem. According to the detailed account

of Diodorus (17. 5. 3—5) all the sons of
Artaxerxes were murdered by the eunuch
Bagoas with the single exception of Arses,
the predecessor of Darius III. When Arses
was murdered in his turn the house of
Artaxerxes was extinct (Diod. 5. 5). Diodorus
may be mistaken and Bagoas' purge not ex-
haustive (so Th. Nöldeke, *Aufsätze zur per-
sischen Geschichte*, 1887, 81, n. 1), but on
the other hand Arrian or his source might
be in error about Bisthanes' relationship to
the Achaemenid house.

[83] 3.19. 5—8.

the remainder of his army on a forced march to Rhagae and the Caspian Gates.[84]
It is Arrian alone who states that Alexander passed through Ecbatana in his
pursuit of Darius. His statement has been universally believed, and every history
of Alexander includes the Median capital in the itinerary of the pursuit. It is,
however, impossible that his account should stand.

In the first place, the ancient sources disagree about the dismissal of the allied
forces. Plutarch refers briefly to the discharge of the Thessalians, but he dates it
after the news of Darius' arrest, which was only reported to Alexander when he
was beyond the Caspian Gates after leaving Rhagae.[85] This may be slovenly
reporting by Plutarch, but the version of the vulgate sources is more complex
and cannot be reconciled with Arrian. According to Diodorus, the Macedonian
troops were eager for discharge after Darius' death and were only persuaded with
difficulty to continue the campaign. The allied troops were then paid off and
sent back to the coast.[86] Curtius has the same story but inverts the chronological
sequence. At Hecatompylus, the Parthian capital, Macedonian agitation to return
home reached its height, and their eagerness was exacerbated by the recent dis-
missal of the Hellenic troops.[87] Curtius' text is distorted by a lacuna, but the
implication is clear that the discharge preceded the agitation. But Curtius agrees
with Diodorus (and Justin also) that the demobilization of the allied troops came
after Darius' death.

Arrian's narrative is highly vulnerable. It is difficult to see how Alexander
found time for all the measures which Arrian says he took at Ecbatana. The pursuit
of Darius was very much alive. According to Arrian himself, it was not until
Alexander reached Rhagae and learned that Darius had passed inside the Caspian
Gates that he gave up hope of catching him on foot.[88] Previously his intention
had been to overhaul Darius before he reached the Gates (the modern Sar-i-Darreh
defile) and the haven of the plain of Khar.[89] Both before and after Alexander's
supposed arrival at Ecbatana Arrian stresses that the Macedonian army moved by
forced marches.[90] Yet Alexander is supposed to have broken his pursuit in order
to demobilize his Greek allies and arrange their passage home. If that were not
enough in itself, one need only reflect that Alexander had no money with him.
The bullion train had been left far behind in Paraetacene so that Alexander could

---

[84] 3. 20. 1.

[85] Plut. *Al.* 42. 5. For the arrest of Darius
see Arr. 3. 21. 1; Curt. 5. 13. 3. There is
divergence over the precise details but agree-
ment that reports of Darius' danger were
brought by Bagistanes the Babylonian.

[86] Diod. 17. 74. 3—4: placed immediately
after Darius' death and three days' journey
from the Parthian capital Hecatompylos (for
the location see J. Hansman, *Journal of the
Royal Asiatic Society,* 1968, 116—19). This
is a patent mistake. Curtius locates the
troubles with the Macedonians at Hecatom-
pylos itself (6. 2. 15). Diodorus' reference
to the city comes in the course of his nar-
rative of the journey into Hyrcania, which
runs parallel to Curtius (Diod. 75. 1—2 =
Curt. 6. 4. 1—7). Curtius makes the first

stage a three days' march to the Hyrcanian
border. The same three days' march occurs
in Diodorus, who with typical lack of care
makes Hecatompylos the terminus, not the
starting-point, of the march. For another
Diodoran error see n. 97.

[87] Curt. 6. 2. 17: 'fecerant fidem rumori
temere vulgato Graeci milites redire iussi
domos'; cf. Justin 12. 1. 1.

[88] Arr. 3. 20. 3: ἀπέγνω κατὰ πόδας
αἱρήσειν Δαρεῖον.

[89] For the geography of the Caspian Gates
see A.F. von Stahl, *Geogr. Journ.* 64 (1924),
318—19; H. Treidler, *RE* xxii. 322—33; J.F.
Standish, *Greece and Rome* 17 (1970),
17—24.

[90] Arr. 3. 19. 4: ἔτι μᾶλλον ἦγε σπουδῇ ·
3. 20. 1: κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν σπουδῇ γιγνομένην.

lead his army at speed in fighting order.[91] Ecbatana itself was an empty shell.
Darius had taken 7,000 or 8,000 talents with him,[92] stripping the capital clean
of bullion. Nothing remained for Alexander but the legendary gold and silver
leaf which adorned the citadel.[93] It follows with almost mathematical certainty
that Alexander cannot have paid off the allied troops in the course of the
pursuit. At best he can only have made provisional arrangements, to be imple-
mented once the pursuit was over and more settled conditions returned.

Curtius is the only other source to cover this section of Alexander's march.
His account is very brief but also very informative. He mentions three reports
to Alexander. The first was the news that Darius had left Ecbatana. At the news
Alexander *broke off his march into Media* and went in pursuit. At Tabae, a town
on the border of Paraetacene, further news came that Darius was in headlong
flight for Bactria. Finally Bagistanes brought the news of Darius' impending
arrest.[94] These three reports cohere with Arrian's narrative. The report of
Darius' departure from Ecbatana corresponds to Bisthanes' message (3. 19. 5);
that of the flight to Bactria is parallel to Arrian's statement that deserters came
over to Alexander in the vicinity of Rhagae, bringing news of Darius' further
flight (3. 20. 2). Bagistanes is mentioned by both sources. Curtius' narrative
differs in that it represents Alexander turning aside from the route to Ecbatana
in order to press the pursuit. This statement has been received with scholarly
derision,[95] but it seems to be perfectly plausible. Darius' route from Ecbatana

[91] Arr. 3. 19. 3: τὰ μὲν ὑποζύγια καὶ
τοὺς τούτων φύλακας καὶ τὴν ἄλλην
κατασκευὴν ἕπεσθαι ἐκέλευσεν.

[92] Arr. 3. 19. 5 (7,000 talents). Diodorus
74.5 and Strabo 15. 3. 9 (731) agree on
8,000.

[93] See particularly Polybius 10. 27.
10–13. As late as the reign of Antiochus III
almost 4,000 talents of coin was struck from
the gold and silver embellishments of the
temple of Anaitis. The rest of the palace
complex, Polybius says, had been denuded
of its decorations during the reigns of Alex-
ander, Antigonus, and Seleucus I. There
would presumably have been enough to pay
off the allied troops, but Alexander hardly
had the time to strip the necessary silver
from the walls and roofs of Ecbatana.

[94] Curt. 5. 13. 1–3: 'Alexander audito
Dareum movisse ab Ecbatanis, omisso itinere
quod patebat in Mediam fugientem insequi
pergit strenue. Tabas (oppidum est in Para-
etacene ultima) pervenit; ibi transfugae
nuntiant praecipitem fuga Bactra petere
Dareum. certiora deinde cognoscit ex Bagis-
tane Babylonio.'

[95] Cf. J. Marquart, *Philologus* Suppl. 10
(1907), 30–4, arguing that Curtius has con-
flated the two reports of Bisanthes and
Bagistanes, conflating the events of a month
into a single day and confusing the stay at
Ecbatana with that at Rhagae. On the con-
trary, Curtius mentions both reports, although
only Bagistanes is mentioned by name. His
account may be brief, but it does not imply

that all these reports came on a single day. It
is moreover quite explicit; Alexander moved
from the direct road to Ecbatana and passed
through Tabae. The location of Tabae is un-
known. Marquart suggested emending to
Gabae, the provincial capital of Paraetacene
mentioned by Diodorus (19. 26. 1; 34. 7),
and he has been followed recently by R.
Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great,* 529–30.
That is unfortunate. Tabae is mentioned by
Polybius as the town in Persis where Antio-
chus IV perished after his expedition against
the shrine of Anaitis in Elymais (Polybius
31. 9. 3; cf. App. *Syr.* 66. 352; *FGrH* 260
F 56). Elymais was the Seleucid term for the
mountain country between Susa and the
Median border, comprising part of what
had been Paraetacene. It seems clear that
the town where Antiochus died is the same
as that visited by Alexander; both are named
Tabae (so Weissbach, *RE* ivA. 1840–1). The
location of Tabae is still difficult. G. Radet
(*Mélanges Glotz,* Paris 1932, ii.772) mistaken-
ly supposed that Tabae was the site of Bagis-
tanes' message and located it at Padi, east of
the Caspian Gates on the further side of the
plain of Khar. It is, however, clear that it was
only after leaving Tabae that Alexander re-
ceived Bagistanes' 'more certain news'. From
Curtius' narrative it looks as though the town
should be placed somewhere on Alexander's
route to Rhagae after leaving the road to
Ecbatana. It is at this stage that Arrian places
the influx of deserters from Darius' army with
their news of the flight beyond the Caspian

took him east towards Rhagae (the modern town of Rey, 12 kilometres south-east of Teheran) and the Caspian Gates. Alexander was originally moving in a north-westerly direction from Persis, following the line of the Zagros massif. Once the news of Darius' flight reached him there was no point in continuing the march to Ecbatana. Every step took him further from his quarry, and by the time he reached Rhagae his line of march would have described two sides of a triangle. It was in fact perfectly possible for Alexander to have cut across from the route to Ecbatana and taken what is now the modern highway via Qom to Teheran. That would have given him a much better chance of intercepting Darius.[96] Curtius' statement is inherently plausible and should be accepted. If we can believe Arrian that the news of Darius' flight came when Alexander was three days' march from Ecbatana, we may conjecture that Alexander made his diversion near the modern town of Arak (Sultanabad). There the road forks, one branch leading to Hamadan (Ecbatana) and the other diverging north by north-east to Teheran. It was presumably this second fork that Alexander took. His route passed through the northern extremity of the district of Paraetacene, which is known to have extended to the vicinity of the Caspian Gates.

If we omit the paragraph about Ecbatana (3. 19. 5—8), Arrian's narrative agrees substantially with Curtius. At the news of Darius' flight from Ecbatana Alexander moved directly to Rhagae with the nucleus of the army. Now only three words of the offending paragraph state that Alexander himself entered Ecbatana (ἐλθών . . . ἐς Ἐκβάτανα). In view of his carelessness in handling the sources it is not too much to assume that there is an error of misunderstanding here also. All that is needed is to assume that Arrian's source digressed from the account of the pursuit to discuss Alexander's administrative arrangements. Once he had diverted from the road to Ecbatana there were two tasks to be carried out in his rear. The first was the securing of the bullion left behind in Paraetacene under the supervision of Harpalus. Parmenion was sent to reinforce the bullion convoy and to see to the transfer of the treasure to the citadel at Ecbatana. That mission completed, he was to continue through the territory of Darius' Cadusian allies, presumably with the intention of intercepting any Persian retreat through the Elburz mountains. But, while Parmenion moved south to the bullion train, Ecbatana needed to be occupied and prepared for the reception of the treasure. The Median capital was no longer enemy headquarters and its capture presented no problem, but it was prudent to have it secured before the arrival of the bullion from Persepolis. That role was allotted to the allied troops. At this point came the digression. Arrian's source dealt with the later demobilization of the troops. One can easily see why. In the vulgate sources the demobilization of the Hellenic troops is associated with discontent in the Macedonian army, and according to Curtius the discharge of the allies was an important ingredient in the agitation.[97]

Gates. Alexander was still in Paraetacene; according to Strabo the district extended as far north as the Caspian Gates (16. 1. 17 (744); cf. 11. 13. 6 (524)).

[96] G. Radet (*Mélanges Glotz* ii.770) accepts Curtius in part, arguing that Alexander sent off a flying column to intercept the Persian force. None the less he regards the statement that Alexander himself diverged from the road as an indisputable error.

[97] Curt. 6. 2. 17. Diodorus 74. 3 reads as though the allied troops were physically present when Alexander discharged them (συναγαγών . . . καὶ ἐπαινέσας ἀπέλυσε). That is impossible. Alexander had only a small fraction of his army with him at the end of the pursuit of Darius, and it is most unlikely that the Hellenic troops were forced to march to Hecatompylos, only to be dismissed on arrival.

Discontent in the army is a subject scrupulously avoided wherever possible by the official sources (so we must term Ptolemy and Aristobulus).[98] Arrian has no suggestion that the Macedonians demanded to return home after Darius' death, and the whole story was probably omitted by his sources. Once that episode was excised, the demobilization of the allies was best dealt with in an anticipatory digression. I am assuming that Arrian's source recorded that Alexander sent the Hellenic troops to Ecbatana, where he later dismissed them.[99] Arrian may then wrongly have inferred that Alexander himself went to Ecbatana. It is a very trivial slip compared with some of the others discussed, but it has beguiled all historians of Alexander into assuming a lengthy and wholly irrelevant halt at Ecbatana, during which Darius would have been able to increase his lead substantially, if not get clean away to Bactria.

Finally we can tackle one of the most annoying *cruces* of Alexander's reign, the return journey to Egypt from the Oasis of Siwah. Arrian is wholly responsible, for without him there would be no problem. He records a divergence of views in his sources; Aristobulus said that Alexander took the same route back to Egypt, Ptolemy that he took another route direct to Memphis.[100] The vulgate tradition agrees with Aristobulus, placing the foundation of Alexandria on the return journey.[101] If Arrian is taken at face value, there is an inescapable dilemma, fundamental conflict among the primary sources over an issue both elementary and important.[102]

Ptolemy stands alone in stating that Alexander tood a direct route across the desert, but there is nothing inherently implausible in the statement. The route was not, as has been recently argued, a dangerous passage of trackless desert but a relatively well-beaten road. In modern times there have been two inland routes from Siwah, one branching east by north-east to the Nile Delta and the other going east through the oasis of Bahariâh. Travellers apparently preferred the inland route in winter because it escaped the rains and cold of the coastal road.[103] It was precisely in winter that Alexander visited the sanctuary of Ammon, and he might indeed have taken an inland route back to Egypt. There is, however, an argument from silence, which has some force, though it is far from decisive. If

---

[98] Note particularly H. Strasburger's impressive list of hardships undergone by the Macedonian army (*Hermes* 80, 1952, 470-3); most are reported in full by the vulgate sources but either omitted or glossed over by Arrian.

[99] According to Arrian's own narrative the Thessalian cavalry who volunteered for further service at Ecbatana only reached Alexander much later in 330 when he was at the borders of Areia (3. 25. 4). They arrived with the mercenary cavalry who had served with Parmenion in Media. Had they re-enlisted when Alexander was physically present, he would presumably have taken them in the pursuit of Darius along with the mercenary cavalry of Erigyius (cf. 3. 20. 1).

[100] Arr. 3. 4. 5: ἀνέζευξεν ἐπ' Αἰγύπτου, ὡς μὲν Ἀριστόβουλος λέγει, τὴν αὐτὴν ὀπίσω ὁδόν, ὡς δὲ Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Λάγου, ἄλλην εὐθεῖαν ὡς ἐπὶ Μέμφιν.

[101] Curt. 4. 8. 1 (explicit); Diod. 17. 51. 4–52. 1; Justin 11. 11. 13. Plut. *Al.* 26 places the foundation of Alexandria before the journey to Siwah.

[102] Alexander historians unhesitantly accepted the Ptolemaic version until C.B. Welles (*Historia* 11, 1962, 278–81) argued that Ptolemy was wrong and that Alexandria was in fact founded on the return journey. In this he was followed by E.N. Borza (*Historia* 16, 1967, 369). P.M. Fraser (*Opuscula Atheniensia* 7, 1967, 30, n. 27) exposed many of the weaknesses of Welles's arguments, but did not tackle the fundamental problem of the conflict of primary sources. See also, in support of Ptolemy, F. Schachermeyr, *Alexander der Grosse*[2] (SB. Wien cclxxxv: 1973), 253, n. 287; R. Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great*, 522: 525.

[103] I here follow the discussion of O. Bates, *The Eastern Libyans* (1916), 14.

Alexander cut directly across to Memphis, his journey was a close parallel to the
abortive invasion of Siwah by Cambyses, whose army had perished in the desert
with a loss, Herodotus says, of 50,000 men.[104] Whether true or false, the story
would have been familiar to Alexander, and one would have expected him to
have acted in conscious emulation, just as his journey across the Makran was
allegedly stimulated by the legends of the failures of Cyrus and Semiramis.[105]
Plutarch indeed mentions Cambyses' expedition and raises the possibility of a
north wind arising and burying Alexander's force.[106] The parallel here is re-
lated to the outward journey alone, and it seems likely that, had Alexander
made a successful crossing to Memphis, the Alexander historians would have
underlined the parallel with Cambyses.

     The important point is that Aristobulus and the vulgate sources say that
Alexander retraced his steps to the coast, founding Alexandria on the return
journey. Aristobulus was an eye-witness like Ptolemy, and Cleitarchus, the
probable author of the vulgate tradition, may well have been a citizen of
Alexandria.[107] It is strange to find them misinformed on a point so fundamental.
What is more, Alexander's route back to Siwah was surely a matter of record
and there is no obvious reason for falsification. Where the factual material is so
uncontroversial and the disagreement among primary sources so disturbing, the
most economical hypothesis seems to be that of error in Arrian, a misunderstand-
ing of the type discussed in part I. Aristobulus may have stated that Alexander
returned to the coast and founded Alexandria, while Ptolemy stated baldly that
he went straight back to Memphis, including no details of the itinerary. Arrian
could easily have interpreted this as a divergence over the actual route followed
and inferred wrongly that Ptolemy knew of another route followed by Alexander
to Memphis. Error in Arrian is a hypothesis which has occurred to scholars, but
it has not been unhesitatingly advocated.[108] Now it can be seen that Arrian's
narrative is frequently warped by misunderstanding, and the error I have supposed
of misinterpreting Ptolemy is not outlandish but typical of Arrian's slapdash use
of sources.

     There seems to be a genuine conflict among the primary sources over the
chronology of the foundation of Alexandria. Ptolemy apparently placed it on
the outward journey to Siwah, the vulgate tradition on the return journey. There
are similar divergences in chronology elsewhere in the tradition,[109] and it is easy
to see how the divergence might have occurred in this case. All that is necessary
is to assume that Alexander was, as Arrian says, impressed by the site on his

[104] Hdt. 3. 25. 3—7.
     [105] Arr. 6. 24. 2—3; Strabo 15. 1. 5
(686) = FGrH 133 F 3.
     [106] Plut. Al. 26. 11—12. There is a
possibility that this passage, like the des-
cription of the journey itself, is taken from
Callisthenes of Olynthus.
     [107] Philodemus Rhet. 4. 1 = FGrH 137
T 12: Κλεί[τ]αρ[χο]ς 'Αλεξανδρεύς. It is
unfortunately by no means certain that the
Cleitarchus here mentioned was in fact the
historian of Alexander. He may be an
otherwise unknown rhetorician (cf. P.M.
Fraser, Ptolemaic Alexandria, Oxford

1972, ii.717—18).
     [108] Welles, Historia 11 (1962), 279:
'it is possible that he [Ptolemy] is wrongly
quoted'; Borza, Historia 16 (1967), 369:
'whether it was Arrian's error in citing
Ptolemy or an unresolved conflict in Ptolemy
himself cannot be ascertained'.
     [109] Note the arrival of Amyntas with
reinforcements from Macedonia, placed at
Babylon by Curtius (5. 1. 40—2), at Susa
by Arrian (3. 16. 9—11), and at an inter-
mediate point in Sittacene by Diodorus
(17. 65. 1).

outward journey.[110] On his return he laid the foundations of the new city. There
is a hint in Curtius that this is what actually happened. His account follows that
of Arrian, in that he stresses that Alexander's route passed by Lake Mareotis
on the outward journey. On his return to the lake Alexander founded the city.
Curtius begins his description in the pluperfect; Alexander had decided ('statuerat')
to build on the island of Paros, but on closer inspection he chose a site for the city
on the mainland.[111] This suggests that Alexander evolved plans for the city on the
outward journey and implemented them on his return. In that case there would
be a natural temptation to describe the entire foundation as one episode, placed
either before or after the journey to the sanctuary. There is in fact only one
piece of evidence which suggests that the work of planning was well advanced
before the journey to Siwah. That is Plutarch's transitional phrase: ἔργου κελεύσας
ἔχεσθαι τοὺς ἐπιμελητὰς αὐτὸς ὥρμησεν εἰς Ἄμμωνος (Plut. Al. 26.11). Plutarch,
however, is moving from one episode to another and might well be changing
sources. His sutures connecting pieces of anecdote are notoriously unreliable for
chronology,[112] and it is dangerous to rely too closely on his wording. It is Plutarch
himself, not his source, who has joined together the foundation of Alexandria and
the beginning of the journey to Siwah. On the other hand, Curtius' pluperfect
comes in the stream of the narrative and may be taken more seriously. The found-
ation of Alexandria is, however, a separate problem. Provided that Ptolemy's
narrative did not originally conflict with the rest of the tradition, Alexander's
journey to and from Siwah followed the same route, and it makes little difference
whether the city was founded on the outward or return journey.

It is, I hope, amply shown that Arrian is prone to misunderstand and mishandle
his primary sources. The errors he commits can in some cases be corrected from
his own narrative, but more often they are revealed by critical comparison with
the rest of the historical tradition of Alexander's reign. This is important. Only
so long as Arrian's work is regarded as an uncontaminated repository of fact can
it be regarded as the sole authoritative account of Alexander.[113] As it is, it is clear
that Arrian's primary sources were not extracts from the archives of Alexander
but political histories with all the propaganda and distortion one would expect
from first-generation authors with their own axes to grind. Above all, Arrian is
too fallible in his handling of sources for his narrative ever to be dispensed from

[110] Arr. 3. 1. 5: καὶ ἔδοξεν αὐτῷ ὁ
χῶρος κάλλιστος κτίσαι ἐν αὐτῷ πόλιν.
[111] Curt. 4. 8. 1–2: 'contemplatus loci
naturam primum in ipsa insula statuerat
urbem condere; inde, ut adparuit magnae
sedis insulam haud capacem esse, elegit urbi
locum ubi nunc est Alexandrea.' For the
visit to Lake Mareotis on the outward journey
see Curt. 4. 7. 9; Arr. 3. 1. 5.
[112] There is an exact parallel in Plutarch's
description of Gaugamela. He describes Alex-
ander's coolness before the battle and caps his
account with a similar incident in the battle
itself (32. 1–7). After the anecdote he reverts
to the prelude of the battle and Alexander
arming himself. The link, however, is very
misleading and gives the impression that
Alexander only put on his armour after the
frenzied action described before (32. 8:
ταῦτα ἐπιστείλας . . . τὸ κράνος παριέθετο
κτλ). This led Tarn to stigmatize the passage
as the worst farrago of nonsense in the Greek
language (Alexander ii. 352). All that is at
fault is the misleading transitional phrase.
For examples of violent chronological jumps
in the Lysander see A. Andrewes, Phoenix 25
(1971), 211–12.
[113] Note the sagacious remarks of
J. Seibert, Alexander der Grosse (1972), 6,
who stresses the danger of accepting the
theory of the Ephemerides as the official
basis of 'the best Alexander literature'
without first refuting the criticisms evinced
in recent research: 'sollte diese sich be-
stätigen, müsste die bisherige Quellenkritik
neu überdacht werden.'

cross-examination. He may still be the most detailed extant source, but he requires constant assessment against the rest of the tradition.

The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton   A. B. BOSWORTH