238

THE SPEECHES IN ARRIAN'S *INDICA* AND *ANABASIS**

The evaluation of speeches in ancient histories by modern scholars is very varied. Tarn (p. 286) opened his discussion of 'The speeches in Arrian' with the following words:

Speaking generally, one expects a speech in any ancient historian to be a fabrication, either composed by the historian himself or by a predecessor, or else some exercise from one of the schools or rhetoric which he had adopted.

On the other hand, according to Fornara (p. 143), 'the fact does not seem to have been sufficiently appreciated that the ancients unfailingly endorsed the convention that speeches must be reported accurately'. When Fornara made a generalization, he wrote as follows:

The ancients had unanimously adopted the Thucydidean principle of honest reporting of the things that were said as well as the things that were done.

Given such diversity of opinion, it is not surprising that scholars' judgements of the speeches in Arrian have varied extremely widely. The latest writer on the subject, A. B. Bosworth, opened his chapter, 'The problems of the speeches', with the words:

It is a popular assumption that in Arrian's time the formal orations, which were a mandatory feature of historical writing, were free compositions, enabling the author to give a bravura display of rhetorical technique.

* The following abbreviations are used:

AG	N. G. L. Hammond, *Alexander the Great: King, Commander and Statesman* (New Jersey, 1980; London, 1981; 2nd. ed. Bristol, 1989)
Andronikos *V*	M. Andronikos, *Vergina: the Royal Tombs and the Ancient City* (Athens, 1984)
Atkinson	J. E. Atkinson, *A commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus' Historiae Alexandri Magni Books 3 and 4* (Amsterdam, 1980)
Bosworth *C*	A. B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* 1 (Oxford, 1980) and 2 (1995)
Bosworth *From A to A*	idem, *From Arrian to Alexander* (Oxford, 1988)
Brunt	P. A. Brunt, The Loeb edition of Arrian, *Anabasis* 1 and 2 (Harvard, 1976 and 1983)
Fornara	C. W. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley, 1983)
Hamilton *C*	J. R. Hamilton, *Plutarch Alexander: a Commentary* (Oxford, 1969)
Hammond *Philip*	N. G. L. Hammond, *Philip of Macedon* (London, 1995)
Lane Fox	R. Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great* (London, 1973)
Schachermeyr	F. Schachermeyr, *Alexander der Grosse: das Problem seiner Persönlichkeit und seines Wirkens* (Vienna, 1973)
Sources	N. G. L. Hammond, *Sources for Alexander the Great: An Analysis of Plutarch's Life of Alexander and Arrian's Anabasis* (Cambridge, 1983)
Stadter	P. A. Stadter, *Arrian of Nicomedia* (Chapel Hill, 1980)
Tarn	W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* 2 (Cambridge, 1948 and 1979)
THA	N. G. L. Hammond, *Three Historians of Alexander the Great: The So-called Vulgate Authors, Diodorus, Justin and Curtius* (Cambridge, 1983)
Wüst	F. R. Wüst, 'Die Rede Alexanders des Grossen in Opis', *Historia* 2 (1953/4), 177–88

And he made a very fair assessment of the present state of scholarship in this matter: 'Virtually every speech has been acclaimed as a genuine report or damned as rhetorical fabrication according to the prejudices of the individual scholar.'[1]

In this paper I hope to be objective. For my aim is to establish the methods which Arrian used in reporting speeches, and in particular to consider what sources Arrian used for them in the *Indica* and the *Anabasis*. This approach is made possible by Arrian's open declaration of his sources.

1. THE METHODOLOGY OF ARRIAN IN THE *INDICA*

Since Arrian's approach to the writing of history is clearer in the *Indica* than in the *Anabasis*, we shall consider the *Indica* first.

The *Indica* consisted of two parts, the description of India and the voyage of Nearchus from India to Persia. For the first part Arrian named the sources whom he chose to follow: Nearchus[2] and Megasthenes (17.6). He gave the reasons for such a choice: both Nearchus and Megasthenes were 'reputable men' (17.6 δοκίμω ἄνδρε; the same words were used of Megasthenes and Eratosthenes at *Anab.* 5.5.1); similarly on the size of India he found Eratosthenes to be more 'worthy of trust than any other, because his concern was with world-geography' (3.1). In his text he named Megasthenes twelve times and Nearchus nine times (the latter mostly in one chapter, 15); and he noted a difference in their versions only twice (3.6–7 and 15.4–5).[3] He mentioned Ctesias and Onesicritus as talking nonsense (3.6). He judged common opinions' (3.5 δόξας) to be less accurate than Eratosthenes. And he regarded statements about India east of the Hyphasis as questionable, whereas up to the Hyphasis participants in Alexander's expedition were 'not entirely unworthy of trust' (6.1 οὐ πάντη ἄπιστοι, cited also at 2.4).

He valued personal experience such as theirs and his own (4.15 αὐτὸς ἰδὼν οἶδα) above hearsay (15.7 ἀκοήν). Occasionally he used a general term 'the story goes' (8.4 λόγος κατέχει), and he distinguished between a story strongly held and one less strongly (5.8). His scrupulousness in mentioning his sources is emphasized by his clear marking of his own personal opinions at ten places, usually with the personal pronoun (e.g. 15.7).

The second part is cast in historical form. Greek writers regarded the record of the past as comprising the actions and the words of men. This was a truism from Homer to Arrian. Writers therefore provided both narrative and speeches.[4] The latter were sometimes in direct speech and sometimes in indirect speech. Even a dull universal

---

[1] Bosworth *From A to A*, p. 99. For example, views on the speech of Alexander at Opis in Arr. 7.9–10 varied accordingly. For Bosworth 'Arrian's main source appears to be himself . . . Arrian had a vestigial report of the Opis speech . . . the whole speech is a display piece . . . neither in its shape nor in its detailed content can it bear any relation to what was actually said' (pp. 105, 112–13). Similarly Brunt (2, pp. 532–3) and Wüst (p. 187) found it 'nicht echt' and proposed as author 'wohl nur Kleitarch'. Tarn (p. 290) reckoned it to be 'certainly Alexander's' and said that 'it came through Ptolemy' (pp. 290–1). E. Kornemann, *Die Alexandergeschichte des Königs Ptolemaios I von Aegypten* (Leipzig, 1934), pp. 158 ff. concluded 'vielleicht im Anschluss an wirklich gesprochene Worte Alexanders'.

[2] In *Anabasis* 6.28.6 Arrian said that he would write an account of the voyage 'in Greek . . . following Nearchus himself'. See also *Anabasis* 5.5.1.

[3] Thus Arrian tended to follow one authority at a time. So too Brunt (2, p. 447) 'Arrian preferred to follow first one of his authorities and the another'.

[4] For instance, Herodotus, whom Arrian took as a literary model. So too Stadter (p. 116) 'Most evident is the influence of Herodotus etc.'

historian like Diodorus used both forms (e.g. 17.66.5 and 72.2), and Trogus was very exceptional in using only indirect speech and condemning 'direct speeches' in the histories of Sallust and Livy (Justin 38.3.11 'contiones directas'). Thus when Arrian said 'the following is the account of Nearchus' (20.1 Νεάρχῳ λέλεκται . . . ὅδε ὁ λόγος), he was assuring us that he was not putting his own ideas into the mouth of Nearchus but was reporting Nearchus' account, consisting of actions and of words (e.g. 20.1–11). This is generally accepted. Even Brunt, who distrusted Arrian's speeches in the *Anabasis*, wrote thus:[5] 'no one, however, can doubt that the dialogues in the *Indica* go back to N(earchus) himself'.

While the substance of these dialogues and speeches came from Nearchus, the direction and the style and even the dialect were those not of Nearchus but of Arrian.[6] For the skill of the historian lay in producing a work of art according to the canons and the taste of his own predecessors, including Ptolemy, Aristobulus, and Nearchus (Arrian 1.12.5 and 6.28.6).[7] Thus the dialect of the *Indica* was the Ionic dialect of Herodotus. This was certainly not the dialect of Nearchus, who wrote presumably in standard *koinê* with a touch perhaps of Cretan dialect.[8] Thus too the words of the speeches were not the *ipsissima* verba of the speakers but those of Arrian. His originality lay also in his selection and his abbreviation of what Nearchus had written; for the second part of the *Indica* was certainly very much shorter than what Nearchus had written about his voyage.[9]

Whether Nearchus had been truthful in his reports of the speeches is a separate issue. We have no objective test by which we can determine the truthfulness or not of the reported *tête-à-tête* conversations between Alexander and Nearchus (e.g. in 20.4–7 and 36.4–6). Opinions therefore vary between acceptance by Arrian and rejection by Badian. On the other hand, when Nearchus reported a discussion with several persons, his report should be accepted as truthful. For he knew that when his report was published they would be among his readers and would protest if they had been misrepresented. This applies particularly to the dispute between Nearchus and Onesicritus as to whether they should sail from the coast of Carmania into the Persian Gulf or across to the Arabian peninsula (32.9–13).

2. THE METHODOLOGY OF ARRIAN IN THE *ANABASIS*

In the *Anabasis* Arrian foresaw that he would write an *Indica* based on 'what was most reliably narrated by those who campaigned with Alexander and by Nearchus' (5.5.1); and in the *Indica* he harked back to the *Anabasis* as evidently a recent work (19.8, 23.6, 26.1). It is likely, then, that his methodology was the same in both works. In the *Preface* of the *Anabasis* he announced his choice of Ptolemy and Aristobulus as his main sources, and he gave the reasons for his choice, reasons which resembled those in the *Indica*. He said he would record as 'completely true' what was affirmed by both of them; he would select, when they differed, what he himself judged to be

---

[5] Brunt, 2, p. 529.

[6] This is apparent when we compare the two accounts in *Anabasis* 7.20.9f. and in *Indica* 32.10–13 of Nearchus' reply to Onesicritus. See Stadter (p. 129f.) 'the words, and the choice of emphasis, are in both cases Arrian's'.

[7] These passages are well discussed by Brunt (2, p. 540).

[8] So too Stadter (p. 125) and Brunt (2, p. 541).

[9] See Stadter (p. 125) 'it is evident as well that Arrian severely edited Nearchus' narrative'; and (p. 132) 'Arrian would claim for himself, justly, a different kind of originality, one lying in the charm of his presentation and the effectiveness of his selection'.

more credible and worthwhile; and he would add as 'stories (λεγόμενα) . . . what seemed to him worth reporting and not completely incredible' from other writers. And throughout the *Anabasis* he marked clearly any comment or addition which he himself made, usually with the use of the personal pronoun (e.g. 2.16.6).[10]

As in the *Indica*, he selected and abbreviated what he took from his sources; expressed himself in his own diction and in an artificial archaizing Attic dialect (*Ind.* 19.8); and cast his narrative and his speeches in his own manner. Nevertheless he reproduced faithfully the substance of what he did select and provide. As we have seen in the *Indica* this was as true of the speeches as of the narrative. In my opinion it was so also in the *Anabasis*. To take an example, the narrative of events at Opis and the speech which Alexander delivered (7.8–10) were both derived from the works of Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus, and the substance of both the narrative and the speech was faithful to the substance in those works. At the same time we have to bear in mind that we are reading not the words or the entirety of the narrative and of the speeches as related by those two writers, but the diction and the selection of Arrian.

That Ptolemy and Aristobulus reported in their histories of Alexander not only actions but also speeches may be assumed from the general practice of ancient historians. Moreover, it is attested by a passage in Arrian, *Anabasis* 2.12.3–6. For after describing what Alexander said to Leonnatus and what Leonnatus said to the family of Darius, Arrian added: 'this is what Ptolemy and Aristobulus say'.

Because my interpretation of the speeches in the *Anabasis* differs radically from the interpretations of most scholars, it is necessary to look at the speeches themselves. I do so under categories. We have to consider in each case whether it was derived from a speech in the histories of Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus, or whether it was an invention by Arrian.

3. SPEECHES AT MEETINGS OF COMPANIONS AND SOMETIMES OTHERS IN THE *ANABASIS*

(1) The occasion for the first pair of these was while Alexander 'was deploying for battle his entire army', which had been marching in a double phalanx with reconnoitring troops in advance. He had just received the report of the enemy's 'position for battle' on the far side of the river Granicus. That position was obviously a defensive one, and even if the enemy should pass to the offensive they could not cross the river rapidly. Alexander could therefore deploy his troops at leisure. It was during the deployment that Parmenio 'came forward to speak' (1.13.2 προσελθὼν λέγει).[11] Of the discussion which followed, Brunt wrote that it 'may well have been private'.[12] This, however, is not credible. During the deployment Alexander had to call a conference of his commanders not only for consultation but also for the issuing of orders, which could not be done once he went into action himself. Arrian assumed that his readers would understand that it was at such a conference that Parmenio 'came forward to speak'. Moreover, if the debate had been private, how did it come to be known to Arrian's sources, Ptolemy and Aristobulus? Alexander and Parmenio were dead long before Ptolemy and Aristobulus began to write their histories.

---

[10] See *Sources*, pp. 217f., 232f., and 239ff.

[11] For Alexander's dispositions, see my article in *JHS* 100 (1980), 81ff. = *Collected Studies* 3.101ff. The imperfect tense συνέταττεν shows that the deployment was in operation when Parmenio came forward.

[12] Brunt (1, p. 452).

When Parmenio came forward, he spoke to Alexander 'thus' (τάδε), and Alexander's reply was summarized as 'this' (ταῦτα εἰπών). These words are part of Arrian's rewriting; they do not indicate that the words of Arrian's speech were the very words of Parmenio.[13] The substance of Parmenio's speech was eminently sensible in that he foresaw the dangers of a frontal attack through the riverbed, the very dangers in fact which so nearly cost Alexander his life. The reply of Alexander was that he realized this, but that having crossed the Hellespont he would be ashamed to be deterred by the small stream (the Granicus) from crossing 'as we are' (i.e. in deployed formation); and he added psychological points about the Macedonians, himself, and the Persians. These speeches were reported by Arrian in direct speech; they were not *ipsissima verba*, they were greatly abbreviated and they were cast by Arrian in *oratio recta* simply for vividness. On the other hand, the substance in each case was derived from speeches in Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus and was therefore historical.

Plutarch had already given a brief account of what was evidently this conference of commanders. 'The majority were afraid' of making an attack through the riverbed; Parmenio advised against risking the passage of the river, and Alexander said the Hellespont would blush for shame if he showed himself afraid to cross the Granicus. These points, being common to Arrian and Plutarch, show that Plutarch, like Arrian, was following Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus. Plutarch alone mentioned Alexander's renaming of the month, which was presumably in the same account; for Plutarch made his report in one narrative sentence of great length (*Alex.* 16.1–3). Thus Arrian and Plutarch, both abbreviating their source, were free to choose independently what to excerpt.[14]

(2) The next debate in which Arrian reported speeches by Parmenio and by Alexander concerned naval policy. As in the debate at the Granicus we can see that their views were expressed in a conference and so became known at the time. Arrian's sources here also were Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus. Arrian selected very few points for Parmenio; he implied that Parmenio had reasons for supposing that the Greek fleet might win an engagement, but he mentioned only one, namely Parmenio's inter-pretation of the omen that an eagle had been seen perched astern of Alexander's ships on the land (1.18.6). For Parmenio held that the omen presaged victory at sea for Alexander; indeed he was willing to serve on board himself, if, as he advised, the Greeks were to engage in a battle, which if lost would not be of much account, and if won would be most advantageous. Alexander disagreed. He saw no sense in attacking a fleet so superior in numbers and in training, or in exposing Macedonians as marines to heavy casualties. A defeat would be serious, especially as it might encourage the Greeks of the mainland to rebel. The omen, he considered, meant that he would conquer the Persian fleet 'from the land', i.e. by capturing the bases on the coast on which it relied for crews and services (see 1.20.1).[15]

Here too the substance of the arguments attributed to Parmenio and Alexander is

[13] Tarn (pp. 287, n. 1 and 290, n. 1) seemed to regard these words as indicative of authenticity. These speeches are discussed well by Brunt (2, p. 528).

[14] This is true of their accounts generally; see *Sources* (pp. 34f.) for the similarities and the differences.

[15] What Alexander foresaw is clarified at 1.20.1, namely that no place 'in Asia' would be available to the enemy; for we must remember that his 'Asia' included Egypt east of the Nile, where the Egyptian squadron in the Persian fleet had its bases. Tarn (p. 286) realized that Alexander's foresight 'is not beyond the powers of calculation of a competent commander'; so too Schachermeyr (p. 182). Bosworth (1, p. 143) 'it is difficult to suppose that Alexander saw so far ahead' expressed his own concept of Alexander's ability.

to be accepted as historical, because it was derived from Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus, as Arrian told us in his *Preface*. The occasion and the arguments are entirely acceptable. At the time there was no mention of disbanding the fleet, and Parmenio may have argued that to keep the fleet inactive would inevitably lower its morale and ensure its defeat.

(3) When a captured Persian agent asserted that he was carrying an offer from Darius to Alexander Lyncestes, 'Alexander convened his Friends' and asked their advice (1.25–4). The opinion of 'the Companions' was that Alexander had been ill advised to entrust the command of the strongest cavalry force to an untrustworthy officer, and that he should now put him out of the way as soon as possible.[16] They were also alarmed by an omen. For his part Alexander consulted his seer and was told that the omen indicated a plot by one of the Friends, a plot which would be revealed. In consideration of the assertion by the Persian agent and of the interpretation of the omen, Alexander made arrangements for the arrest of Alexander Lyncestes.

The occasion of this discussion is certainly historical. That Alexander Lyncestes was arrested had been stated by other Alexander-historians (Diod. 17.32.2 and 80.2; Just. 11.7.2; Curt. 7.1.5–8); and the dating of the arrest to the winter of 334–333 by Arrian was the same in the accounts of Justin and Curtius ('sicut supra diximus', referring to the lost book).[17] Arrian, following the accounts of Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus, was alone in reporting the consultation of the Friends; but such a consultation was probably a normal procedure, since it occurred when Philotas came under suspicion (Curt. 6.8.1 'consilio amicorum', and 6.11.9 'amicos'; cf. Plut. *Alex.* 49.8f.). It is likely that the discussion was deliberately publicized in order to offset the popularity of Alexander Lyncestes with the army and especially with the Thessalians.

(4) When the people of Tyre refused to admit any Macedonians, Alexander convened a meeting of 'the Companions, and the commanding officers, the battalion commanders, and the squadron commanders of the army' (Arr. 2.16–8).[18] On this occasion he included the commanders because he had in view the strain which a siege of Tyre would impose on the army. Arrian reported Alexander's statement in direct speech. In the course of it he developed further the arguments which he had advanced at Miletus in favour of defeating the Persian fleet 'from the land' (section [2] above); for if Tyre should fall the Phoenician ships, 'being the most numerous and the strongest in the Persian fleet', would probably join the Macedonians, the fleets from Cyprus would either do likewise or be defeated without difficulty, and the thalassocracy of the Eastern Mediterranean would be held by Macedonia, so that the invasion of Egypt would present no difficulty. The alternative policy—to leave Tyre alone and to advance inland towards Babylon—would leave the thalassocracy in the hands of the Persians and enable them to carry the war into Greece, where Sparta was already hostile and where Athens might defect to Persia.

[16] This is accepted as historical by Brunt (1, p. 531). On the other hand, Lane Fox (p. 145) found it 'all most implausible, and it deserves to be suspected', and he felt free to propose his own scenario (pp. 146–8).

[17] Diodorus was alone in placing the arrest in August 333 in view of a letter from Olympias. Alexander Lyncestes was executed in October 330. Both Diodorus 17.80.2 and Curtius 7.1.6 reported that he had been under arrest for three years. That would be approximately correct if the arrest was indeed in August 333. Thus Diodorus was consistent. It is probable that Curtius used the same source as Diodorus when he wrote 7.1.6. On the other hand, in his lost book he will have used a different source, namely that followed by Justin and Arrian. In *THA* (pp. 41, 138) I argued that these sources were respectively Cleitarchus and Diyllus.

[18] He addressed them as 'friends and allies' because the commanders of Greek units were present. For a meeting of commanders and friends in Macedonia, see Diod. 17.16.1.

The occasion is certainly historical. Alexander had to persuade his leading Friends and Officers that the siege of Tyre was the right course. His speech was supported by a dream which was interpreted by his seer to mean that Tyre would be captured but with difficulty. Allusion to a speech ('referebat') and the report of the same dream had appeared in Curtius 4.2.17–18, with the addition that Alexander made his dream known to his soldiers. The dream alone had been reported by Plutarch, *Alex.* 24.5, who dated it within the siege of Tyre. It is clear that Arrian was drawing on Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus alone, whereas Curtius and Plutarch may have made use also of other writers.[19]

(5) The second offer of Darius to Alexander, made during the siege of Tyre, was reported to 'the meeting of the Companions' (Arr. 2.25.2), and the reply by Alexander was recorded (2.25.3). Both the offer and the reply were in the narrative, which was therefore derived from Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus according to Arrian's statement in the *Preface*. They are therefore to be accepted as historical.

Between the offer and the reply Arrian inserted a *legomenon*, in which Parmenio advised acceptance of the offer and Alexander retorted that if he had been Parmenio he would have done so but that being Alexander 'he would reply to Darius as in fact he did reply'. The *legomenon*, introduced by 'they say' (λέγουσιν), was expressed in the accusative and infinitive. With the words 'as in fact he did reply' Arrian returned to his narrative. The *legomenon* was thus clearly marked by Arrian. The substance of it was well known already; for it had been reported by Diodorus 17.54.3–5, Plutarch *Alex.* 29.7f. and Curtius 4.11.10–14.[20] Arrian thus was warning his readers that the anecdote was 'not entirely trustworthy' (*Preface*, section 3). Of the earlier writers Plutarch had attributed the anecdote to summer 331, whereas Diodorus and Curtius had attributed it to just before the Battle of Gaugamela.[21] Neither dating was correct in the judgement of Arrian. On the whole the *legomenon* should be regarded as probably unhistorical.[22]

(6) When Alexander came within scouting distance of Darius' position at Gauga-mela, he convened a meeting of Companions, generals, squadron-commanders, and officers in charge of the allies and the mercenaries (3.9.3), and he asked them what he should do next. The majority favoured an immediate advance; Parmenio advised a reconnaissance in case there were unforeseen dangers, and his opinion prevailed. When the reconnaissance was completed, Alexander reconvened 'the same officers', i.e. not the Companions. The meeting and the reconnaissance were not mentioned by the other Alexander-historians. Arrian derived his knowledge from his sources, Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus.

(7) Arrian reported as a *legomenon* (λέγουσιν) a recommendation of a night attack by Parmenio and Alexander's riposte on the evening before the battle. As this

---

[19] The suggestion of Tarn (pp. 286–7), that what Arrian gave as a speech was 'more probably' a manifesto issued by Alexander, rests on no evidence. Brunt (1, pp. 185–6) held that 'the speech is apparently based on Arrian's main sources', and Bosworth *C* (1, p. 238) expressed some doubts, e.g. 'the speech has little relevance to the context'.

[20] See *THA* (pp. 45, and 121–2) for Cleitarchus being the source of Diodorus and Curtius in these passages.

[21] Justin 11.12.9–13.1 did not mention the anecdote but dated the offer by Darius to just before the Battle of Gaugamela, his source being Cleitarchus (*THA* p. 100).

[22] I argued in *THA* (pp. 45, 122) and in *Sources* (p. 225) that one of the sources from which the *legomenon* was derived was Cleitarchus, an unreliable author. It is doubtful too whether Alexander would have ridiculed Parmenio, his second-in-command, in the presence of the other commanders. The passage is discussed by Atkinson (p. 429).

recommendation was made 'when others were listening' (3.10.2), the implication is that there was a meeting of Friends. Arrian appended his own view: 'it seems to me at least' (δοκεῖν ἔμοιγε), and 'I praise Alexander' (ἐπαινῶ Ἀλέξανδρον). The substance of this *legomenon* had been provided already by Curtius, who gave a council (4.13.3 'consilium adhibet') as the setting and had Alexander rebuke not Parmenio but Polyperchon, and by Plutarch *Alex.* 31.11, who made Parmenio and other senior Companions go to Alexander after dark on the evening before the battle and called Alexander's riposte 'the remembered expression, I do not steal the victory'. The source of Plutarch here was probably Cleitarchus.[23]

It is clear that a choice has to be made between the meeting of section (6) in the daytime and the meeting of section (7) according to Plutarch after dark. The latter is to be rejected, because once dark had fallen there was no possibility of mounting a well-organized night attack.[24] In the account of Curtius the meeting at which a night attack was proposed was in daylight (4.13.1), when preparations could have been made; but the details of the account are puerile, e.g. the shaggy faces of the huge Scythians and Bactrians seen 'for the first time' and scaring the Macedonians,[25] and the absurdities of the speech put into the mouth of Alexander (4.13.5 and 8–10). Arrian was obviously wise to follow Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus rather than the author or authors of the *legomenon*.

Summary of conclusions

It is certain that Alexander made a point of consulting his Friends before coming to important decisions. He was wise to do so, because he needed to 'rule by persuasion' (Arr. 5.27.2 πείσας μέν . . . πεισθεὶς δέ), and to that end he asked them to advise him first 'with freedom of speech' (Diod. 17.54.3). The leading Friend in Europe was Antipater, who had in that capacity accompanied the prince Alexander to Athens (Just. 9.4.5 'cum amico Antipatro'), convened the assembly after Philip's death (Ps.-Callisth. 1.26), and been appointed Alexander's deputy in Macedonia (Arr. 1.11.3). The leading Friend in Asia at first was Parmenio (Diod. 17.56.2 πρεσβύτατος ὢν τῶν φίλων; and 17.80.1 ὁ πρῶτος εἶναι δοκῶν τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου φίλων; Curt. 3.6.4 'fidissimo purpuratorum'). Before Alexander left Macedonia these two Friends advised Alexander to beget an heir (Diod. 17.16.2).

As we have seen, the reports of the meetings were transmitted mainly by Arrian. He was recording what had been stated by Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus. But how did they know what the proceedings had been? There is no reason to suppose that details of what was said were regularly publicized, and participants in the meetings were likely to report only some smart sayings, such as Alexander's comparison of the Granicus to the Hellespont. Then neither Ptolemy nor Aristobulus were senior enough to have been present in the years up to the Battle of Gaugamela.[26] The most likely explanation is that the speeches of Alexander and their context were recorded in the *Royal Journal* at the time (see n. 49 below), and that Ptolemy had access to the *Journal* in Alexandria, when he wrote his history.

[23] See *Sources* (p. 38).
[24] One has to remember that communication was by runner, and that changes of disposition by units in the dark could hardly be made without confusion.
[25] The Macedonians were familiar with Scythians on both sides of the lower Danube, and with the Bactrians who had fought at the Granicus River according to Diodorus 17.19.4.
[26] Thereafter Arrian did not report any meetings of Friends or Companions, no doubt because he had to abbreviate his account drastically.

Some scholars have maintained that the proposals made by Parmenio in these meetings were fabricated, in order to make Parmenio look foolish and so not undeserving of execution in 330. Their view seems to me to be mistaken. That Parmenio should have been present and have spoken is obvious; for he was not only the leading Friend, but also 'the most skilled among the generals in the arts of war' (Curt. 4.13.4 'peritissimus inter duces artium belli', at the meeting before the Battle of Gaugamela). Moreover, his advice in the passages which derived from Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus was not foolish: namely (1) above at the Granicus, where Parmenio's advice to encamp for the night seemed so logical to Lane Fox and Green, for instance, that they believed Alexander to have followed it;[27] (2) at Miletus, where Bosworth, for instance, sided with Parmenio in thinking that the Greek fleet should not be disbanded;[28] and (6) before the Battle of Gaugamela, where Parmenio's advice to encamp and reconnoitre was followed by Alexander and was in fact so sensible that even Arrian's critics do not question its authenticity. The passages which Arrian reported as *legomena* and which derived from Cleitarchus or some other writer were of an entirely different order: namely (5) above, when Parmenio was snubbed by Alexander for proposing to accept the terms offered by Darius;[29] and (7), when Parmenio was said to have advised a night attack on the Persians at Gaugamela. These *legomena* were rightly distrusted by Arrian.[30]

4. MEETINGS OF ALEXANDER AND HIS OFFICERS

That Alexander did often convene his Officers to discuss military matters and thereafter sometimes to issue his orders[31] is abundantly clear from the accounts of his last illness in the *Royal Journal*.[32] In Plutarch *Alex*. 7.6.5 he discussed with them the selection of appropriate officers to fill vacant positions of command. In Arrian's version at 7.25 he gave orders to the Officers for the march and/or the voyage towards Arabia on five different days, and on the day when he became speechless he had summoned the generals and other leading Officers. Because Plutarch and Arrian

[27] See Brunt (1, pp. 450–1) for criticism of such an interpretation. As he remarked, 'the truth of Arrian's account of the Battle of the Granicus is crucial for the whole value of his history of Alexander'.

[28] Bosworth C (1, pp. 142–3).

[29] Bosworth C (1, p. 257) failed to recognize the significance of λέγουσιν in Arr. 2.25.2, which indicated in accordance with Arrian's *Preface* that he was now reporting something not from Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus. The *legomenon* ended just before the narrative tense ἅπερ δὴ καὶ ἀπεκρίνατο.

[30] The actions of Parmenio which Arrian reported from Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus were entirely praiseworthy. In the Battle of Gaugamela he and his Thessalians fought brilliantly (3.11.10 and 15.3 λαμπρῶς), joined Alexander in the pursuit, and captured the Persian camp (3.15.3–4). At Persepolis Parmenio argued against the burning of the Palace and his arguments convinced Arrian (3.18.12), as well as some modern scholars (but see my views in *CQ* 42 [1992], 362 and *Sources*, pp. 73–4). The defamation of Parmenio began after his death and was conducted by Callisthenes (Plut. *Alex*. 33.10 with Hamilton C, p. 89). Arrian was of course familiar with it through his reading of Callisthenes and of Plutarch and no doubt others, and he had the good sense not to accept Callisthenes's account here or elsewhere (*pace* A. M. Devine in *Ventures into Greek History* [Oxford, 1994], pp. 89–90; see my article in *Class. Bull*. 68 [1992], 89–90). The same contrast is seen in Plutarch's account of the Persians reaching Alexander's camp (*Alex*. 32.6) and in Arrian's account (3.14.5).

[31] During a campaign it was probably a matter of routine that the officers came to Alexander at dawn (Curt. 4.13.17 '*luce orta*', Plut. *Alex*. 32.1 ὄρθρου and Arr. 7.25.3 ἕωθεν for instance).

[32] For the differences between Plutarch and Arrian see my analysis in *Historia* 37 (1988), 145–6 = *Collected Studies* 3.167–8.

were concerned with the illness of Alexander, they did not report either the names of the officers promoted to commands or the precise orders issued by Alexander, which were presumably recorded for the days of his illness in the *Royal Journal*.[33] We shall now consider Arrian's account of such meetings with the knowledge that the ultimate source of the information was the *Royal Journal*, which described the acts and the words of the king day by day. Arrian's immediate source was Ptolemy's history which was itself based on his use of the *Royal Journal*.

(1) On learning that Darius was encamped near Issus, Alexander convened the generals, the squadron commanders, and the Officers of the allies (2.7.3). His address was reported in indirect speech by Arrian in an abbreviated form and in Arrian's own diction. The substance of the speech was derived through Ptolemy from the *Royal Journal*; and some ideas may have come down from hearsay through the accounts of Ptolemy and Aristobulus. Everything in the speech is in character with comments and with other speeches by Alexander in Arrian's *Anabasis*. Most striking is his far-reaching vision of the future: 'after this contest nothing will be left except to take possession of the whole of Asia' (2.7.6).[34]

Arrian then added a *legomenon*, which came therefore from a not necessarily trustworthy source. This was a comparison of the resources of Xenophon and his Ten Thousand with those of Alexander and the successes of Xenophon over the Persians. Arrian's source here may have been Cleitarchus; for he put the Greek viewpoint, which implied that Alexander's success was not at all remarkable by comparison with that of Xenophon.

After the *legomenon* in which he used some finite tenses (ἐτρέψαντο . . . καὶ ἐπῆλθον) Arrian added a sentence in the accusative and infinitive, which therefore belonged to the main speech, deriving from Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus. It stated that Alexander uttered other remarks appropriate to such an occasion. From this addition we infer that Arrian omitted the final part of what he had read in Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus.

(2) As we noted in 3.6 above, Alexander convened his Officers for the second time before the Battle of Gaugamela. He urged them to exhort the men of each unit and to instruct them to maintain perfect obedience to precise orders. The courage of officers and men, he claimed, had been fully demonstrated in past actions. They were now to fight not for possession of Hollow Syria, Phoenicia, or Egypt but for 'rule over the whole of Asia' (3.9.6). The speech was reported by Arrian in the accusative and infinitive. It was summarized with words which show that Arrian had abbreviated a longer account in his source: 'after uttering these and other such exhortations but not many . . . he ordered', etc.

As we know from the *Preface*, Arrian was drawing here on the account or accounts of Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus. To suppose, as Bosworth *C* (1, p. 295) does, that 'the content (of the speech) may be equally (with the style) Arrian's own invention' is to deny the truthfulness of Arrian in the *Preface*. Moreover, the speech was written at a time when critics could have compared Arrian's version with those of Ptolemy and

---

[33] The immense amount of detailed information in Arrian's *Anabasis* must have come ultimately from a record written at the time of the expedition. See *Sources* (p. 321), mentioning the names of 250 officers in Books 1.11.1–4.30.9 and 147 orders in Books 1–6.

[34] Bosworth *C* (1, p. 204) gives a summary of views 'about the authenticity of the speech'. These varied widely. Tarn (p. 286) dismissed it as 'part of a school exercise', and Brunt (2, p. 531) wrote that 'in substance Alexander's speech seems as likely to come from Pt./Ar.' apart possibly from the passage about Xenophon's Ten Thousand 'as that before Gaugamela'.

Aristobulus. Furthermore, the supposition overlooks the fact that Arrian marked his own inventions with the use of the personal pronoun or verb, but did not do so in this passage. The speech, then, was based on Arrian's main sources.

The phrase 'the rule over the whole of Asia' expressed the aim which Alexander had had on landing in the Troad (Diod. 17.17.2), and the claim which he had advanced in his reply to Darius (Arr. 2.14.8–9). After the battle he made his personal dedication at Lindus as 'Lord of Asia' (*FGrH* 532 F 1.38) and he was proclaimed 'King of Asia' by his army (Plut. *Alex*. 34.1). In the last sentence of his *Preface* Arrian invited comparison of his account with the accounts of others. In this case he will have had in mind the words of Trogus as reflected in Justin 11.13.5–11, of Curtius 4.13.38–14.7, and of Plut. *Alex*. 33.1–3. We can see that he was wise to turn to his trustworthy sources, Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus, and thus to preserve the record of Alexander's aim, 'the rule over the whole of Asia'.

(3) When the Macedonians showed their unwillingness to advance beyond the Hyphasis, Alexander convened 'the Officers in command of the regiments and spoke thus' (Arr. 5.25.2). What followed was in direct speech (the choice of direct speech and of the diction being Arrian's) and was addressed to 'Macedonians and allies'. The substance of the speech, in accordance with Arrian's statement in the *Preface*, came from Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus. Of them Ptolemy will have had access to a report of the speech in the *Royal Journal*. The substance of the speech in Arrian is therefore historical in principle.[35] He indicated that he had not recorded all that he had read in his sources, because he concluded with the words 'these and suchlike things were said by Alexander' (5.27.1 ταῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα εἰπόντος).

Alexander invited the Officers to reply to his speech. They hesitated for some time, and then Coenus' speech was 'such as this' (5.27.1 ἔλεξε τοιάδε). Arrian gave the reply in direct speech. The substance of it, as of Alexander's speech, was taken from the accounts of Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus; but in this case not from a report in the *Royal Journal*, which will have dealt only with Alexander's words. Ptolemy was at this time an 'Officer' holding a command (e.g. 5.23.7), and he would therefore have been one of the Officers present at the meeting. In composing his account Ptolemy thus relied on his own memory and on hearsay for the reply by Coenus. Aristobulus would have relied only on hearsay, if he too included an account of the speeches.

The conclusions which may be drawn are as follows. The speech by Alexander before the Battle of Issus, apart from the *legomenon*, is historical in substance. It is therefore a great interest, in that it shows Alexander's method in seeking to persuade his Officers and also Alexander's vision of controlling 'all Asia'. Alexander's speech at the Hyphasis is also historical in substance, and it has the same interest. It is remarkable for the summary of past conquests, the vision of advance to the outer Ocean, and the call for unlimited exertion and the pursuit of boundless fame. The reply of Coenus, as remembered by Ptolemy and other Officers, is rather an approximation of what he actually said, but a fairly close approximation, because powers of memory were greater then than in modern times when the media provide a picture.

[35] Brunt (2, pp. 531–2) held that Arrian derived the speeches and their setting from the history of Aristobulus. Bosworth *From A to A* discussed the speeches at length (pp. 123–34) and summarized his conclusion on p. 133: 'the debate at the Hyphasis, then, is the clearest example we have of a purely fictitious composition, independent of any report in Arrian's sources'. So also in *C* (2, pp. 344–4). Herein he resembles Tarn (2, pp. 287ff.) 'Some have accepted Alexander's speech as genuine; that is impossible. It is obviously a late patchwork.' He thought much the same of the reply by Coenus (p. 290).

5. ALEXANDER ADDRESSES AN ASSEMBLY OF MACEDONIANS

At Opis Alexander convened the Macedonians. His initial address, the reaction of the Macedonians, and the arrest of thirteen men were briefly stated in narrative form. Then came a speech by Alexander in *oratio recta* (7.9–10). After delivering it, Alexander went into the palace. The assembled Macedonians were unwilling to depart, and on hearing that Alexander had summoned the leading Persians they ran to the palace (7.11.2–4). It was here that the reconciliation took place, and thereupon the Macedonians went away to their camp. The whole passage, both the narrative and the inset speech, was derived by Arrian from the accounts of Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus, as we know from Arrian's *Preface*. In my opinion the actions and the words of Alexander had been recorded in the *Royal Journal* immediately after the events, and Ptolemy had had access to the *Journal*. He also had his own memories, because he was one of the Bodyguards who attended on Alexander at the assembly, then after a short interval at the palace (7.11.2), and during the reconciliation. Thus the whole passage rests on good evidence. While the form and the diction are due to Arrian and there may be considerable abbreviation, the substance of the whole passage, including the speech, is dependable.[36]

It has, however, been argued that the speech at Opis was, to quote a recent exposition, 'an epideictic display' by Arrian. This view is based on the supposition that there are inaccuracies, 'exaggerations and absurdities' in the speech which cannot have come from either Ptolemy or Aristobulus.[37] Let us consider some of them. The speech opens with the description of Philip 'taking over' ($\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\lambda\alpha\beta\dot{\omega}\nu$) nomadic shepherds endangered by their neighbours and settling them in the plains. This has been called an 'absurdity', because the people of Lower Macedonia had had a settled existence for some generations. But those whom Philip 'took over' in 358 were the peoples of Upper Macedonia who were practising transhumant pastoralism and had suffered from raids by their neighbours. Then the mention of Philip's annexation of 'the great part of Thrace' is called 'an exaggeration'; but the fact is that by the end of Philip's reign the Macedonians were in control of almost all of Thrace from the Nestus river to the mouth of the Danube and to the coasts of the Black Sea and the Propontis. 'Payment of tribute to Athens' has been called 'false Athenian propaganda'; but the Athenian Tribute Lists include payments by cities of Philip's Macedonia from Methone to Strepsa, for instance, in the latter part of the fifth century.[38] Other criticisms are based on the assumption that remarks in the speech should have applied to all the members of his huge audience: e.g. that the leaders in military and administrative posts were

---

[36] Tarn (p. 290) 'the speech is certainly Alexander's . . . written down from memory or from his notes by Ptolemy' (pp. 290–1), even if 'it contained some insertions made later' (p. 290). Brunt (2, p. 532) 'lack of authenticity is much more evident in the speech at Opis . . . an epideictic display by Arrian' (p. 533). Bosworth *From A to A* (p. 133) 'in the Opis speech there are traces of an original digest of contents, but the great bulk of it is Arrian's own composition, a re-embroidery of themes previously expounded but now given a different emphasis'. At 7.10.7 Brunt thought that Arrian was contradicting his own narrative (in which Alexander was at Opis) in telling the Macedonians on returning home to say they had deserted him when they came back to Susa; but that was appropriate, because Susa, not Opis, was well known to Macedonians at home. Bosworth *From A to A* (p. 130) derived the concept of 'the encircling Ocean with its subsidiary gulfs' from Eratosthenes (*floruit c.* 235 B.C.), apparently unaware that it was the concept of Theopompus and Aristotle, contemporaries of Alexander (see *AG*, pp. 174–5 and fig. 17).

[37] See Bosworth *From A to A* (pp. 101–13) and Brunt (2, p. 533).

[38] Brunt (2, p. 229, n. 3). See Demosthenes 3.24 and 11.16 $\mathring{A}\theta\eta\nu\alpha\acute{\iota}o\iota\varsigma$ $\phi\acute{o}\rho o\upsilon\varsigma$ $\mathring{\eta}\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\nu$ as well as Ps.-D. 7.12 (which Brunt cites alone) and my *A History of Macedonia* 2 (Oxford, 1979 and Amsterdam, 1997), pp. 116–17 and 124–5.

Macedonians, that his children by his Asian wives would be akin to the children of Macedonians by their Asian wives, and that Macedonians were honoured for their courage with golden crowns and bronze statues.[39] But the assumption is ill founded. It would be absurd to suppose that all his audience should be described as generals and satraps. Granted that the speech at Opis in its original form or in the reports of it were rhetorical in style, there is in my opinion nothing inappropriate to the occasion in 324.

6. EXHORTATIONS BEFORE ENTERING BATTLE

In a recent study of such exhortations it has been maintained that 'the battle exhortation in ancient historiography is a literary composition and not the historian's report of a speech which had actually been made'. As an example of such a composition the speech of Alexander to his army before engaging the enemy at Issus was cited (Arr. 2.10.2).[40]

That a commander may urge his men to be brave should not be doubted. Arrian opened his account of the engagement at the Granicus with the statement that Alexander leapt on his horse and called on his immediate companions 'to follow and be brave men' (1.14.6). Before engaging in battle at Gaugamela Alexander convened his commanding officers for the second time and required them individually to exhort the men under their command. Arrian appended a summary of the various points which Alexander made both to the commanders themselves and for them to pass on to their men. The summary is evidently based on a longer version—probably in direct speech—which Arrian had in the account of Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus; and at the end of the summary Arrian said that 'these and other such' exhortations brought a response from the commanders.[41] On this occasion Alexander's tactical plan did not permit him to halt his line and harangue the men himself; for he kept moving to his right front in order to keep clear of the enemy's prepared ground and to draw the enemy cavalry out of its defensive position.[42] Similarly before engaging the army of Porus Alexander had to keep his cavalry circling in order to protect his infantry (5.16.1). There was no opportunity for making a general exhortation.

It was a different matter at Issus. Because the army of Darius was anchored to its defensive position on the far bank of the river Pinarus, Alexander was able to advance at a leisurely pace and to make occasional halts (2.10.1). During one of these halts 'Alexander riding all along the front (παριππεύων πάντῃ) kept exhorting them to be brave men',[43] and paid suitable tributes to officers of all ranks, including the mercenaries, who had distinguished themselves in action. 'There was an answering shout from all sides not to delay but to charge the enemy.' It is probable that Arrian was giving a brief summary of fuller exhortations, which had been described by Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus. There is nothing in Arrian's account to suggest that he was inventing any 'literary composition'.

---

[39] Brunt (2, pp. 232, n. 3 and 234, n.1) 'absurd', 'an invention'. For Alexander's emphasis on courage and for the rewards given for acts of outstanding courage see Arr. 1.16.4, 1.19.6, 2.7.7 and 9, 2.10.2, 2.12.1, 2.18.4, 2.23.4, 2.27.6, 3.9.5, 4.18.7 (huge rewards), 4.27.3, and 7.5.4 (gold crowns).

[40] M. H. Hansen, 'The battle exhortation in ancient historiography', *Historia* 42 (1993), 161–80, esp. 172.

[41] Arr. 3.9.5–8 and for the emphasis on courage see n. 39 above.

[42] Arr. 3.13.1–2 and for the tactics *AG* (p. 145 with fig. 14).

[43] Curtius 3.10.3–4 reported the slow march and Alexander riding along the line '*cumque agmini obequitaret*'. Curtius then added a speech of his own invention.

7. SPEECHES WHICH WERE *LEGOMENA* OR WITHIN *LEGOMENA* PASSAGES

In his *Preface* Arrian drew the distinction between passages derived from Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus and passages derived from others—the latter being *legomena*. The distinction applied to speeches as well as to narrative. Thus at 2.12.3–7 the account of Ptolemy and Aristobulus of what Alexander asked and what he told Leonnatus to say to the family of Darius was contrasted with a *legomenon* in which Alexander himself spoke to the mother of Darius. Again, at 2.7.8 a *legomenon* about Xenophon's Ten Thousand was set within the speech of Alexander to his Officers (2.7.3–9). The rest of these passages came from Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus. Similarly, when entire speeches are defined as *legomena*, the implication is that speeches not so defined came from Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus.

Some short speeches were reported as *legomena*. Anaxarchus consoled Alexander at 4.9.7, introduced by 'there are some who say'. Anaxarchus supported *proskynesis* at 4.10.6–7, with a story introduced by 'such a story prevails'. Callisthenes was 'poorer by a kiss' at 4.12.3, introduced by 'such a story'. The escaped eunuch and Darius conversed at 4.20, introduced by 'a story prevails'. Acuphis spoke of Dionysus (5.1.4–6) and urged Alexander to take fewer men at 5.2.3–4, introduced by 'he is said'. There was also a long speech by Callisthenes concerning *proskynesis* at 4.11.2–9, introduced by 'such a story prevails' at 4.10.5. The care with which Arrian labelled these speeches as *legomena* indicates that where that label was lacking the speeches came from Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus.

8. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

We have to imagine the conditions of life in the fourth century, when there were none of the modern media. Any leader had to persuade and to command by speech, whether he was addressing a conference of Officers or an assembly of thousands of soldiers, e.g. some 10,000 at Pella in 358 or some 6,000 at Opis. Extraordinary skill in elocution and in rhetorical force was needed to sway such numbers in the open air. Demosthenes could do it in Athens, and John Wesley addressed 30,000 and was heard.[44] Philip and Alexander had to be and were brilliant speakers (e.g. Diod. 16.3.1 and 4.3, 17.2.2). When we notice that the two longest speeches of Alexander, at the Hyphasis to his Officers and at Opis to the Macedonians, were strongly rhetorical, we should realize that the rhetoric was that of Alexander and not a retrojection from the second-century A.D., as Bosworth *From A to A* (pp. 133f.) and Wüst (pp. 186f.) proposed.

It is also important to realize that Alexander's achievements were accomplished as much by his persuasion of his officers and men as by his personal actions. This was apparent to Arrian, who himself exercised command over Roman forces and addressed large assemblies, whether on campaign or at Athens when he was *archon*, and it was therefore second nature to him to report speeches as well as actions in his *Anabasis* of Alexander.

When Arrian provided speeches which were derived from speeches in the accounts of Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus, he indicated that the substance was 'true' by introducing them with 'thus' (ὧδε) or 'these things' (τάδε) and by resuming them with 'so'

---

[44] Tarn (p. 289, n. 1) for Wesley. The theatre at Dodona has held an audience of 20,000 in recent times.

(οὕτως) or 'these things' (ταῦτα). Sometimes he indicated that he provided only a part of what lay before him by writing 'these things and such as these' (ταῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα) or 'and other things' (καὶ ἄλλα). This was so for the speeches delivered by Alexander.[45] On the other hand Arrian did not vouch for the accuracy of the substance of Coenus' speech at the Hyphasis, which he introduced by 'such things' (τοιάδε) and resumed by 'such things' (τοιαῦτα); and the words attributed to Callines were 'such' (τοιαῦτα). The best explanation of the difference is that for the speeches of Alexander Ptolemy had access to the *Royal Journal*, whereas the speech of Coenus and the words of Callines were not reported there. This explanation is supported by the introduction and resumption of the paraphrase of Alexander's last illness from the *Royal Journal* with 'thus' (ὧδε) and 'so' (οὕτως); for Arrian was making use of the *Journal* itself.[46]

The importance of the *Journal* has not been appreciated by those who take Thucydides' comments on the speeches in his History as their model in judging the speeches in Arrian's work. For there is a fundamental difference between them. As Thucydides said, he relied on the memory of himself and of other hearers of the orig- inal speeches (1.22.1); for such written records as there were[47] recorded the decisions, for instance of the Athenian Assembly, and not the speeches and discussions. In Macedonia, where the King exercised full executive powers, he had constantly at his side a Secretary, not as an amanuensis but as the recorder of his dealings day by day (e.g. Nepos, *Eum.* 1.5, of Philip and Eumenes, 'eum habuit ad manum scribae loco').[48] These written records were called ἐφημερίδες ('dailies'), ὑπομνήματα ('reminders'), or ἀναγραφαί ('records'). We use the term 'The Royal Journal'. Any historian who had access to the *Journal* was able to read the recorded words of Alexander, for instance, issuing orders, naming commanders, and delivering a speech.[49] We know that *Royal Journals* were available later in the Library at Alexandria for consultation.[50] It is a reasonable conjecture that Ptolemy had taken not only the funerary carriage of Alexander but also the personal records of Alexander, the *Ephemerides*, to Alexandria in 322. If so, he was able to use them in writing his own History of Alexander *c.* 285.

If my conclusions are sound, we gain a new insight into the mind and the person- ality of Alexander. We know definitely, for instance, that before the siege of Tyre Alexander did foresee the thalassocracy of the Eastern Mediterranean, the easy conquest of Egypt, the check to trouble in Greece, the annexation of territory west of the Euphrates, and the advance towards Babylon. In the speeches at the Hyphasis and

[45] The Greek words for his speeches will be found respectively at 2.16.8, 5.25.2 and 7.9.1; at 1.14.1, 2.7.6, 2.18.1, 3.10.1, and 7.11.1; and at 2.7.9 and 3.10.1.

[46] I have argued this in *Historia* 37 (1988), 144–6 = *Coll. Stud.* 3.166–8.

[47] We have an example in Tod *GHI* 77 = M-L. 78, which records decrees concerning the Athenian expedition to Sicily in 415. The speeches on that occasion in Thucydides 6.9–23 were based on hearsay.

[48] Eumenes as 'the King's Secretary' ranked as one of the highest Companions and married a daughter of the Persian noble Artabazus (Arr. 7.4.6).

[49] In their summaries of the account of Alexander's illness in the *Journal*, Plutarch and Arrian mentioned the issuing of instructions and orders seven times and also a discussion with officers about promotions. The details of the orders and of the discussion will have been stated in the *Journal*; those details were not reported by Plutarch and Arrian because they had no bearing on Alexander's illness. For the contents of a *Journal* kept by Antipater and of later *Journals*, see *Historia* 37 (1988) = *Coll. Stud.* 3.154. Ptolemy II, for instance, checked each day 'all that was said and done' by himself (πάντα . . . τὰ λεγόμενα καὶ πρασσόμενα).

[50] Diodorus consulted the *King's Journal* at Alexandria (3.38.1); so probably did Appian (*Proem* 10). A commentary in five books *On the Ephemerides of Alexander* was written by Strattis, probably in the latter half of the third century B.C.

at Opis we see that as a Macedonian Alexander lived and fought like any of his men; that he set no limit to his own labours and those of his men in the pursuit of 'immortal glory' (5.26.4); and that he envisaged a career of further conquest.[51] The vehemence of his speeches enables us to see how he cast his spell over his Macedonians and his allies alike.

Clare College, Cambridge   N. G. L. HAMMOND

[51] When he was at the Hyphasis, he spoke of exploration by sea and of conquest as far as the Pillars of Heracles (5.26.1–2). Shortly before his death at Babylon he was planning to circumnavigate Arabia and then to conduct a campaign in the Western Mediterranean with a view to winning thalassocracy there. For this campaign he intended to increase his fleet in the Mediterranean by building 'a thousand warships larger than triremes' (Diod. 18.4.4.). See *AG* (pp. 281ff.) arguing that these last plans were genuine. So now Bosworth, *From A to A* (p. 211), 'Diodorus' report of the Last Plans is a unitary extract from his main source (which I am sure was Hieronymus).'