NOTES ON Q. CURTIUS RUFUS' HISTORY OF ALEXANDER
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N.G.L. Hammond (THA 1–2) quotes with approval a typical 'Tarnism': 'There never was any such thing as an Alexander vulgate or Cleitarchean vulgate ... . How two such totally different historians as Diodorus and Curtius, with such different points of view and such different main portraits of Alexander, ever got bracketed together is hard to understand' (Tarn, Alexander ii 132). Hammond uses Tarn's pronouncement as a platform from which to launch into a condemnation of scholars who not only persist in using the term 'Alexander Vulgate' but who treat Plutarch and the Metz Epitome as part of that tradition. The purpose of this paper is not to debate Hammond's theory — I have touched on this elsewhere — but to consider Curtius' manipulation of the primary evidence for artistic purposes. By claiming to detect such manipulation, I realise that I am asserting that Curtius and Diodorus followed closely the same primary source, almost certainly Cleitarchus. And this must be true of Trogus, Plutarch (for most of the chronologically ordered narrative of his Alexander) and the Metz Epitome, to which I unrepentantly apply the term 'vulgate sources'. In fact, concerning the Metz Epitome, there is little that can be said with confidence except that it is undoubtedly Vulgate!

The fact that some recent studies have recognised in both Curtius' and Diodorus' histories more than one source is not in itself damaging to the view presented here. Indeed, it actually helps my argument. For it is my contention that the noticeable differences between Curtius and Diodorus (or sometimes other vulgate sources) are attributable to Curtius' own creativity rather than indicative of the use of different sources. Curtius was no mindless plagiarist, even if like his predecessors and contemporaries he could extract lengthy passages from earlier writers without acknowledgement. He supplemented his historical information with details from Ptolemy, and apparently Timagenes (cf. ix 5. 21); as stylistic models he used a number of Latin authors, including Pompeius Trogus, Vergil and Livy. In addition, he introduced elements from his own experience of early imperial Rome and from his knowledge of Herodotus. But he unquestionably shaped his own work, restructuring his evidence in order to
avoid, where possible, awkward disagreements in his underlying sources. The result was a Latin History of Alexander in the spirit of Cleitarchus, with a heavy overlay of literary and contemporary motifs. In this paper, I wish to discuss some elements of Curtius’ style of composition and the curious results of his narrative, or story-telling, technique. I shall give some examples of episodes in Curtius’ history where the author himself has left clues about his method of composition, or where this can be deduced from a comparison of Curtius with the other writers of the Vulgate.

1. Charidemus and the Greek mercenaries of Thimodes (iii 2. 10–19)

In 333 B.C., Darius III held a review of his troops near Babylon, enumerating them by using the method employed by Xerxes at Doriscus in 480. After this review, he turned to Charidemus, an Athenian exile, asking him for his opinion of the troops. But, like the exiled Spartan king Demaratus, Charidemus praised the fighting skill of the Europeans and disparaged the Persian soldiers, much to the chagrin of King Darius. Now the episode was clearly modelled on Herodotus’ description of the advice of Demaratus (Hdt. vii 101–105), as has been demonstrated by J. Blaensdorf, with the notable exception that Charidemus, unlike Demaratus, was executed. But Curtius was, after all, attempting to give Herodotean colouring to the story, not to distort the facts any more than was necessary.

More interesting, however, is what Curtius does with the original version in his source. From Diódorus (xvii 30. 2 ff.), we learn that Charidemus advised Darius to divide his forces and not risk everything in a single engagement. Furthermore, Charidemus offered to command a detachment of 100,000 men from Darius’ army, provided that one-third of these were Greek mercenaries (30. 3). This aroused the suspicions of Darius’ courtiers, who declared that he wished this command in order to betray the Persian troops to Alexander. Charidemus, for his part, questioned the manliness of the Persians and was thus sentenced to death (30. 4–5). This remark about Persian ‘unmanliness’ is surely the inspiration for Curtius’ reworking of Charidemus’ speech to create a parallel to Herodotus’ Demaratus. Once Curtius has used Charidemus for a different purpose, he transfers the sentiments expressed in his speech to the Greek mercenaries brought from the coast by Thymondas (Curt. iii 8. 2, the MSS have ‘Thimodes’). But here the arguments ascribed to the Greek mercenaries — that Darius should withdraw to the plains of Mesopotamia, where his army could best be deployed — are remarkably similar to those attributed by Arrian ii 6. 3, 6 (cf. Plut. Alex. 20. 1–4) to Amyntas son of Antiochus.

It appears that the original version of the vulgate assigned to the Greek exile Charidemus the advice that Darius divide his forces, giving half to Charidemus to command while he himself withdrew with the rest (thus
Diod. xvii 30. 2 ff.). There existed a variant, related by Ptolemy, that the Macedonian exile, Amyntas son of Antiochus, urged him to remain in Mesopotamia (that is, not to cross into Cilicia). In each case, the advice of Darius' courtiers prevailed (Diod. xvii 30. 4; Arr. ii 6. 4-6). That Curtius knew Ptolemy's version is suggested by the fact that, although he inserts Thimodes and his Greeks into his story at exactly the point where Arrian recounts the fate of Amyntas, he nevertheless weaves together the arguments of both Amyntas and Charidemus: 'Hi magnopere suadebant, ut retro abiret spatiososque Mesopotamiae campos repeteret: si id consilium damnaret, at ille divideret saltem inn'Umerabiles capias, neu sub unum fortunae ictum totas vires regni cadere pateretur' (iii 8. 2). Curtius thus presents a conflation of the evidence of Cleitarchus and Ptolemy.

The restructuring of Curtius' narrative is, however, not entirely satisfactory. It creates an unfortunate contradiction in that, at iii 2. 17-19, Darius on his own initiative orders the death of an adviser but, at iii 8. 4 ff., reproaches his courtiers for recommending the slaughter of the Greeks who had advised him to retreat. And it is hard for the reader to suppress a smile when Curtius makes Darius remark: 'No one ought to pay with his head for giving stupid advice' ('Neminem stolidum consilium capite luere debere' iii 8. 6).

ii. The Speeches of the two Amyntases (vi 9. 28-29; vii 1. 21-40)

A less obvious example of the same method can be found in the account of the Philotas affair. Hence we have in Curtius the speeches of (apparently) two different Amyntases: the latter by the famous son of Andromenes, the former by an otherwise unknown regius praetor. I have argued in 'Amyntas, Son of Andromenes',8 GRBS 16 (1975) 395-397, that these Amyntases are one and the same (that Berve's no. 65 was identical with no. 57, the son of Andromenes). The former speech represents what one would expect from an individual who had recently returned from Macedonia and who sought to exculpate himself from the charge of 'Philotae amicitia'. Amyntas, the regius praetor, makes a speech reminding the Macedonians of their wives and of their homeland, but he also attacks Philotas vehemently. This calls to mind Coenus, who, as Philotas' brother-in-law, had reason to fear guilt by association and thus launched a violent attack on Philotas: 'tum Coenus, quamquam Philotae sororem matrimonio secum conjunxerat, tamen acerius quam quisquam in Philotan inventus est patricidam esse regis, patriae, exercitus clamitans ... ' (Curt. vi 9. 30).

The speech which Curtius puts into the mouth of Amyntas, son of Andromenes, is certainly a fabrication. modelled on the speech of M. Terentius, defending himself against the crime of 'Seiani amicitia'. The remarkable similarities between the words of Curtius' Amyntas and Tacitus' Terentius
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are probably to be explained, by 'the psychological or ideological impres­sion made by a single historical event — the trial and inspired defence of M. Terentius — on both Curtius and Tacitus'. Thus we find in Curtius the fabricated (literary) speech of Amyntas as the show-piece of the Philotus affair (vii 1. 21-40); but the actual (historical) speech of the same man is given in summary form and attributed to another (vi 9. 28-29).

iii. The Punishment of Bessus (vii 5. 38-43; vii 10. 10)

Like many other ancient authors, Curtius experiences occasional difficulties when dealing with two sources that give conflicting information. Unlike Arrian, however, who simply did not reconcile the conflicts in his sources in certain cases,10 Curtius makes at least a clumsy attempt at doing so. The punishment of Bessus, the murderer of Darius III, provides the best illustration. Comparison with the accounts of the other extant sources shows that Curtius was following the Cleitarchean version for the arrest of Bessus. He agrees with Diodorus (xvii 83. 8) that the conspirators handed Bessus over directly to Alexander, making no mention of Ptolemy's role (cf. Arr. iii 30. 3 ff.); and he also mentions that the regicide was given by Alexander to Oaxathres for punishment (Curt. vii 5. 40; cf. Diod. xvii 83. 9; Justin xii 5. 11). Now that punishment apparently took place on the spot (cf. Justin xii 5. 11; Diod. xvii 83. 9; Plut. Alex. 43. 6, the last two agreeing that he was torn apart by recoiling trees). But, it is precisely at this point that Curtius makes curious changes to the version that he is following: Bessus is now mutilated (his nose and ears are cut off), crucified and shot full of arrows (vii 5. 40), but his execution is nevertheless postponed until he can be brought to the place where Darius himself was murdered (vii 5. 43)! Five chapters later (vii 10. 10), Curtius agrees with Ptolemy that Bessus was sent from Bactra to Ecbatana to be executed (cf. Arr. iii 30. 5 and iv 7. 3).

The only explanation for the curious information given at vii 5. 40-43 is that Curtius recognised that Ptolemy's version contradicted that of Cleitarchus, but he was loath to omit the latter's story completely and, therefore, transformed the details about recoiling trees into crucifixion. Nevertheless his attempt to reconcile the different versions is very clumsy and thus easily detected.11

iv. The Cleitus Affair (viii 1. 22-52)

In his account of the Cleitus affair, Curtius also reconciles at least two di­vergent sources. Arrian (iv 8. 8-9) notes that there was some disagreement over how Cleitus was killed: ἄλλ’ ἄναπηδήσαντα γὰρ ὁ μὲν λόγχην ἄρπάσας λέγουσι τῶν σωματοφυλάκων τινὸς καὶ ταύτης ταύτανα Ἐλειφῶν ἀποκτεῖναι, ὁ δὲ σάρισσαν παρὰ τῶν φυλάκων τινὸς καὶ ταύτης. Justin's abbreviation
of Trogus reads only ‘telο a satellite rapto hasta ablata eundem in con-
vivio trucidaverit’ (xii 6. 3). Now the terminology is too vague to allow
us to determine whether the weapon (teium) is the equivalent of Arrian’s
λόγχη or σάρισσα, much less the status of the guard (satelles). But it is
clear that Cleitus, in Trogus’ version, was killed ‘at the banquet table’—
if only for dramatic effect. And Hammond appears to be right in attribut-
ing this version to Cleitarchus (THA 103). Plutarch (Alex. 51. 9) writes:

εὔτω δὴ λαβὼν παρὰ τινος τῶν δορυφόρων ’Αλέξανδρος αἰχμὴν ἀπαντῶντα
tὸν Κλείτον αὐτῷ καὶ παράγοντα τὸ πρὸ τῆς θύρας παρακάλυμμα διελαύνει.

Plutarch’s version is closer to one of the variants supplied by Arrian, and
agrees that Cleitus was killed when he returned to the tent (cf. Arr. iv 8. 9).

What does Curtius make of all this? To begin with, it is clear that he
is following the same primary source as Trogus (Justin). It is Alexander
himself who raises his own achievements above those of Philip and thus
offends Cleitus (compare Justin xii 6. 2 with Curt. viii 1. 22 ff.); this met
with the approval of the majority of his guests but annoyed the veterans
(compare Justin xii 6. 2-3 with Curt. viii 1. 22-23); and the death of
Cleitus is accompanied by the king’s taunting (compare Justin xii 6. 4—
the details of Cleitus’ ‘vindication of Philip’ are given by Curt. viii 1. 33 ff.
—with Curt. viii 1. 52). But Curtius is clearly aware of other details, not
found in Cleitarchus: the quotation from Euripides (Curt. viii 1. 28; Plut.
Alex. 51. 8); the disarming of the king by his Somatophylakes (Curt. viii 1.
45-46; Plut. Alex. 51. 6); and question of which sort of weapon was used to
kill Cleitus (Curt. viii i. 45-46, 49 and 52; Arr. iv 8. 8-9). Clearly, Curtius
has taken one version, which saw Alexander grabbing a spear from one of
his guards and killing Cleitus at the dinner-table, and reconciled it with
another which depicted Cleitus as killed in the doorway. Hence Curtius’
Alexander rapta lancea ex manibus armigeri reflects the version given in
Arrian iv 8. 8 (λόγχην ἀφάσσα ... τῶν σωματοφυλάκων τινῶς), whereas
‘vigili excubanti hasta ablata’ (viii 1. 49) and ‘latus hasta transfixit’ (viii
1. 52) recalls Arrian iv 8. 9 (σάρισσαν παρὰ τῶν φυλάκων τινῶς). Where
Curtius has used a bit of licence is in the description of the disarming of
the King. Plutarch makes it clear that the weapon which was removed was
Alexander’s sword; Curtius changes this to the first spear snatched from
a guard, thus making it necessary for Alexander to seize a second spear
from another guard. Curtius retains (and, indeed, exaggerates) some of
the sinister nature of the Cleitarchean original by having Alexander lie in
wait for Cleitus. Thus the latter is killed as he tries to leave the banquet
and not, as the apologists maintain, when he returned to taunt Alexander
further (Arr. iv 8. 9; Plut. Alex. 51. 8-9).

v. Barsine and Alexander (iii 13. 14)

We have now considered how Curtius introduced information from other
sources, or from his own experience, and how he has attempted to work this information into his narrative. There is at least one case where omission is as obvious as insertion: the failure to mention Alexander's sexual relations with Barsine. Now we know that Curtius was aware of the relationship, since he mentions Barsine's child by Alexander at x 6. 11. But he does not tell us that Barsine was the first woman with whom Alexander had been intimate (Plut. Alex. 21. 7, from Aristoboulus) nor does he describe their meeting after her capture at Damascus (cf. Justin xi 10. 2: 'tunc et Barsinen captivam diligere propter formae pulchritudinem coepit, a qua postea susceplum puerum Herculem vocavit').

P.A. Brunt argued that 'it is doubtful if Aristoboulus could have got the story of Barsine from Cleitarchus. Though Justin does allude to it, it is not in Diodorus and Curtius, who are generally believed to have drawn ultimately on Cleitarchus as a common source, and Cleitarchus may not have had it at all'. But the omission was deliberate. Curtius had just praised Alexander for his self-control (continentia) with respect to the Persian princesses and their mother: 'Virgines reginas excellenteris formae tam sancte habituit, quam, si eodem quo ipse parente genitae forent; coniugem eiusdem, quam nulla aetatis suae pulchritudine corporis vicit, adeo ipse non violavit, ut summam adhibuerit curam, ne quis captivo corpori inluderet: omnem cultum reddi feminis iussit, nec quicquam ex pristinae fortunae magnificentia captivis praeter fiduciam defuit' (iii 12. 21-23). In the case of Barsine, we are dealing not with a member of Darius' immediate family (though she did, of course, have Achaemenid ancestry) but with another female Persian captive. Curtius would have stultified his entire argument if he had proceeded, in the following chapter, to recount how Alexander was overcome with desire for the beautiful captive, Barsine, and how he fathered on her the child Hercules! For it was Alexander's continentia, and condemnation of sexual impropriety in general, at least early in the campaign (cf. Plut. Alex. 22), which mattered more than the status of the woman.

vi. Darius' Knowledge of the Greek Language (v 11. 4)

It can be demonstrated that Curtius invents for literary effect, but these inventions need not always be clumsy (as in examples i–iii above). In fact, by attributing to Darius a reasonable command of the Greek language, Curtius demonstrates that he can be a very good story-teller, that he can manipulate his material in order to create situations that are more plausible than the ones found in his source(s). That Darius knew little or no Greek is clear from the existence of his interpreter, Melon, whom Alexander captured at the village where Bessus had arrested Darius (Curt. v 13. 7); poor health had prevented him from keeping up with the fleeing Persians. Curtius nevertheless has Patron, the Greek mercenary captain, conversing
with Darius in Greek (within an ear-shot of Bessus, who did not under­stand what they were saying) at a time when Melon was stil with Darius. I suspect that it was precisely because Curtius read in his source that Melon, the King’s interpreter, was captured by Alexander that he recognised the awkwardness of his source’s (Cleitarchus’) account of the death of Dar­ius. How would the Great King make his noble speech to the Macedonian Polystratus, if the former knew no Greek, the latter no Persian?

The original version was probably very close to that found in Plutarch (Alex. 43. 3-4), with little or no regard for the language-barrier. Curtius’ account of Darius’ death breaks off at the point where Polystratus, having stopped for water at a nearby spring, detects the presence of a dying man, undoubtedly Darius. The lost portion can be easily constructed along the lines of Plutarch’s version, because Curtius has solved the problem of communication by demonstrating earlier that Darius could speak and understand Greek. Trogus (or an intermediary) resolved the problem in a less satisfying and more awkward way: Polystratus, when he came upon the dying King, brought up a Persian captive, whereupon Darius rejoiced because he would not be speaking his last words in vain to a man who would not understand them: (‘id saltim praesentis fortunae habuere se solacium dixit, quod apud intellecturum locuturus esset nec incassum postremas voces emissurus’: Justin xi 15. 6).

Trogus’ version allows us to ascribe the invention of Darius’ linguistic skills to Curtius and not to his source (i.e., Cleitarchus had already solved the problem, but Plutarch omitted Darius’ conversation with Patron); for, since Trogus followed the same source at this point, he would not have found it necessary to introduce, at the last minute, the captive Persian, if the original version had recorded that Darius was sufficiently well versed in Greek. There remains also the possibility that the awkward scene found in Justin-Trogus came directly from Cleitarchus and that Plutarch simply gives an abridged version. But, in either case, it was Curtius who provided a more readable solution.15

vii. The Achilles-Motif (ix 4. 9–14; viii 4. 26; viii 1. 34)

Further evidence of Curtius’ thinking can be found in his treatment of Alexander and his hero, Achilles. That Alexander emulated Achilles may well have some historical basis, but there is also a strong literary tradition — deriving ultimately from Callisthenes and embellished by Cleitarchus — which links Alexander and Achilles wherever possible.16 In Curtius, at least one of the cases of Achillis imitatio is down-played, though clearly recognisable. Alexander’s struggle with the Indus River (ix 4. 9–14) exhibits some important differences from the version given Diodorus (xiv 97. 2–3), which is so strongly reminiscent of Achilles’ battle with the Scaman­der (Iliad xxi 228 ff.). Unlike Diodorus, Curtius does not have Alexander
jumping into the river — he considers it and prepares to do so, but he does not ‘take the plunge’; nor does Curtius underline the comparison, saying only that the Macedonians appeared to be ‘making war on the river’ (ix 4. 14), whereas Diodorus (xvii 97. 3) claims that Alexander sacrificed to the gods ‘as one who, like Achilles, had done battle with a river’. Why Curtius made these changes is not certain, though one might speculate that he was aware of — but did not himself record — the story (perhaps even from Cleitarchus himself, in which case the latter contradicted himself) that Alexander, when attacking the city of Nysa, lamented that he could not swim (Plut. Alex. 58. 6).\textsuperscript{17} For this reason, Curtius’ hero was not prepared to jump into the river unless he had no choice, and, because he did not actually jump in, the parallel with Achilles and the Scamander could not be fully exploited.

In two other places, however, Curtius introduces the Achilles-motif, in what we might call ‘Roman passages’, where it is not found in the other sources. At viii 4. 26, Alexander’s desire to marry Roxane is justified by appealing to the precedent set by Achilles, who shared his bed with Briseis. Now there is none of this in Plutarch (Alex. 47) or in the Metz Epitome (28–31), which treats the episode in some detail and appears to correspond closely with what was probably in Diodorus’ version (compare the contents of Book xvii, especially the remark that ‘Alexander persuaded many of his friends to marry the daughters of prominent barbarians’, with Metz Epit. 31). That this was Curtius’ own insertion is suggested by the Roman undertones of the whole account: not only is the master-slave relationship typical of Roman poetry and rhetoric (though, admittedly, of Hellenistic origin),\textsuperscript{18} but the servility of the Macedonians who gave ‘facial’ approval to the marriage, since freedom of speech had been suspended after the Cleitus-affair, suggests that of the Roman Senators of the early principate.\textsuperscript{19}

The second passage comes from the speech of Cleitus, where Curtius puts into Cleitus’ mouth sentiments remarkably similar to those expressed by Achilles in his quarrel with Agamemnon in the first book of the \textit{Iliad} (compare vii 1. 34 with \textit{Iliad} i 165–168). It is probably no coincidence that this confrontation of Alexander and Cleitus contains an argument from the famous quarrel in the \textit{Iliad}: ‘The labour is mine, but the lion’s share of the glory goes to you (and your kind)’. But the likelihood that this was inherited by Curtius from his Greek source declines when one considers that it is not Alexander who parallels Achilles, but Cleitus, and that the passage itself is, as Hammond observes, ‘a masterpiece of Roman rhetoric’.\textsuperscript{20} Cleitus’ remark, shortly afterwards, that Alexander of Epirus had faced men in Italy, while Alexander the Great was fighting women in Asia, is more likely to have come from Livy to Curtius than from hearsay to Cleitus’ attention.
viii. Some other examples of Curtius’ technique

In certain passages, it can be argued that Curtius has invented episodes or details rather than taken them from his sources. The account of the courage of Charus and Alexander at Aornus, for example, is easily recognised as a variation on Vergil’s story of Nisus and Euryalus (compare Curt. viii 11. 10–17 with Aen. ix 176 ff.). But is the Vergilian echo Curtius’ own work? Probably it is. Plutarch (Alex. 58. 5), the only other author to mention this particular episode, says only that Alexander urged his namesake not to disgrace him; the Metz Epitome (46–47) does not mention Charus and Alexander at all. Yet Berve concludes: ‘Als Erfindung ist die Erzählung nicht zu erweisen’ (Das Alexanderreich ii 21).

The identification of the ‘Camp of Cyrus’ near the Cilician Gates as that established by Cyrus the Great in his campaign against the Lydian king Croesus is almost certainly Curtius’ invention (iii 4. 1), inspired again by his interest in Herodotus (noted above in section i). Arrian rightly identifies it as the camp of the Younger Cyrus (ii 4. 3; cf. Xenophon, Anab. i 2. 21). Why Polyperchon receives unfavourable treatment in Curtius’ history is not entirely clear: in the discussion of strategy before the battle of Arbela (Gaugamela), Polyperchon is introduced as supporting the ‘bad’ advice given by Parmenion, and Alexander, who has already chided Parmenion on several occasions in the past, once very recently, turns on Polyperchon and scolds him instead (iv 13. 7–8). Curtius’ explanation of Alexander’s reasoning — i.e., to avoid rebuking Parmenion too often — is, in fact, an explanation of his own motive for inserting a third party: he himself was uncomfortable with an account that had Alexander rejecting Parmenion’s advice twice within two chapters (see iv 11. 14, postponed by Curtius until after the death of Stateira; cf. Diod. xvii 54. 4–5, 7). But why Polyperchon? Curtius places Polyperchon in a bad light in the proskynesis episode (vii 5. 22; cf. Arr. iv 12. 2, who names Leonnatus in this context). I have demonstrated (AJP 99 [1978] 459–461) that Polyperchon was not even present when the introduction of proskynesis occurred. Perhaps Curtius found the latter information about Polyperchon (and, indeed, a hostile tradition concerning Polyperchon) in another source (possibly Timagenes — using Duris?). It is, of course, possible that the scolding of Polyperchon before the battle of Gaugamela came also from that source, along with the entire arrangement of iv 11–13. But it is equally possible that Curtius resorted to the hostile tradition against Polyperchon to extricate himself from the difficulty presented by his own re-arrangement of the version he found in Cleitarchus.

Somewhat suspicious, too, is Curtius’ claim that Meleager criticised Alexander’s generous treatment of the Indian king, Taxiles. Meleager is supposed to have had too much to drink and to have remarked that ‘at
least in India, Alexander had found a man worthy of one thousand talents' (viii 12. 17). Alexander, however, remembered his remorse after the killing of Cleitus and took no action against Meleager (viii 12. 18). This story is found in a more general form in Plutarch (Alex. 69. 5), and it is not clear whether the details about Meleager were added by Curtius himself or merely omitted by Plutarch. It is nevertheless part of a popular theme in Curtius: the Macedonian aristocracy, like the Senators of Rome, find it dangerous to speak freely to their autocratic ruler (cf. vii 4. 30 mentioned above).

NOTES

1. I thank the journal's reader, Professor John Atkinson, for his helpful comments on a paper which presents several arguments with which he does not necessarily agree.


7. Hence, he records also that the Macedonians captured at Issus, like the spies taken at Sardis in 481, were shown the Persian army and sent back to report to their commander what they had seen (Curt. iii 8. 13–15; cf. Hdt. vii 146–147). But unlike the spies of Herodotus' account, who were unharmed, these captives were first mutilated by their Persian captors (Curt. iii 8. 15; cf. Arr. ii 7. 1). Again, we may have an allusion to Herodotus (but cf. Polyb. xv 5. 4 f. and Dion. Hal. xix 11, for similar treatment of prisoners) and there was no need to alter the remainder of the episode. See W. Heckel, 'One More Herodotean Reminiscence in Curtius Rufus', Hermes 107 (1979) 122–123.

8. In 1975 I regarded the speeches of the two Amyntases as the result of confusion and invention (see pp. 395–397). At that time, I had not looked closely at Curtius’ method of composition. I now prefer to see the speech of the regius praetor as the original version found in Curtius’ source, the speech of the son of Andromenes as
Curtius' own invention, based on a reasonably accurate assessment of the historical circumstances. Curtius' information about Amyntas' relationship with Philotas (vii 1. 30) and the problems of recruiting the pages in Macedonia (vii 1. 38-39) are almost certainly historical; nor do I see any reason to doubt the story concerning Autophanes (vii 1. 35 ff).


11. Metz Epitome 74 reads: '... in Bactriam pervenit et Bessum adduci iussit eumque suspeditum Morum Persarum fundis necavit'. Here 'fundis' is perhaps explained as a misunderstanding of the Greek original. Diod. xvii 83. 9, speaking of the treatment given by Darius' kin to Bessus, writes that πάντως ἐπέστρεφεν καὶ ἀκόλουθον τρεις ἑκατεροίκημονοι καὶ τὸ σώμα κατὰ λεπίσματα διαφέρουσαν. Plut. Alex. 43. 6: καὶ Βροσσον μὲν ὅστερον εὐφόρον διαφέρουσαν. He was not killed by slings (i.e., slingers, or possibly sling-stones) but his body parts were slung all over the countryside.


13. Hercules' birth did not occur, as Professor Atkinson reminds me, until c.327 B.C. (and Justin does use the word *postea*). What is significant, however, is that Curtius chose not to record the affair with Barsine at this point (although Trogus clearly did).

14. Of course, there is no need to go to the extremes proposed by Tarn ii 319-326, 'Appendix 18: Alexander's Attitude to Sex'.

15. Curt. iii 12. 6-7 shows the same concern for the 'language-barrier'. Alexander plans to send Mithrenes to Persian queens captured at Issus but then sends Leccatus (perhaps an error in the lost source for Laomedon, who, on Arrian's testimony [iii 6. 6], was diglossos). For this episode, see W. Heckel, 'Leccatus and the Captive Persian Queens: A Case of Mistaken Identity', *SFIC* 53 (1981) 272-274. Cf. also the bilingual Lycian guide (Curt. v 4. 4, 4. 10, 13, 7. 12) and the interpreter through whom Alexander and Omphis/Taxiles conversed (Curt. viii 12. 9).


19. Cf. Tacitus, *Agricola* 2. 3-3. 2; cf. 42. 5; 45. 1.

23. P. Green, *Alexander of Macedon*, Harmondsworth 1974, 388, treats the episode as historical and uses it to explain Meleager's lacklustre career: 'if Meleager never reached field rank this was, in a sense, just retribution for plain stupidity'. Cf. Berve ii 250.

### THE CHARIDEMUS EPISODE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Death of Memnon</th>
<th>Curt. iii. 2. 1</th>
<th>Diod. xvii 30. 1</th>
<th>Att. ii 1. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enumeration of Persian troops at Babylon</td>
<td>iii 2. 2 ff.</td>
<td>xvii 31. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charidemus disparages Persian troops</td>
<td>iii 2. 11 ff.</td>
<td>cf. xvii 30. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charidemus urges Darius to hire 'Greek' troops</td>
<td>iii 2. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius grows angry and orders C.'s execution</td>
<td>iii 2. 17</td>
<td>xvii 30. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. curses Darius</td>
<td>iii 2. 18</td>
<td>xvii 30. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius later repents</td>
<td>iii 2. 19</td>
<td>xvii 30. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of Thymondas</td>
<td>iii 3. 1</td>
<td>ii 2. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius troubled by dreams</td>
<td>iii 3. 2 ff.</td>
<td>xvii 30. 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek mercenaries advise Darius to withdraw to Mesopotamia</td>
<td>iii 8. 2</td>
<td>ii 6. 3, 6; Amyntas advises not to leave Mesopotamia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or to divide his forces and not risk all in one engagement.</td>
<td>iii 8. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius' courtiers urge rejection of this advice</td>
<td>iii 8. 4</td>
<td>xvii 30. 4</td>
<td>ii 6. 4–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius follows the recommendations of his courtiers,</td>
<td>iii 8. 7</td>
<td>xvii 30. 4; but in the case of Charidemus</td>
<td>ii 6. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>except for the advice to kill the Greeks.</td>
<td>iii 8. 5–6</td>
<td>xvii 30. 4–6; he actually kills Charidemus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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