

# A Plutarchan Parallel to Arrian *Anabasis* 7.1

*Bradley Buszard*

When Arrian tries to sum up Alexander's character at the end of his *Anabasis*, he falls back on the pattern which Xenophon had used in describing Cyrus; he does not attempt to compare one source with another or one verdict with another, but simply offers his own opinions, not borrowed from anyone else.

SO WROTE LIONEL PEARSON fifty years ago when comparing Arrian's description of Alexander at *Anab.* 7.28–29 with Xenophon *Anab.* 1.9.<sup>1</sup> And while the debate over Arrian's sources has continued, no parallel has been found for the passage that Pearson discusses, and his assertion that Arrian generated this character analysis independently has not been re-examined.<sup>2</sup> There is a similar analysis at *Anab.* 7.1, however, in which one can detect the influence of an earlier author, Plutarch. I will examine this earlier passage in order to define better the range of Arrian's independence: to draw a clearer distinction between the thematic raw material of his narrative, which was present already in his sources, and his interpretation of this material, which was his own.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> L. Pearson, *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great* (London 1960) 17.

<sup>2</sup> See A. B. Bosworth, *From Arrian to Alexander* (Oxford 1988) 38–60, and *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* I (Oxford 1980) 16–34; P. A. Brunt, *Arrian: History of Alexander and Indica* (Loeb: 1976–1983) I xxix–xxxiv, II 542–572. Much of the source criticism in the last century has been devoted to Alexander's last plans; I discuss the more recent and influential of these arguments below.

<sup>3</sup> Bosworth draws a similar distinction in discussing Arrian's Pallacotta episode (*Anab.* 7.19.3–7.21.7): “Even when we are confident of the ascrip-

Although Plutarch wrote one of our most important accounts of Alexander, he is never discussed as a possible influence upon Arrian. The consensus is that Arrian drew independently from some of the same sources, including Aristobulus and perhaps Callisthenes, but not from Plutarch directly.<sup>4</sup> In Henri Tonnet's extensive discussion of the sources of the *Anabasis*, for instance, Plutarch appears only very briefly, and even then only as one of the inheritors of the Cleitarchan tradition that is better represented in Diodorus and Curtius Rufus.<sup>5</sup> I would agree that there is no obvious link between the *Anabasis* and Plutarch's *Alexander* when the latter is read in isolation. But we cannot forget that the *Alexander* is part of a combined parallel biography, the *Alexander-Caesar*, and not an independent work. If we read the parallel biography in its original totality, then the thematic analyses in *Caesar* will influence our interpretation of Plutarch's *Alexander*. The same would be true of Arrian. If he read the *Alexander-Caesar*, he should have reflected carefully upon both halves of the work. I will argue that he did, and that as a consequence his character analysis at *Anab.* 7.1 combines the same two themes that Plutarch treats in *Caes.* 58, namely his subject's unrealized plans for further conquest and his rivalry with himself.

Because my argument depends on the unity of the *Alexander-Caesar* I should explain my confidence that Arrian would have read the entire work. We know from Plutarch's own comments that the *Lives* were generally conceived and written as pairs, each yoking a Greek and a Roman statesman together in order

---

tion of the material ... we have no guarantee that he preserved the narrative sequence or the historical judgement of his exemplar. The presentation is his own and it must be treated as such" (*From Arrian to Alexander* 60). His conclusion, *mutatis mutandis*, will also prove applicable to Arrian's analytical digressions.

<sup>4</sup> See J. R. Hamilton, *Plutarch: Alexander* (Oxford 1969) xlix–lxii (with a hypothetical table of Plutarch's sources, lii–liii).

<sup>5</sup> H. Tonnet, *Recherches sur Arrien: sa personnalité et ses écrits atticistes* I (Amsterdam 1988) 120–121.

to elucidate commonalities and significant differences.<sup>6</sup> There is often a comparative summary, or *synkrisis*, at the end as well. For whatever reason *Alexander-Caesar* lacks a *synkrisis*. The unity of the pair is nonetheless assured by a statement in its introduction: “While writing in this book (τὸ βιβλίον) the life of Alexander the king and that of Caesar, by whom Pompey was destroyed, we will make no preface but to ask of our readers that they not cavil” (*Alex.* 1.1). Originally, then, the two *Lives* were contained in one scroll (the singular βιβλίον), and Arrian like Plutarch would have regarded them as a single work. And if we should identify some influence of Plutarch’s *Caesar* upon the *Anabasis* it should elicit no skepticism on the grounds that the work does not concern Alexander. In truth, it does.

I will begin by laying out the parallel in detail, following the thematic order chosen by Arrian.<sup>7</sup> I will then consider the possible consequences of the parallel for our understanding of Plutarch’s and Arrian’s sources, and conclude by examining the two authors’ adaptations of their common themes to suit the rhetorical goals of their respective works.

### *The parallel*

The first theme that Arrian draws from Plutarch, Alexan-

<sup>6</sup> The four exceptions are *Aratus*, *Artaxerxes*, and the two survivors from Plutarch’s earlier series of imperial biographies, *Galba* and *Otho*.

<sup>7</sup> The order is arbitrary from the perspective of my argument, and I do not mean to suggest that Arrian’s account is more reliable than that of Plutarch. Though Arrian was considered our most reliable narrative of Alexander’s exploits from the eighteenth century through the mid-twentieth, when his account was strongly defended by Tarn (e.g., W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* II [Cambridge 1948] 135), Bosworth has since cast doubt upon Arrian’s supremacy (e.g., A. B. Bosworth, “Arrian and the Alexander Vulgate,” *Entretiens Hardt* 22 [1976] 1–33, at 2–4), and Curtius, Diodorus, and Justin have been rehabilitated, greatly complicating subsequent inquiries into the period. See J. C. Yardley and W. Heckel, *Justin: Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus, Books 11–12* (Oxford 1997); J. E. Atkinson, *A Commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus’ Historiae Alexandri Magni: Books 3 and 4* (Amsterdam 1980), and *Books 5 to 7.2* (Amsterdam 1994).

der's unfulfilled desire for conquest, takes the form of an ambitious plan to sail from the Persian Gulf to Spain, subduing the nations along the way, and thence perhaps also to Sicily or the Black Sea. It forms part of a historical crux, the so-called "last plans," which are variously represented in five sources: Arrian, Diodorus, Curtius, Strabo, and Plutarch.<sup>8</sup> Arrian places his description of these plans at the opening of the final book of his history, after Alexander's return from Gedrosia (*Anab.* 7.1.1–3).<sup>9</sup>

When (Alexander) reached Pasargadae and Persepolis a desire (*πόθος*) seized him to sail down the Euphrates and Tigris to the Persian Sea and to see the outflows of the rivers into the sea, just as he had the Indus and the sea there (cf. *Anab.* 6.19). Some also wrote that Alexander was intending to circumnavigate much of Arabia and the land of the Ethiopians and both Libya and the Nomads beyond Mt. Atlas, to sail towards Gades and then into our sea, and having subdued (*καταστρεψάμενος*) both Libya and Carthage thus indeed to be called justly king of all Asia ... And some claimed that he was intending next to sail into the Euxine Sea, to Scythia and Lake Maiotis, others that he was planning to sail to Sicily and the Iapygian height, since the name of the Romans, already rising to greatness, was also inciting him to action.

Four sub-themes distinguish Arrian's account: Alexander's motives, his preparations, the nature and extent of his initial itinerary, and his subsequent plans. The motives shift, with Arrian at first noting only Alexander's desire (*πόθος*) to explore the Tigris and Euphrates, then adducing unnamed sources for

<sup>8</sup> Justin's epitome of Pompeius Trogus also contains an abridged narrative of Alexander's campaigns, but does not mention the plans. The phrase "last plans" has become a fixture in Germanic scholarship, and has earned the arch sobriquet *sogennant*. See K. Kraft, *Der "rationale" Alexander* (Kallmünz 1971) 119; F. Schachermeyr, "Die letzten Pläne Alexanders des Großen," *JÖAI* 41 (1954) 118–140, at 118.

<sup>9</sup> My text for the *Anabasis* is A. G. Roos, *Flavius Arrianus: Alexandri Anabasis*, rev. G. Wirth (Leipzig 2002); for *Alexander-Caesar* I have used K. Ziegler and H. Gärtner, *Plutarchus: Vitae parallelae* II.2 (Stuttgart/Leipzig 1994). The translations are my own.

Alexander's desire to be called the true king of all Asia, then drawing upon still more sources to allege his growing rivalry with Rome. In contrast to our other accounts, Arrian says nothing about Alexander's preparations, concentrating our attention solely on the voyage itself.<sup>10</sup> The itinerary of this voyage is a circumnavigation, first of Arabia, then of African topography as Alexander might have known it: the Persian Gulf, Ethiopia, Libya, Carthage, the nomadic regions of modern Morocco, and back into the Mediterranean through the Pillars of Heracles.<sup>11</sup> The direction of Alexander's subsequent expedition, if he had survived to launch it, would either have been to the northeast, into the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov, or in the west, against Sicily and Rome.

Aside from Arrian, the only description of Alexander's plans framed as an African circumnavigation is that of Plutarch, *Alex.* 68.1–2. Plutarch's narrative is considerably shorter than Arrian's, however, and does not mention subsequent expeditions to the Black sea or Sicily. Nor does Plutarch credit Alexander with any grandiose ambitions. In motive, vocab-

<sup>10</sup> Christopher Pelling considers this diminution of the "final plans" narrative in *Alexander*, like the remarkable absence of Dacia in Caesar's itinerary, evidence that Plutarch wished to avoid invoking the Dacian conquests of Trajan: C. B. R. Pelling, "Plutarch's *Caesar*: A *Caesar* for the Caesars?" in P. A. Stadter and L. van der Stockt (eds.), *Sage and Emperor* (Leuven 2002) 213–226 (repr. C. B. R. Pelling, *Plutarch and History* [Swansea 2002] 253–265, at 255).

<sup>11</sup> Alexander might very well have planned an invasion of Libya. Arrian crafts a speech for Alexander describing a similar intent (5.26.2), and vouches for Alexander's desire to subdue Libya (4.7.5). Brunt, *Arrian* II 501–503, has defended the possible historicity of the account. In doing so he grants without argument that Arrian did not take these passages from Ptolemy or Aristobulus, a concession that I do not understand. Brunt's wording suggests that he is echoing the assertion of Hamilton that "neither Ptolemy nor Aristobulus is the source of his information in Book 7" (*Plutarch: Alexander* 187). But Hamilton's argument, elaborated earlier (116–117) and based in turn on Tarn, *Alexander* II 288, can rule out only the anachronistic Asian geography of *Anab.* 5.26.2. Brunt's main point is sound, and he need not have concerned himself with this illusory caveat.

ulary, and length, Arrian's description of Alexander's plans finds a much closer parallel in the paired *Life* of Julius Caesar. Like Arrian, Plutarch offers it immediately after his subject's return from his final campaign. Alexander had just returned to Persepolis, Caesar is just home from the battle of Munda. Like Alexander, Caesar cannot rest (*Caes.* 58.5–7):

His condition (*πάθος*) was nothing other than ... a preparation and intent to march against the Parthians, and having subdued (*καταστρεψαμένω*) these peoples, and having traversed through Hyrcania to the Caspian Sea, and having gone around the Pontic Sea, to invade Scythia, and having attacked Germany and the surrounding territory to return into Italy through the Celts, and to complete this circle of empire bounded from every side by Ocean.

Caesar's Parthian plans are historical, corroborated in Appian, Suetonius, and Nicolaus of Damascus; his plans to subdue Scythia and northern Europe are not, for we find them only in Plutarch, who shapes his description of Caesar's abortive global conquest with Alexander in mind.<sup>12</sup> But if we leave history aside and compare this description of Caesar's land campaign to the naval itinerary in Arrian we find surprising similarities. Foremost is the idea of circumnavigation. Though Caesar would perforce go mainly on foot, his itinerary and empire are mapped out primarily by bodies of water: the Caspian Sea, the Pontic Sea, and Ocean. His intended result, a circle of empire bounded by Ocean, also recalls Alexander's desire to be called king of all Asia (*Anab.* 7.1.2); it is an even closer match to Alexander's goal as described earlier by Arrian, where the king boasts that "the boundaries of the land there (will) become those that god has also established for the land" (5.26.2).<sup>13</sup> Two

<sup>12</sup> Discussion and bibliography in M. Gelzer, *Caesar: Politician and Statesman* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1968) 322. I agree here with O. Weippert, *Alexander-imitatio und römische Politik in republikanischer Zeit* (Augsburg 1972), who argues that the emulation of Alexander was a part of Pompey's propaganda, but never of Caesar's (107–123, 171–192).

<sup>13</sup> Curtius' Alexander makes a similar claim on the same occasion: he is

verbal similarities to Arrian's narrative are also noteworthy: first, Alexander's desire (*πόθος*) in Arrian echoes Caesar's condition or disease (*πάθος*);<sup>14</sup> second, Arrian and Plutarch use the same verb for subjugation, *καταστρέφομαι*, a word which does not appear in the accounts of Diodorus or Strabo.

Before turning to the second theme of the parallel we should examine our other extant accounts, those of Diodorus, Curtius, and Strabo. All three drew on earlier sources, and also themselves preceded Plutarch, so a close parallel to Arrian's narrative found in one of them would fatally weaken our hypothesis of Plutarchan influence upon Arrian. Diodorus is the logical place to begin, since the modern debate about Alexander's last plans has been concerned above all with Diod. 18.4.1–6. It contains the longest surviving description of the plans, including the expedition itself, the foundation of cities, the construction of temples, and the exchange of European and Asian peoples. Diodorus also provides a historical origin for the plans, a source that he calls Alexander's *ὑπομνήματα* (18.4.2).<sup>15</sup> He

---

approaching the end of human habitation (*humanarum rerum terminos*, 9.2.28), nearly the end of the world itself (*paene in ultimo mundi fine*, 9.3.7).

<sup>14</sup> Word play like *πόθος/πάθος* is not uncommon in Greek. It is sometimes playful, as in Plato's *Cratylus*, and sometimes used for more serious analysis, as it is here and in Aristotle's treatment of *ἀπειρία* (vs. *ἀπορία*) and *ἀπάγει* (vs. *ἀπαγωγή*) at *Phys.* 191. The latter are discussed in K. Quandt, "Some Puns in Aristotle," *TAPA* (1981) 179–196, at 184–186.

<sup>15</sup> The *ὑπομνήματα* are perhaps best understood as memoirs. These same memoirs or something akin to them are called *ἐφημερίδες* in Plutarch *Alex.* 76.1 and 77.1. Tarn gave an extensive analysis of them in 1921 ("Alexander's *ὑπομνήματα* and the 'World-kingdom,'" *JHS* 41 [1921] 1–17, at 11–14) and returned to the question twice more, in 1939 ("Alexander's Plans," *JHS* 59 [1939] 124–135) and 1948 (*Alexander the Great* II 380). See also Bosworth, *From Arrian to Alexander* 185–186; Brunt, *Arrian* II 500–509; the survey by J. R. Hamilton, "Cleitararchus and Diodorus 17," in K. H. Kinzl (ed.), *Greece and the Ancient Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory* (Berlin/New York 1977) 126–146, at 126–127; Hamilton, *Plutarch: Alexander* 187–189; E. Badian, "A King's Notebooks," *HSCP* 72 (1968) 183–204; Schachermeyr, *JÖAI* 41 (1954) 118–119; and F. Hampl, "Alexanders des Grossen Hypomnemata und letzten Pläne," in G. E. Mylonas and D. Ray-

and his sources seem to have had little influence on Arrian, however. His description of the plans differs from Arrian's in all of the characteristics described above. First, his Alexander is motivated neither by *πόθος* nor a grandiose desire to surpass the Persian kings, but by the more concrete desire to subdue Carthage, Libya, and the rest of the Mediterranean coast as far as Sicily. And unlike Arrian, Diodorus describes Alexander's preparations in some detail, including the construction of his fleet and a coastal road, complete with harbors and shipyards.<sup>16</sup> The voyage itself is not a circumnavigation of Africa but is confined to the Mediterranean: neither Arabia nor a voyage through the pillars of Heracles is mentioned. And Diodorus alleges no further plans for conquest, neither to the northeast nor against Rome. He does mention Sicily, but in the absence of further explanation one assumes that he means the Carthaginians or Greeks living there, in which case a Sicilian voyage would be part of Alexander's coastal campaign and not a separate endeavor.

The description of the voyage in Curtius (10.1.16–18) does at least record a motive similar to that in Arrian. He does not allege *πόθος* as Arrian does, but his claim that Alexander had “embraced the unbounded in his mind” (*animo infinita complexus*) recalls the assertion by some of Arrian's sources that the king wished to be called the true king of all Asia. Curtius also invokes Ocean in earlier passages as the ultimate goal of Alexander's career (9.6.20, 9.9.1–10). Yet his narrative of the

---

mond (eds.), *Studies presented to David Moore Robinson* (St. Louis 1953) II 816–829, at 817. See in particular the discussion appended to Bosworth's paper, *Entretiens Hardt* 22 (1976) 34–46, in which Badian, Wirth, Schachermeyr, Errington, and others debate various aspects of the problem.

<sup>16</sup> Tarn, *JHS* 59 (1939) 130–131, argues that extensive road construction was a purely Roman phenomenon, and so discounts this part of Diodorus' narrative. Hampl, *Studies Robinson* 816–817, rightly dismisses Tarn's argument as insufficient. There was, moreover, a Persian precedent in the Achaemenid royal roads: see P. Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander* (Winona Lake 2002) 357–364.

expedition's itinerary makes it exploratory in nature, not a campaign of conquest.<sup>17</sup> And his emphasis on Alexander's preparations, his silence concerning Alexander's further plans, and his description of the expedition itself—a voyage around the Mediterranean, not a circumnavigation of Africa—are elements he shares with Diodorus, not Arrian.

The same can be said of Strabo (16.1.1), who records the motive alleged by Aristobulus for Alexander's western expedition: the king falsely alleged an Arabian diplomatic slight but was in truth driven by his desire to become master of all (*ὀρεγόμενον πάντων εἶναι κύριον*, *FGrHist* 139 F 56). Setting aside the differences in phrasing, the sentiment behind this Greek does closely resemble that of Curtius' Latin, and may indicate that Aristobulus also lurks behind the Roman's account. Yet the rest of Aristobulus' narrative as reported by Strabo is idiosyncratic, and is even further removed from Arrian than Curtius or Diodorus. He ascribes to Alexander merely a desire to subdue the Arabian peninsula, and this is the only territory he includes in his circumnavigation.<sup>18</sup> He never mentions Africa or the Mediterranean.<sup>19</sup> And there is no hint of further plans to sail to the north or northeast, and nothing whatever of Rome.

There being no evidence of an alternative source for the first

<sup>17</sup> Curtius does say that Alexander is *infensus Carthagini*, but I agree with Tam here (*JHS* 59 [1939] 126, 132) that the expedition Curtius describes is not primarily motivated by conquest.

<sup>18</sup> Strabo elsewhere relates a claim by Nearchus that Alexander planned to send a river expedition from the Hydaspes to the Nile (15.1.25, *FGrHist* 133 F 20). A coincidence of peculiar plants and animals had supposedly convinced him that the former river fed into the latter.

<sup>19</sup> Arrian discusses the same passage of Aristobulus at 7.19.3–6, where he treats the naval expedition against Arabia as distinct from the circumnavigation (unlike the speech of Alexander in *Anab.* 5.25.3–5.26.8, where they are combined). Various additional sources have been adduced to explain these disparate accounts, including Hieronymus, Callisthenes, Cleitarchus, Diyllus, and even the hypothetical memoirs, which some ancient authors may have consulted.

theme, we may proceed to the second theme common to Plutarch and Arrian, that of self-rivalry. The similarities between the itineraries of *Anab.* 7.1 and *Caes.* 58, arresting enough in themselves, are mated to very similar analyses of self-rivalry, despite the absence of any obvious motive for doing so. We begin again with Arrian, whose analysis follows immediately after his description of Alexander's plans for conquest (*Anab.* 7.1.4):

For my part I cannot accurately reconstruct the nature of Alexander's intentions; nor do I care to guess. But I do think I should emphasize that Alexander did not undertake any small and base goal, nor would he have rested content upon anything that he had already acquired, not even if he had attached Europe to Asia or the British Isles to Europe, but still would have sought some additional unknown thing, vying at least with himself (*αὐτῷ ἐρίζοντα*) if not also with another.

Greek writers have a complex view of rivalry (*ἔρις*). It can lead to unnecessary conflict and personal suffering, but is also an important motive for human endeavor, as Hesiod argues in his famous discussion of good and bad rivalry at the opening of the *Works and Days* (11–26). Pindar likewise describes rivalry as a dangerous force when misapplied (*Pyth.* 4.285) while elsewhere commending it as a virtue of his patrons (*Ol.* 1.95, *Nem.* 5.39, *Isthm.* 4.29). Perhaps because of the concept's ambiguity Arrian is careful to emphasize its positive connotations. It was the king's magnanimity that drove him to such ventures. He could never have pursued anything "small" (*μικρόν*), anything "easy/ordinary/base" (*φᾶλλον*). The antonyms to these adjectives are "great" (*μέγας*), the usual epithet for Alexander, and "noble" (*ἀγαθός*).<sup>20</sup> So for Arrian, Alexander's rivalry is both

<sup>20</sup> In all likelihood *μέγας*, a well-established epithet for Alexander by Plutarch's day, was first applied to Demetrius Poliorcetes a generation after Alexander. It is not attested for Alexander until Plautus (*Most.* 775–777); see P. Green, "Caesar and Alexander: *Aemulatio, Imitatio, Comparatio*," *AJAH* 3 (1978) 1–26, at 8–9. On *ἀγαθός* vs. *φᾶλος* see Xen. *Mem.* 4.47, *πάντες γοῦν αἰτοῦνται τοὺς θεοὺς τὰ μὲν φᾶλα ἀποτρέπειν, τὰγαθὰ δὲ διδόναι*; cf. *Mem.* 2.6.

evidence of his greatness and nobility and the wellspring of these virtues. No ordinary rivalry would do, of course, for no other could compete with Alexander. He could vie only with himself.

Self-rivalry, which is also a central theme of Plutarch's *Caesar*, is strikingly absent from our other accounts of Alexander. Diodorus' Alexander vies with Heracles' reputation at Aornus (17.85.2), but never with himself. Curtius criticizes Alexander's ambition repeatedly, but usually condemns it as greed (*avaritia*), and never self-rivalry.<sup>21</sup> Nor is there anything similar in Strabo or Justin. Even Plutarch's *Alexander*, when read in isolation, appears more concerned with ambition and self-control.<sup>22</sup> Only when we come to the second half of *Alexander-Caesar* do we again encounter self-rivalry, and in the very same passage that discusses Caesar's abortive plans for further conquest (*Caes.* 58.4–5):

Since his many successes did not turn his inherent magnificence and love of honor towards the enjoyment of his labors, but being instead fuel and encouragement for things to come engendered intentions to pursue greater matters and a lust for new glory, as if he had exhausted his current resources, his condition (*πάθος*) was nothing other than jealousy of himself (*ζήλος αὐτοῦ*) as if of another, and a sort of rivalry (*φιλονικία*) on behalf of the future

<sup>21</sup> E.g. 9.2.9–12, his harshest critique of Alexander's greed: *avaritia gloriae et insatiabilis cupido famae nihil invium, nihil remotum videri sinebat*. Cf. 9.6.15, where Craterus and others plead with Alexander to relent from his ceaseless drive for praise (*orabant ut tandem ex satietate laudi modum faceret*).

<sup>22</sup> On ambition (*πλεονεξία*) see *Alex.* 5 and 62; on self-control, 21.1–23.2. D. Sansone, "Plutarch, Alexander, and the Discovery of Naphtha," *GRBS* 21 (1980) 63–74, discusses self-control and volatility in *Alexander* (65–68); T. Duff, *Plutarch's Lives* (Oxford 1999) 86–87, compares ambition and self-control in the combined *Alexander-Caesar*. Rivalry is of course an occasional theme in *Alexander*—in the Siwah narrative the king's resolve is so strengthened by repeated success that even geography and opportunity yield to him (*Alex.* 26.11)—but the self-rivalry of *Anab.* 7.1 and *Caes.* 58 is absent. I believe that it is still an important theme in *Alexander*, but Plutarch has left it for his readers to draw the connection between the two *Lives*.

against what he had already accomplished.<sup>23</sup>

I have tried to represent the contortions of Plutarch's Greek accurately, with the initial "since" far removed from the independent clause. In fact, the full complications of this sentence are greater than is readily apparent in translation. Plutarch's Greek combines Caesar's self-rivalry and his plans for conquest into a single elaborate sentence, knitting the two themes even more tightly together than Arrian does, with the subject of the sentence, *πάθος*, manifesting itself internally in Caesar's self-rivalry, then externally in his incipient plans for Parthian and European campaigns. Plutarch puts Caesar's plans for conquest in the emphatic second position and unites them in his narrative with Caesar's civilian construction projects and reform of the calendar (58.8–59.6). Arrian addresses the two themes in the opposite order, beginning instead with Alexander's circumnavigation and concluding with his self-rivalry, thereby emphasizing self-rivalry more and providing a smoother transition to his discussion of the Indian brahmins. Both authors present the two as cause and effect, with the two men's self-rivalry driving their abortive plans.

*The origin and nature of the parallel*

Having described the twin parallel of *Anab.* 7.1 and *Caes.* 58, we are now prepared to evaluate its possible origins. Though the similarities are sufficiently close, numerous, and in sufficient proximity to each other that some relationship between the two passages is a near certainty, the exact nature of this relationship is less clear, especially since the remnants of the original sources on Alexander are so poorly preserved. Two explanations are possible. Arrian may have adapted *Alexander-Caesar*, drawing inspiration from Plutarch's analysis of Caesar's character, and incorporating the same themes into his own analysis

<sup>23</sup> Caesar's love of honor drives him to excel and contributes to his unhappy end, a pattern common in the *Lives* that is discussed by C. B. R. Pelling, "Plutarch on Caesar's Fall," in J. M. Mossman (ed.), *Plutarch and His Intellectual World* (London 1997) 215–232, at 216–218.

of Alexander's character. Or Plutarch may have gleaned the twin themes of *Caes.* 58 from an older source on Alexander that Arrian employed independently a generation later. In choosing between these possibilities, the state of our evidence will preclude certainty. The trend of the surviving evidence is not ambivalent, however, and I will argue that Arrian drew from Plutarch directly.

The alternative explanation imposes three difficulties. First, if we insist that Plutarch and Arrian independently derived their character sketches from a lost source, then Plutarch must have carried over the theme of self-rivalry from this source in *Caesar* while withholding it entirely from his discussion of Alexander's plans in *Alex.* 68.1–2. Such a complete transposition of a borrowed theme to the paired *Life* would be, to my knowledge, unparalleled.<sup>24</sup> Second, the broader theme of rivalry is more prevalent in *Alexander-Caesar* than in Arrian, and is more equally distributed in the rest of Plutarch's narrative, which is precisely what one would expect if Plutarch were influencing Arrian.<sup>25</sup> Third, if we argue that both are employing a common source it becomes incumbent on us to determine which source is the most plausible candidate. Source criticism of the Alexander tradition is a well explored quagmire, so this third argument, which is perhaps the least significant of the three, will require the longest explanation.

<sup>24</sup> Christopher Pelling's explanation (*Plutarch and History* 255) for the absence of Dacia in Caesar's itinerary, which I find convincing, does not help us here.

<sup>25</sup> This is easily confirmed by a TLG search for relevant terms. *ἔρις*, for instance, occurs 3 times in *Alexander-Caesar* (*Alex.* 7.1; *Caes.* 5.1, 62.4), and the stem *φιλονικ-* 6 times (*Alex.* 6.1, 26.14, 31.3, 52.9; *Caes.* 42.2, 58.5). Neither appears anywhere in the *Anabasis*. The most prevalent related concept in Arrian, *φιλοτιμία*, is not precisely rivalry but rather love of honor. And even then, the stem *φιλοτιμ-* appears only 7 times in the *Anabasis* (1.21.1, 2.10.7, 3.3.2, 4.18.6, 7.12.5, 7.14.5, 7.28.1), but no less than 22 in *Alexander-Caesar* (*Alex.* 4.8, 5.6, 7.8, 16.17, 29.1, 34.2, 38.5, 48.5, 53.2, 58.2; *Caes.* 3.2, 5.9, 6.1, 6.3, 7.2, 11.3, 17.1, 17.2, 54.1, 54.4, 58.4, 62.8), despite the relative brevity of Plutarch's work.

In the first place, our analysis is complicated greatly by the many authors whom Arrian consults but does not cite. We may call these the *legomena* sources after *Anab.* 1.3 (to borrow P. A. Stadter's formulation).<sup>26</sup> Some can be ruled out. We cannot claim Nearchus, for instance, since the extant fragments of his work, admittedly meager, seem to have influenced only Arrian's Indian narrative.<sup>27</sup> Strattis of Olynthus wrote a work on the death of Alexander (*Suda* σ1179), in which he would probably have discussed the king's character and accomplishments, but we know nothing more about it. Cleitarchus is unlikely because there is no parallel to either of our two themes in Diodorus, the usual mine for Cleitarchan material.<sup>28</sup> Callisthe-

<sup>26</sup> See P. A. Stadter, *Arrian of Nicomedia* (Chapel Hill 1980) 60–76, which supersedes Tarn's overly schematic analysis (*Alexander the Great* II 1–2). Many *legomena* sources have been proposed for the *Anabasis*, including Callisthenes, Cleitarchus, Nearchus, Aristos and Asclepiades (both *per* Arrian *Anab.* 7.15.5), Onesicratus, Chares, Ehippus, Nicobule, Medeus, Polycleitus, Tarn's hypothetical mercenaries' source (cf. Tarn 71–73 and Pearson, *Lost Histories* 78–82), and others described in Pearson 243–264. On the sources for Plutarch's *Alexander* see Hamilton, *Plutarch: Alexander* xlix–lxii; R. Flacelière and E. Chambry, *Plutarque: Vies IX Alexandre-César* (Paris 1975) 11–25; and the collation (though not the analysis) in J. E. Powell, "The Sources of Plutarch's *Alexander*," *JHS* 59 (1939) 229–240. For Arrian one should begin with the detailed entries on the first historians and biographers of Alexander in H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (Munich 1926). Bosworth, *From Arrian to Alexander* 61–93, is the best introduction to Arrian's use of his sources.

<sup>27</sup> Nearchus mentioned Alexander's rivalry (*φιλονικία*) when describing the march through the Gedrosian desert, but not to our knowledge his self-rivalry (Strab. 15.2.5 = *FGrHist* 133 F 3).

<sup>28</sup> Admittedly the surviving fragments tell us little about the overall plan of Cleitarchus' narrative (T. S. Brown, "Cleitarchus," *AJP* 71 [1950] 134–155). What we can say is that Diodorus' short summaries of Alexander's character at 17.66.3–7, 17.69.2–9, 17.72, and 17.79.1 do not resemble *Anab.* 7.1 or *Caes.* 58. His only detailed analysis of Alexander's character is prompted by the king's admirable treatment of the Persian royal women after Issus (17.37.4–7), and seems unrelated to either the *Anabasis* or *Alexander-Caesar*. This incident earns Plutarch's praise in *Alex.* 21.4–5, but Plutarch's version resembles the negative estimate in Curtius 3.12.18–23

nes is also problematic. Brown suspected that Callisthenes lay behind the words spoken by Anaxarchus the sophist after the death of Black Clitus (*Alex.* 52 / *Anab.* 4.9.7–8),<sup>29</sup> but we cannot easily attribute ambivalent or negative judgments of Alexander to Callisthenes, whose history of Alexander was notoriously encomiastic. Further, our best chance for reliable comparison, the original pseudo-Callisthenic Alexander Romance, has not survived, the extant version probably having arisen later than Arrian.<sup>30</sup> Jacoby and Bosworth identify Chares of Mytilene as a possible common source for the *proskynesis* narrative in the *Anabasis* (4.12.3–5) and Plutarch's *Alexander* (54.4–6), but their identification depends on the assumption that Arrian drew from only one source at a time.<sup>31</sup> Even worse, for each of these hypotheses an intermediate source is also possible. As a result, none of the *legomena* sources can be identified with assurance, and assertions about their influence on Arrian will lack conviction.

---

more than it does Diodorus (cf. *Alex.* 21.6 and Curtius 3.12.22). And Arrian at *Anab.* 2.11.9 merely notes the women's capture. Overall, Cleitarchus seems to have had little influence on Arrian; the only visible parallel between them is their description of the Hyrcanian Sea (*Anab.* 3.30.7 / Pliny *HN* 6.36 = Cleitarch. *FGrHist* 137 F 12). Nor did Cleitarchus visibly influence *Caesar*. Though Plutarch cites Cleitarchus at *Alex.* 46.1 (F 15), and compares the Hyrcanian Sea to the Euxine (44.1) as Cleitarchus does, in *Caesar* he never mentions him (naturally enough), and in the Caesarian itinerary calls the Hyrcanian Sea the Caspian (58.6). For a helpful summary of earlier arguments relating Cleitarchus to Diodorus see Hamilton, in *Greece and the Ancient Mediterranean* 126–127, and cf. the comments of P. Goukowsky, "Clitarque seul?" *REA* 71 (1968) 320–336, and the analyses in P. A. Brunt, "On Historical Fragments and Epitomes," *CQ* 30 (1980) 477–494, at 493, and N. G. L. Hammond, *Three Historians of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge 1983) 12–85.

<sup>29</sup> T. S. Brown, "Callisthenes and Alexander," *AJP* 70 [1949] 225–248, at 240.

<sup>30</sup> The original text was probably an Alexandrian work of the late third century B.C.: see D. Holton, *Διήγησις τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου*, *The Tale of Alexander: the Rhymed Version* (Thessalonica 1974) 3–12.

<sup>31</sup> Jacoby ad *FGrHist* 125 F 14; Bosworth, *Historical Commentary* 31–33.

We are on slightly firmer ground when discussing Arrian's named sources, Ptolemy and Aristobulus. The former's influence on Plutarch would be impossible to prove, since he is cited only once in *Alexander* (61.3), but Aristobulus is a much better candidate, and perhaps the best overall.<sup>32</sup> He is cited no fewer than six times by Plutarch, and we know from the Strabo passage discussed above that he not only described Alexander's plans for a western campaign, but in doing so stressed ambition, as did Arrian. Yet we have no evidence that he ever addressed the theme of self-rivalry, and without this second half of our dual parallel we cannot argue that Aristobulus influenced *Caes.* 58 and *Anab.* 7.1. Plutarch would have read many descriptions of Alexander's character and career in his research, and could have selected these two themes from any combination of sources, if not simply generating them by himself. It is conversely very unlikely that Arrian would have recreated Plutarch's selection and organization of these same themes independently.

The simpler explanation is that Plutarch was himself the primary influence for Arrian's analysis. It absolves us from postulating a phantom source and expending our energy fruitlessly debating its identity. As already shown, we can be sure that the *Alexander-Caesar* was written and originally read as a unit, and we have no reason to think that Arrian was so incurious or pressed for time that he would not have done so.<sup>33</sup> Plutarch was a famous and popular author soon after his death and throughout subsequent antiquity.<sup>34</sup> Even given the wealth of

<sup>32</sup> Plutarch also cites Ptolemy once in the *Moralia* on the size of Alexander's cavalry (*De Alexandri Magni fortuna*, 327D).

<sup>33</sup> Bosworth, *Entretiens Hardt* 22 (1976) 34–46, notes several passages where Arrian's careless use of sources is apparent (e.g. *Anab.* 3.11.9), but as convincing as his demonstrations of Arrian's historiographical inadequacies are, they do not show that Arrian was hurried or lazy.

<sup>34</sup> On Plutarch's posthumous importance and popularity see D. A. Russell, *Plutarch* (New York 1973) 143–146; K. Ziegler, *Plutarchos von Chaironeia* (Stuttgart 1964) 309–312.

narratives available to him (*Anab.* 1.2) it would be strange if Arrian did not know and consult Plutarch's treatment of his subject.

The lack of an explicit citation in Arrian is the only argument against his use of Plutarch, and it is a weak one. As is typical in ancient authors, Arrian cites inconsistently. I would further argue that Plutarch is just the sort of author he should fail to mention. In Arrian's first preface, a much-discussed passage that supports multiple interpretations, Arrian explains his use of the *legomena* sources (*Anab.* 1.3):

There are accounts composed by others that, because they seemed to me worth recounting, and not wholly unbelievable, I have recorded *ὡς λεγόμενα μόνον ὑπὲρ Ἀλεξάνδρου*.<sup>35</sup>

The last phrase can be construed by taking the adverb *μόνον* closely with the participle *λεγόμενα*, meaning that Arrian will treat such material as speculative. Bosworth follows this interpretation,<sup>36</sup> as does Brunt in translating the passage thus: "However, I have also recorded some statements made in other accounts ... but *only as tales* told of Alexander" (emphasis mine). This reading makes perfect grammatical sense but generates an interpretive problem in the work as a whole, since Bosworth has shown that Arrian does not reserve phrases like "they say" (*ὡς λέγουσι*) for *legomena* sources.<sup>37</sup> Consistency between Ar-

<sup>35</sup> The word order in the Greek is slightly different: ἔστι δὲ ἂ καὶ πρὸς ἄλλων ξυγγεγραμμένα, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὰ ἀξιαφήγητά τέ μοι ἔδοξε καὶ οὐ πάντῃ ἄπιστα, ὡς λεγόμενα μόνον ὑπὲρ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἀνέγραψα. The second preface at *Anab.* 1.12, which has received recent attention, concerns the author himself, not his use of sources; see G. Schepens, "Arrian's View of his Task as Alexander Historian," *AncSoc* 2 (1971) 254–268; J. L. Moles, "The Interpretation of the 'Second Preface' in Arrian's *Anabasis*," *JHS* 105 (1985) 162–168; J. M. Marincola, "Some Suggestions on the Proem and 'Second Preface' of Arrian's *Anabasis*," *JHS* 109 (1989) 186–189; V. J. Gray, "The Moral Interpretation of the 'Second Preface' to Arrian's *Anabasis*," *JHS* 110 (1990) 180–186.

<sup>36</sup> Bosworth, *From Arrian to Alexander* 60.

<sup>37</sup> Bosworth, *From Arrian to Alexander* 74: "It is hard to separate the primary

rian's preface and practice can be preserved by instead construing *μόνον* closely with *ὑπὲρ Ἀλεξάνδρου* and reading the phrase thus: "However, I have also recorded some statements made in other accounts ... but as tales told *about Alexander alone*." Restated, Arrian will employ auxiliary materials only when they concern Alexander's personal actions or character, elements that are more biographical than military or political. By this standard Plutarch's analysis of Caesar's character, which affects one's interpretation of Alexander in the parallel *Life*, would be reckoned a *legomena* source.

We have, then, three separate arguments in favor of Plutarch's direct influence upon Arrian. While none of them is conclusive by itself, taken together they argue strongly against the hypothetical influence of a lost source. We cannot be certain, of course, but all the available evidence supports the simpler explanation, and the burden of proof rests with those who would defend the *lectio difficilior*.

*Arrian's rhetorical independence*

In all the parallels that we have examined, the thematic structures of Arrian's *Anabasis* and Plutarch's *Alexander-Caesar* are independent of the moral evaluations that they contain. Indeed the latter diverge. Arrian's work is doggedly, even illogically, encomiastic, while Plutarch's estimation of Caesar toward the end of his career becomes quite negative. In the two "last plans" narratives, for instance, Alexander's yearning (*πόθος*) to see the Persian sea and to be called justly (*δικαίως*) king of all Asia sounds far better than Caesar's malady (*πάθος*), his intent to acquire a world empire bounded everywhere by Ocean. A *πόθος* in the *Anabasis* is always positive, and four

---

and secondary tradition. Arrian's use of sources outside the regular campaign narrative is complex, and where he is suspicious of his material he expresses his doubts and uses indirect statement irrespective of whether his source is a major narrative authority or a representative of the minor tradition."

times is even synonymous with love for one's own;<sup>38</sup> a *πάθος* in Plutarch refers to a physical or spiritual disease.<sup>39</sup> The two authors also judge their subjects' respective self-rivalry differently. Arrian stresses the greatness of Alexander's plans; Plutarch emphasizes Caesar's inability to enjoy his accomplishments. Caesar does not plan his conquests because he is great or noble, as Arrian's Alexander does, but because he is inflamed by his previous successes and harbors a lust (*ἔρως*) for new glory (*δόξα*).<sup>40</sup> Arrian too can espouse an ambivalent at-

<sup>38</sup> Arrian chooses *πόθος* to describe Alexander's love for his men at *Anab.* 7.12.3, their desire for him at 7.16.7 and 7.26.1, and their longing for their families in Coenus' speech at the Hyphasis (5.27.6). It also prompts Alexander's crossing of the Danube (1.3.5), his severing of the Gordian knot (2.3.1), his foundation of the Egyptian Alexandria (3.1.5), his journey to Siwah (3.3.1), his desire to capture Aornus (4.28.4), his wish to recruit one of the brahmins (7.2.2), and his prospective voyage to the Caspian Sea (7.16.2). Bosworth (*Historical Commentary* I 62, II 210–211) notes a Herodotean precedent in which *πόθος* causes Phocaean colonists to return to their mother city (1.165.3). He also connects *πόθος* at *Anab.* 3.3.1 and 5.2.5 with the Herodotean tone of Arrian's Danube and Nysa narratives. See also Brunt, *Arrian* I 468–470.

<sup>39</sup> *πάθος* represents a very broad idea, a thing experienced. In a medical context it can be a synonym for symptom (= *πάθημα*, LSJ I.2.c), and it is occasionally used by Plutarch in a primarily physical sense (e.g. *Per.* 38.2, *κινούμενα τοῖς τῶν σωματίων πάθεισιν*). Yet he more often exploits the word's wider connotations, combining physical suffering with political and philosophical afflictions. A neat parallel to the passage under consideration here is *Alc.* 16.2, where he combines the philosophical and the political with *πάθος* and *πόθος* in discussing the Athenian view of Alcibiades: "Aristophanes explained well the *πάθος* of the people towards him, saying, 'They long for him (*ποθεῖ*); they despise him; they yearn to have him.'"

<sup>40</sup> His lust stems from a failure to apply *paideia* and a resulting deficiency in his *ethos*. This is a fundamental flaw that he shares with Plutarch's less successful subjects, men like Demetrius and Antony, Pyrrhus and Marius. S. Swain, "Plutarch's Lives of Cicero, Cato, and Brutus," *Hermes* 119 (1990) 192–203, at 194–197, discusses faulty *paideia* in Plutarch's *Cicero*; on Plutarch's representation of bad *paideia* in *Marius* see C. B. R. Pelling, "Rhetoric, *Paideia*, and Psychology in Plutarch's Lives," in L. van der Stockt (ed.), *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch* (Leuven 2000) 331–339 (repr.

titude towards ambition, one that he inherited from his mentor Epictetus, but the tension between ambition and wisdom inherent in his Stoic doctrine is suppressed throughout the *Anabasis*.<sup>41</sup> Only once does he appear poised to criticize Alexander's pursuit of glory (*δόξα*), during the story of the gymnosophists (*Anab.* 7.1.5–7.2.1), but he stops short at the last moment and veers into an anecdote concerning Diogenes that gives further evidence of the king's virtues (7.2.1–2). In *Caesar*, on the other hand, Plutarch discounts the pursuit of glory entirely, deriving it from fruitless populism and linking it to jealousy, and so indirectly to Caesar's murder. In Arrian, Alexander's concern for his reputation immortalizes him; in Plutarch, Caesar's obsession with his reputation causes his death.

In part, the rhetorical freedom thus revealed in Arrian and Plutarch confirms earlier assessments of their writing. DeBlois and Whitmarsh among others have demonstrated Plutarch's willingness to deviate from the conclusions of his predecessors;<sup>42</sup> Bosworth has done the same for Arrian (see n.3 above). But the parallel between *Anab.* 7.1 and *Caes.* 58 allows us to see more. Through it, we better understand the preface of the *Anabasis*, and the degree to which Arrian could be influenced

---

Pelling, *Plutarch and History* 339–347, at 334); see B. Buszard, “Caesar's Ambition: A Combined Reading of Plutarch's *Alexander-Caesar* and *Pyrrhus-Marius*,” *TAPA* 138 (2008) 185–215, on *paideia* and ambition in *Alexander*, as framed by Plutarch's more explicit analysis in *Pyrrhus-Marius*.

<sup>41</sup> On Epictetus see Stadter, *Arrian* 23–24. On the restricted scope of Arrian's criticism in Book 4 see Stadter 103–114. Bosworth, *Historical Commentary* II 182, argues that Alexander's *πρόθος* to emulate Heracles at Aornus (*Anab.* 4.28.4) is morally neutral or perhaps even negative, but while this may be true in the Dio and Diodorus passages he cites I see no convincing evidence for negative *πρόθος* in Arrian's account.

<sup>42</sup> L. DeBlois, “Political Concepts in Plutarch's *Dion* and *Timoleon*,” *AncSoc* 28 (1997) 209–224, on Plutarch's adaptation of philosophical themes in *Dion* and *Timoleon*; T. Whitmarsh, “Alexander's Hellenism and Plutarch's Textualism,” *CQ* 52 (2002) 174–192, on Plutarch's application of Dionysiac material within *Alexander*.

by a source's thematic organization, even while asserting his own moral evaluation. And within it, if I am correct, we find strong evidence that Arrian read and used Plutarch, an important discovery both for our understanding of Arrian and for our assessment of Plutarch's posthumous influence.<sup>43</sup>

*August, 2010*

Modern & Classical Languages  
Christopher Newport Univ.  
Newport News, VA 23606  
buszard@gmail.com

<sup>43</sup> I would like to thank Jeffrey Beneker, Keyne Cheshire, John Hyland, David Pollio, and the editor and anonymous readers of *GRBS* for their helpful suggestions.