

# Alexander's Newly-founded Cities

N. G. L. Hammond

IN THIS ARTICLE<sup>1</sup> I consider the nature and the scale of Alexander's "newly-founded cities" from a new angle. It has been customary to determine the number of such cities by studying the mentions of individual cities in post-Alexander literature. The result is that Tarn, for instance, after a lengthy study ended up with thirteen cities as "the only ones of which anything is really known" (237), and P. M. Fraser in his book devoted to the subject has recently concluded that Alexander was the actual founder of only six cities.<sup>2</sup> Neither of them took into consideration the general statements about these cities which are found in the writings of historians. My plan is to consider all the evidence first and only thereafter to evaluate the conclusions of, for instance, Tarn and Fraser.

<sup>1</sup>The following abbreviations are used: Berve = H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* I-II (Munich 1926); Bosworth, *Comm.* = A. B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* I-II (Oxford 1982-95); Bosworth, *Conquest* = *Conquest and Empire* (Cambridge 1988); Fraser = P. M. Fraser, *Cities of Alexander the Great* (Oxford 1996); Goukowsky = P. Goukowsky, *Diodore de Sicile XVII* (Paris 1976); Green = P. Green, *Alexander the Great* (London 1974); Hammond, *Coll. Stud.* = *Collected Studies* I-IV (Amsterdam 1993-97); *Sources* = *Sources for Alexander the Great* (Cambridge 1993); *THA* = *Three Historians of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge 1983); Tarn = W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great II* (Cambridge 1950); Wilcken = U. Wilcken, *Alexander the Great*, transl. G. C. Richards (London 1932).

<sup>2</sup>Fraser 201: "we must then leave Alexander as the actual founder of only the following [six] cities."

1. The number, origin, and age of the Epigonoi ("Successors")

(a) We begin with Diod. 17.108.1–3. "At this time [324 B.C.] there came to Susa 30,000 of the Persians, utterly young in their ages, having been selected for the beauty and the strength of their physique ... Alexander formed this corps from a single age-group of the Persians." Diodorus here uses "Persians" for all the native peoples as opposed to the invading Macedonians.<sup>3</sup>

(b) Curtius dates the selection of the boys. "When Alexander was intending to reach India and then the Ocean, he ordered the selection of 30,000 of younger persons from all the provinces" (8.5.1: *ex omnibus provinciis iuniorum*)

(c) Plutarch writes in *Alex.* 71.1, "Alexander was delighted with the 30,000 boys whom he had left behind while they were undergoing training and learning; for they showed themselves manly in physique and comely in appearance, and moreover they displayed amazing dexterity and agility in their manoeuvres." At 47.6 Plutarch had mentioned the selection "of 30,000 boys" at a time when Alexander "expected to be far away." He evidently referred like Curtius to Alexander's intention to reach India.

(d) Arrian, who was aware of what Diodorus, Curtius, and Plutarch had written, gave the fullest account (7.6.1; note the hiatus for emphasis): ἦκον δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ σατράπαι οἱ ἐκ τῶν πόλεων τε τῶν νεοκτίστων καὶ τῆς ἄλλης γῆς τῆς δοριαλώτου παιδῶν ἡβάσκοντας ἤδη ἐς τρισμυρίους ἄγοντες τὴν αὐτὴν ἡλικίαν γεγονότας. E. I. Robson in the Loeb edition of 1933 translated as followed: "There came to him also the governors of the new cities which he had founded, and of the provinces he had captured besides, bringing about 30,000 youths, all of the same age." The weakness of this translation is that the normal Greek for "the governors of the new cities which he had founded" would be οἱ σατράπαι τῶν πόλεων τῶν νεοκτίστων, that is, with a simple genitive, as in 4.7.1–2 ὁ Παρθυαίων

<sup>3</sup>As at 17.19.5, 21.4, 35.1, 55.6, 108.3. So too Goukowsky 265: "il ne s'agissait pas de 'Perses' mais d'Asiatiques."

σατράπης and ὁ Συρίας σατράπης. P. A. Brunt, presumably aware of this weakness, altered the translation of the first few words in his edition of 1983: "he was also joined by the satraps from the new cities which he had founded." This was an improvement, but there was then no point in the Greek article οἱ. We should expect the Greek to be ἦκον οἱ σατράπαι ἐκ τῶν πόλεων τῶν νεοκτίστων, and we may compare 4.7.2, 7.23.1–2. There is also a defect in the sense of Robson's translation. For the satraps were not "the governors of the new cities."

The correct meaning of the passage had already been given in paraphrase by H. Berve: "sagt Arrian ausdrücklich, dass die Epigonoι aus den Städten der oberen Satrapien gekommen sein." He added a footnote, in which he cited the Greek text: "natürlich hiessen die militärischen Befehlshaber der Städte nicht 'Satrapen', aber offenbar kamen die Epigonoι aus den Städten unter Führung der Satrapen" (I 299). In brief he understood that the Satraps were not the commanders of the cities but they came conducting the Epigonoι from the cities.

I had occasion in my *Sources* (285) to translate the passage as follows: "The satraps too came to him: they brought some 30,000 boys ... from both the newly-founded cities and the rest of the spear-won territory." I take the οἱ with the participle. What Arrian was stressing was not the origin of the satraps, which was a matter of common knowledge, but the origin of the Epigonoι, as a new phenomenon. One may compare Arr. 7.23.1 ἦκε δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ Φιλόξενος στρατιὰν ἄγων ἀπὸ Καρίας, where the origin of the army is given.

The last part of the long sentence at 7.6.1 ends with κεκοσμημένους Μακεδονικοῖς ὄπλοις καὶ τὰ πολέμια ἐς τὸν τρόπον τὸν Μακεδονικὸν ἡσκημένους. Robson gives the translation: "all dressed in Macedonian dress and trained to warlike exercises on the Macedonian system." Brunt rightly omits the "all," repeats "dressed in Macedonian dress," and words his last part of the sentence more aptly. However, LSJ<sup>9</sup> s.v. ὄπλον III does not give the meaning "dress," for which Arrian's word is

στολή (7.6.2). What alarmed the Macedonian soldiers was the equipment of Asians with Macedonian weapons (7.6.5 δόρατα Μακεδονικά; see also Diod. 17.108.2). Moreover, when the Asians attended the administration of justice by Alexander, each unit wore its own uniform, e.g. flame-coloured, dark blue, and deep-dyed scarlet, whereas it was only the Macedonians who wore Macedonian uniforms.<sup>4</sup>

## 2. The significance of the number and the date

Since Arrian mentioned the cities first and the countryside second, we may infer that the majority of the 30,000 boys were selected within the cities. This was in any case desirable, because the boys were to be trained within the cities where Macedonians were available to provide instruction. Let us say that 20,000 were selected in the cities. The standard size of an Alexander-city at the time of its foundation was held to be 10,000 adult males; for it was proposed to carve on Mt Athos a representation of Alexander holding a city of 10,000 men (Plut. *Alex.* 72.7). In the cases where a number was given it was 10,000 men (Diod. 17.83.2 of each of the cities near Alexandria-in-Caucaso, 17.102.4 of the city by the river Acesines).<sup>5</sup> From these two figures—20,000 boys aged fourteen and 10,000 men to a city—it seemed to me that one should be able to deduce the number of cities which would provide the 20,000 boys. My own calculations lacked a solid basis. So I obtained the help of a demographer, Dr R. S. Scholfield, F.B.A. of Clare College, who made use of *Regional Model Life Tables and Stable Populations* (London 1983). He took as the expectation of life at birth 20 years (this compares with an expectation of 22 to 25 years in

<sup>4</sup>Polyaen. *Strat.* 4.3.24, of which I have discussed the source: *GRBS* 37 (1996) 48.

<sup>5</sup>These two passages came probably from Cleitarchus, who was interested as a Greek writer in the so-called "Greek cities" (*THA* 61, 67). Curtius 7.3.23 gave the Asians as 7,000 in Alexandria-in-Caucaso but no number for the Europeans. I argued (*THA* 139) that Curtius drew here on Cleitarchus.

Roman Egypt),<sup>6</sup> and he reached the conclusion that some 57 cities would have produced a total of 20,000 fourteen-year-old boys. Now all our sources state that the 30,000 boys were “selected” (Diod. 17.108.1, 109.3; Plut. *Alex.* 47.6, *Mor.* 338D; Curt. 8.5.1) “for the comeliness and strength of their physique.” Even if we say that Alexander selected two boys out of three in the cities, the necessary number of cities would have been not some 57 but some 85.

The date at which Alexander selected the boys is uncertain. The length of their training is relevant. The statement by Diodorus, that they had been under instructors “for a sufficient time” (17.108.2), and Arrian’s statement, that on their arrival at Susa they were “already attaining manhood” (7.6.1), suggest that some years were needed. Plutarch (*Alex.* 47.5–6) and Curtius (8.5.1) both placed the beginning of the operation at a time when Alexander expected to be far away in his advance towards India, that is in 328 or early 327 B.C. at the latest.<sup>7</sup>

### 3. Foundations in particular regions and places

Whereas in most cases we are told of an individual foundation, there are six regions in which Alexander is said to have planted a number of cities. (1) In addition to founding Alexandria-in-Caucaso “he founded also other cities at a day’s distance from it” (Diod. 17.83.2).<sup>8</sup> (2) In Bactria and Sogdia in addition to founding Alexandria-on-the-Tanais “he founded also twelve cities” (Just. 12.5.13 *quoque ... XII urbes condidit*).<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup>R. S. Bagnall and B. W. Frier, *Demography of Roman Egypt* (Cambridge 1994) 110, stated that Roman Egypt “provides the most credible demographic evidence that survives from the Greco-Roman world.” Dr Schofield took for his calculation “the most extreme mortality.”

<sup>7</sup>The dating of the event to the time of the Macedonian refusal to advance beyond the Hyphasis (Wilcken 187) has not been accepted by other scholars. In *Historia* 39 (1990) 174 I preferred 330 as the probable date.

<sup>8</sup>The plural ἄλλας πόλεις ἀπεχούσας is the reading of R (XI c.), whereas the reading of F (XV c.) is ἄλλην πόλιν ἀπέχουσαν. The former is retained in the Teubner and Loeb texts, and the latter in the Budé edition.

<sup>9</sup>The numeral was emended to VII by A. v. Gutschmid, but there is no reason to suppose that any scribe confused X and V. Bosworth (*Conquest* 148: “we

(3) "Around Margiana sites were chosen for six cities" (Curt. 7.10.15 *VI oppidis condendis electa sedes est*). (4) In southern Pakistan "he founded several cities" (Curt. 9.10.3 *urbes plerasque condidit*). (5) In Cossaea "he founded considerable cities" (Diod. 17.111.6 πόλεις ἀξιολόγους κτίσας). (6) He pacified all these tribes—Cossaei, Uxii, and Mardi—and "he founded cities among them" (Arr. *Ind.* 40.8 καὶ πόλῃας ἐπέκτισε).

How many cities does this amount to? If we allow for the plurals and for *plerasque* a minimum figure of three, we have five instances at three each. To these 15 we add the stated numbers XII and VI and two named cities, Alexandria-in-Caucaso and Alexandria-on-the-Tanais. That makes a total of 35 cities. There were other regions in which our main sources mention the founding of one or more cities by Alexander: Egypt, Arachosia, Areia, Babylonia, Carmania, Gedrosia, Makarene, Seistan, Susiana, Aspasia, and Central Pakistan.<sup>10</sup> If we suppose that these eleven regions had as many newly-founded cities as the six regions we have considered, the grand total would be around 70 cities.

What, however, is the source or sources from which the statements cited in the first paragraph were derived? We can begin by excluding Ptolemy and Aristobulus not only because mentions of cities are so few in Arrian's *Anabasis*, for which Arrian was using these two writers, but also from the fact that Arrian's description of the foundation of Alexandria-on-the-Tanais is different from that of Curtius. Arrian (4.4.1) says that Alexander fortified it in twenty days, and that the settlers were some Greek mercenaries, some unfit Macedonians, and volunteering barbarians from nearby. Curtius (7.6.25–27) says that in seventeen days the buildings of the city as well as its fortifications were completed, so keen was the competition between the military units; that the circuit-wall measured 60

---

have no indication how many cities were established in Bactria and Sogdiana") does not mention this passage.

<sup>10</sup>See the convenient list in Tarn 455–456.

stades; and that as inhabitants of the new city there were prisoners whom Alexander purchased from their masters (*i.e.*, from his own soldiers).

It seems clear that Curtius and Trogus, whose account Justin was abbreviating, drew on a common source; for Just. 12.5.12 shared with Curt. 7.6.25–27 for the founding of Alexandria-on-the-Tanais the seventeen days, the length of the circuit-wall (six Roman miles),<sup>11</sup> and Alexander's naming the city "Alexandria." This source seems to have been used also by Diodorus and Arrian, *Indica*. It evidently provided information about the number and/or origin of settlers (Diod. 17.83.2; Curt. 7.6.27; Just. 12.5.12), the distance between cities of a group (Diod. 17.83.2 "a day's march"; Curt. 7.10.15 *modicis spatiis*), the type of site selected (Diod. 17.111.6 "in places difficult of access"; Curt. 7.10.15 "high hills"), and the purpose that Alexander had in mind (Curt. 7.10.15 *mutuum auxilium ... velut freni domitarum gentium*; Arr. *Ind.* 40.7 to become farmers and cease injuring one another). There is no doubt that this common source was an eye-witness in some cases; for in the six cities around Margiana he mentioned that two of the cities on high hills had a southern aspect and four an eastern aspect (Curt. 7.10.15, *duo ad meridiem versa, IIII spectantia orientem*), and he evidently witnessed the intense rivalry of the soldiers in their work in the construction of Alexandria-on-the-Tanais (Curt. 7.6.26).

When we ask who this source could have been, we are helped by two passages. At Curt. 9.10.3 Alexander founded several cities and gave orders to Nearchus, and at Arr. *Ind.* 40.8–9 he founded cities and a citation of Nearchus follows. The coincidence can hardly be accidental. There are other grounds for believing that Nearchus was the common source. For Nearchus was particularly close to Alexander, notably in

<sup>11</sup>Justin, abbreviating Trogus, was converting the 60 stades of their common source into Roman miles on the reckoning of 120 stades to a Roman mile of 1,480 m. The length of the stade varied from city-state to city-state: see *A Companion to Greek Studies* (Cambridge 1916) 532; *OCD*<sup>3</sup> 943. The six Roman miles of Justin is equivalent approximately to 9 km.

Alexander's illness when they conversed together (Plut. *Alex.* 76.4; Arr. *Anab.* 7.25.4); and he will have known that Alexander intended to found cities on the coasts and the islands of the Persian Gulf, and on the as yet unexplored coast of the Arabian peninsula (Arr. 7.19.5, 20.2).<sup>12</sup> If I am correct, the information provided in the passages which I have cited in the preceding paragraph is to be accepted as correct.

There are two passages derived from a writer or writers of a later date than Nearchus. For at Alexandria-on-the-Tanais the descendants of freed prisoners preserved the memory of Alexander long afterwards (Curt. 7.6.27 *nunc originis suae oblita serviunt quibus imperaverunt*). We shall consider later when these observations were made.

In his *Life of Alexander* Plutarch paid very little attention to Alexander's founding of cities. There are two reasons for this: he was writing, as he said in his *Preface*, not a History but a Life for which personal details mattered, and he had already written about Alexander's cities in his first essay entitled *On the Fortune or Virtue of Alexander*. In it he argued in support of his "most paradoxical opinion," that Alexander had been more effective than Socrates and Plato in the diaspora of Greek ideas. His special argument was that in the cities which Alexander founded "countless tribes" (μύρια γένη) of barbarians learned to live like Greeks with Greek gods, Greek magistrates, Greek laws, and Greek philosophy and literature. He gave the number of the cities as "exceeding 70," and he mentioned examples from ten provinces in the course of his exposition (*Mor.* 328–329A). His style was rhetorical, but that did not mean that Plutarch was not serious and exact in his factual statements. The number which he gave is of the order which we should expect from the preceding sections of this article.

What source did Plutarch use for the examples and the total of the cities? It is most probable that he drew on the literary

<sup>12</sup>We do not know what the contents of Nearchus' memoirs were; see Bosworth in *OCD*<sup>3</sup> 1032.

works concerning the foundations of cities known as Κτίσεις, which were fashionable in the first half of the third century B.C. (Callimachus and his pupil Apollonius Rhodius wrote such works). They predated the invasion by the Parthians which overlaid some of the provinces cited by Plutarch. The peaceful conditions which these literary works described were mentioned in later writings. In the *Romance* A-text 3.35 a list of cities is prefixed by the remark that "these cities are inhabited and at peace until the present time." This prefix makes sense if the reference to "the present time" was made in contrast to a subsequent Parthian invasion.<sup>13</sup> When Curtius wrote of "the present time" (*nunc*), he may have turned to the same source as Plutarch did on my interpretation.

If my suggestion is correct that Plutarch drew on the Κτίσεις, his total of "more than 70 cities" came from a reputable source. It is particularly noteworthy that the ancient sources sometimes mention Alexander's "intentions" and "expectations." For example, when he went ashore from Lake Mareotis, "it seemed to him that it was the best site for founding a city and that such a city would be prosperous; and a longing (πόθος) for the task came over him" (Arr. 3.1.5). When Alexander advanced to the river Tanais, "he was intending (ἐπενόει) to found a city; for the site seemed to him suitable for the future growth and prosperity of such a city" (4.1.3). Operations intervened; but when he returned to the site where "he was intending (ἐπενόει) to build a city," he made the suitable arrangements (4.4.1). Then during his last year "he was intending (ἐπενόει) to make settlements along the coast and on the islands of the Persian Gulf; for it seemed to him that the region would become as prosperous as Phoenicia" (7.19.5). Who would have known the mind of Alexander and have reported on his thoughts and intentions?<sup>14</sup> In all

<sup>13</sup>This is more probable than the suggestion of Fraser (40–41, 214) that "the present time" was the "late third or early fourth century."

<sup>14</sup>Bosworth, *Comm.* II 16 *ad* Arr. 4.1.3, suggested, as an explanation of "the intention," that "intentions may be publicly proclaimed." But a historian would not be concerned to report such a proclamation.

these passages Arrian was following those he named as his main sources, Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus. The choice between them is easy. At 3.1.5 the mention of Alexander's longing (πόθος) points to Aristobulus. At 7.19.3, 4, and 7.20.5 Arrian cites Aristobulus, which leaves no doubt that he was the source of 7.19.5. This is confirmed when we compare Arrian 7.19.3–6 with the account of Strabo (16.1.11 [741]), who cites Aristobulus as his authority. Thus Arrian's reports in these passages are to be accepted as historically correct.

#### 4. Alexander's plans for further foundations

In the speech of Acuphis at Nysa Alexander was said to be remarkable for "having founded many cities already (*i.e.*, by winter 327/6) and being about to found many in the future" (Arr. 5.1.5). As this speech was composed after Alexander's death,<sup>15</sup> the composer thought of the founding of cities before and after that date as being on a comparable scale. We are well informed about the cities which Alexander shortly before his death was intending to found. While he was in Babylon, he intended to settle the very numerous Greek mercenaries in Persis (Paus. 1.25.5), and also to plant cities on the northern and western coasts and on the islands of the Persian Gulf, and on the coast of the Arabian peninsula (Arr. 7.19.5, 20.2). He intended also to plant Greek cities around Media, as we learn from the remark of Polybius (10.27.3) that Media "is inhabited all round by Greek cities in accordance with the prompting of Alexander."

While the source for some of this may be Aristobulus, it is likely that most of it came from the "memoranda" which Perdicas inherited and reported to the Assembly of Macedonians (Diod. 18.4.2–6 τὰ ὑπομνήματα). For the list of "the largest, remarkable plans" ended with "the formation of cities, and

<sup>15</sup>The ultimate source may have been Chares of Mytilene, as I suggested in *Sources* 250. Bosworth (*Comm.* II 198) suggested Nearchus as "the major source."

with the transfer of populations (*i.e.*, to such cities) from Asia to Europe and vice versa from Europe to Asia." As I have argued elsewhere, this account was derived from the history of Hieronymus, a reliable contemporary, and it should be accepted as correct.<sup>16</sup>

##### 5. The purposes of Alexander in founding new cities

Diodorus had little to say about Alexander's purposes. He noted the importance of the harbours at Alexandria in Egypt and in Oreitis (17.52.2, 104.8); and the placing of cities beside a river (17.95.5, 102.4); and that Alexandria in Egypt was difficult to attack (17.52.3). A military purpose may be inferred from Diodorus' remarks that Alexandria-in-Caucaso was founded on the pass leading to Media, and that "the considerable cities" in Cossaea were founded "in regions difficult of passage" (17.83.1, 111.6).<sup>17</sup> Curtius made similar points. Alexander intended at first, he wrote, to found his Alexandria on the island of Pharos (4.8.1), and three cities (in fact Alexandria Eschate, Nicaea, and Bucephala) were reported to be on the bank of a river (7.7.1, 9.1.6). Alexander evidently had waterborne trade in mind. Curtius underlined the military importance of six cities "around Margiane," located on high hills and at a moderate distance from one another; for he said that at the time they were "curbs upon the conquered tribes" (7.10.16 *freni domitarum gentium*; cf. 7.6.13).

In his *Life of Alexander* Plutarch mentions only Alexandria in Egypt as "a populous Greek city," and two cities named after his horse Bucephalus and after his dog Perita respectively. The purpose of Alexander in founding more than 70 cities was clearly stated by Plutarch (*Mor.* 328D–E) as being to bring Greek civilisation, literature, and government to non-Greek peoples.

<sup>16</sup>For Hieronymus as the probable source see my *History of Macedonia III* 98; Bosworth (*Conquest* 164) is of the same opinion: "these plans were made public ... and are certainly historical."

<sup>17</sup>For the meaning of ἐν ταῖς δυσχωρίαις see Arr. 3.24.2: διὰ δυσχωρίαν.

According to Arrian, Alexander founded some cities where he expected them to become great and prosperous: Alexandria in Egypt (3.1.5, *cf.* 3.2.2), Alexandria Eschate (4.1.3), Alexandria at the junction of the Acesines and the Indus (6.15.2), and Alexandria in Oreitis (6.21.5). He had in mind especially commercial prosperity through waterborne trade, as we see from the many dockyards which he built in Asia. Arrian noted also that some cities were founded among nomadic tribes, in order that the tribesmen should cease to raid others and learn to live a settled life, based on agriculture (*Ind.* 40.8, naming the Uxii, Mardi, and Cossaei as such tribes).<sup>18</sup> That a city had military importance was stated by Arrian only in the case of Alexandria Eschate, which could serve as a base for the invasion of Scythia and for defence against raiders (4.1.3).

The purpose for the founding of cities which Plutarch advanced in *Moralia* is confirmed by some general statements about the aims of Alexander. Plutarch suggested in his *Life of Alexander* that one reason for Alexander putting on barbarian dress was his belief that "community of race and custom does a great deal to civilise mankind" (45.1); and that he hoped to produce loyalty in his kingdom by "a mixing and a community of practice" (47.5). His hope was expressed most vividly in *Moralia*: "he brought everything together by mixing the lives, characters, marriages, and ways of life as it were in a loving-cup" (329c), and his purpose was to "bring about for all men concord, peace, and partnership" (330E). Arrian derived from Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus the account of the banquet of reconciliation at Opis (7.11.9), in which Alexander prayed that "the Macedonians and the Persians should enjoy concord and partnership in the rule" (*i.e.*, of his Kingdom of Asia).<sup>19</sup> As we

<sup>18</sup>The source here is Nearchus, who was named at *Ind.* 40.5, 9. He was evidently the source for the founding of "several cities" in southern Pakistan in *Curt.* 9.10.3.

<sup>19</sup>"The Persians" here included other Asian peoples as we see from the context at 7.11.8, ἐπὶ τούτοις τῶν ἄλλων ἔθνῶν. These chosen leaders were to share in "the rule" (τῆς ἀρχῆς) and not simply in "the realm," as Tarn (444) maintained. It seems that Arrian derived the prayer of Alexander from Ptolemy

have seen, his last plans, of which the report was derived from Hieronymus, included the planting of cities and the transfer of populations between Asia and Europe and vice versa, "in order to bring the largest continents together to a mutual concord and a kindred amity by means of intermarriage and family ties" (Diod. 18.4.4).

## 6. The size and the significance of Alexander's cities

Even in the difficult terrain of the Cossaei the cities which Alexander founded were "considerable cities" (Diod. 17.111.6 πόλεις ἀξιολόγουσ ἐν ταῖς δυσχωρίαις). They were no doubt fortified with circuit-walls, and the population was judged sufficient to man the fortifications; for there was always a danger of raids from the north or of a local rising. The length of some circuit-walls is mentioned in the ancient sources: at Alexandria in Egypt 80 stades (Curt. 4.8.2), at Alexandria-on-the-Tanais 60 stades (Curt. 7.6.25), and at Alexandria in Margiana 75 stades (Solin. 48.3; Mart. Cap. 6.691). The length of a stade varied from one city to another; but in the case of Alexandria-on-the-Tanais we have 6 Roman miles as the equivalent of Curtius' 60 stades (Just. 12.5.12). Adopting this measure of 10 stades to a Roman mile of some 1,480 m., we provide for our three cities circuit-walls of 12 km., 9 km., and 11 km.<sup>20</sup> The first two, we know, were particularly important cities, and it is possible that the third, Alexandria in Margiana, was not one of the six on the high hills in Margiana but the central city of the province. For such a size we may compare Ambracia and Phoenice in Epirus in the Hellenistic period with circuit-walls of 6 and 5 km. respectively.<sup>21</sup>

---

and/or Aristobulus; see Hammond, *Sources* 290. A similar motive is given for Alexander's marriage to Roxane (Curt. 8.4.25). Bosworth (*Conquest* 161) discussed Alexander's prayer in similar terms to mine.

<sup>20</sup>See *supra* n.11. A stade of 150 m. is on the low side. See *Phoenix* 49 (1995) 67 for a stade of 185 m. Thus the circuit-walls were, if anything, longer than I have suggested.

<sup>21</sup>See N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (Oxford 1967) 658–659 and Plan 11.

Excavation is revealing a fortified city at Jebel Khalid on the western bank of the middle Euphrates, where the river is running due south and divides into two branches with an island in mid-stream.<sup>22</sup> The site, hitherto unoccupied, was evidently chosen to guard the bridges which went to and from the island. We can now understand why in 331, when Mazaeus' force held the eastern bank, the bridges for Alexander had been built only part of the way across the river, *i.e.* to the island. When Mazaeus withdrew, the bridges were extended to the eastern bank (Arr. 3.7.1–2). Thereafter Alexander must have placed troops to guard the bridges which were vital to his communications with Syria and Macedonia.<sup>23</sup> The fortifications, "uniformly Hellenistic," together with the cliffs facing the river, extended for some 5 km. round the city. Within the city, inside an internal acropolis, there was a large place with a courtyard, such as is known at Pella and Aï Khanoum. We may be confident that Alexander founded this city shortly after 331. Aï Khanoum, founded "by the end of the fourth century or in the early third century," had a circuit-wall measuring some 6 km.<sup>24</sup> While the exact size of cities at Jebel Khalid and Aï Khanoum was determined by the topography, the site was chosen because it was

<sup>22</sup>For the position of Jebel Khalid a little south of Jerablus see my *Atlas of the Greek and Roman World in Antiquity* (Park Ridge [N.J.] 1981) Map 27 EC; for the site see the plan by G. W. Clarke, *Mediterranean Archaeology* 7 (1994) 70–71, and also D. Kennedy, *The Twin Towns of Zeugma* (JRA Suppl. 27 [1998]).

<sup>23</sup>This new city was presumably "the city of Syria on the Euphrates called Zeugma," of which Stephanus Byzantinus reported that "Alexander brought his army cross the river, bridging it with chains." When we combine that statement with Arrian's account (3.7.2), we may imagine that Alexander used chains already made for the purpose, in order to suspend a temporary bridge and get an advance force quickly onto the other bank. There was another crossing of the river at Thapsacus (Arr. 2.13.1), probably on the same stretch of the river; for Darius after his defeat at Issus hastened to the nearest crossing.

<sup>24</sup>So S. Sherwin-White, *OCD*<sup>3</sup> 47. It is, however, possible that the city was founded by Alexander and completed by Cineas. A similar city is being excavated at Afrasiab, the site of ancient Maracanda (Samarkand), where Alexander may have founded the Greek city (he was there in Arr. 4.16.3). Its circuit-wall was 5 km. in length: *CRAI* (1990) 356.

possible for the intended population to man its walls. As we have seen, the average population of an Alexander-city was 10,000 adult male citizens, which represents a total population of some 50,000 persons.<sup>25</sup> For comparison I take Ambracia in the Hellenistic period (see *supra* n.21), which had probably a population of some 40,000 or 50,000 persons (including slaves, whereas Alexander-cities were without a basis of slaves), and a fortified circuit-wall of some 6 km.

We should not be surprised that Alexander founded such "considerable cities" (Diod. 17.111.6 πόλεις ἀξιολόγους). For he intended his cities not only to be capable of defending themselves against raiders, for instance Scythians, but also to play the leading role in the spreading of Greek civilisation in their provinces and to become large and prosperous centres of trade.

The training of boys was undertaken in the newly-founded cities. For it was there that accommodation could be provided and that teachers and trainers were available among the Greek and Macedonian settlers to teach "Greek letters" and train in "Macedonian weapons" (Plut. *Alex.* 47.6, 71.1). When the course was completed and the young soldiers were equipped by the king with their "Macedonian panoplies" (Diod. 17.108.2),<sup>26</sup> they served in their provinces under the command of the satraps, their duties being to maintain law and order and, wherever necessary, to defend their frontiers. It was only when Alexander had need of reinforcements for his field-army that detachments of them were brought by the satraps to him.

As I have argued elsewhere,<sup>27</sup> it was characteristic of Alexander that after his first victory on Asiatic soil he decided to train not the defeated Asiatic infantrymen but boys of the

<sup>25</sup>In accordance with the calculation of A. W. Gomme, *The Population of Athens* (Oxford 1933) 26 Table 1.

<sup>26</sup>Goukowsky (265) wrote of the instructors being settlers in Alexander's cities. That the king provided weapons and equipment for the pikemen and no doubt for some cavalrymen who used the lance, see my article in *BSA* 91 (1996) 366 (= *Coll. Stud.* IV 274).

<sup>27</sup>*Historia* 39 (1990) 275 = *Coll. Stud.* II 163.

rising generation in the Macedonian art of war. The process began in Lydia in 334. For the first detachment of trained Asiatics came to join his field-army in 330 from Lydia, and later detachments from Caria and Syria came in 329 (Curt. 6.6.35, 7.10.11f). Meanwhile, presumably from 331 onwards, "6,000 King's Boys were practicing thoroughly the arts of war in Egypt on the order of Alexander" (*Suda s.v.* Βασιλικοί παῖδες). By the time of Alexander's death in 323 there were large numbers of trained "Epigonoi" in the provinces under the command of the satraps.

It was from these Epigonoi that the satraps were ordered to send 10,000 infantry and 8,000 cavalry to join a force of a mere 3,000 Macedonian infantry and 800 Macedonian cavalry, in order to face 20,000 Greek mercenary infantry and 3,000 Greek mercenary cavalry in the winter of 323/2.<sup>28</sup> The success of the Epigonoi, who had been trained to fight alongside the Macedonians, was an ample testimony to the expectation of Alexander just before his death: that "Asia could be held by a [Macedonian] army of moderate size, since ... his recently-founded cities had been filled with settlers eager to maintain the status quo" (Curt. 10.2.8).<sup>29</sup>

## 7. Criticism of some other interpretations

One characteristic of modern interpretations is that they are controlled by two dogmas which are not to be found in the ancient evidence but accepted without question. I consider these dogmas individually.

(1) Tarn (233) maintained that "the first city he built was the great Alexandria by Egypt." This has generally been accepted. It

<sup>28</sup>The provision of troops by the satraps has been either misconstrued (*e.g.* by Fraser 193, "a wholly Macedonian force") or neglected. The satraps presumably sent drafts of young soldiers trained as pikemen to cooperate with the 3,000 Macedonian pikemen. They may have recruited some of the 8,000 cavalrymen from men who had served under Darius.

<sup>29</sup>The text is corrupt but the sense is clear, whether one restores *non* or reads *retinere*. I am quoting the translation of J. C. Rolfe in the Loeb edition.

had the corollary which Tarn stated, "that nearly all Alexander's cities were east of the Tigris." Goukowsky (265) carried this dogma further when he wrote in 1976 of "les Hautes-satrapies, les seules où Alexandre eût fondé des villes (abstraction faite d'Alexandrie d'Égypte)." Bosworth (*Conquest* 72) wrote in 1988 of "the site of his first great foundation Alexandria in Egypt," and continued with the remark that "the next instances of city-foundations come in 330, when Alexander was campaigning in central Iran" (247). Fraser was particularly emphatic when he wrote in 1996 "Alexandria in Egypt apart, Alexander did not ... make any foundations ... until he had crossed the Tigris in autumn 331" (65).

This dogma is not reconcilable with Arrian's account of the 30,000 Epigoni being brought "from the newly-founded cities and the rest of the spear-won territory" (7.6.1) and with Curtius' statement that they came "from all provinces." Moreover, there are references in ancient writers to the founding of cities in the western satrapies, which I take individually.

(a) According to Strabo (593) after his victory at the river Granicus, Alexander paid special honour to Troy (Ilium), a village at the time but famous for the temple of Athena. Alexander had visited it on landing in Asia.<sup>30</sup> It was then that he made dedications, called it "a city," ordered those (whom he made) responsible to restore it with buildings, and pronounced it free and exempt from paying tribute. This procedure in founding a city was that which Alexander laid down in other cases where he led his forces to another objective, for instance in Oreitis (Arr. 6.21.5, Plin. *HN* 6.97) After the overthrow of Persia, Strabo continues, Alexander sent a letter promising to make the city great and the temple most distinguished. Strabo's last point is confirmed by the mention in Alexander's last plans of his intention to have "Athena's temple at Ilium fitted out with

<sup>30</sup> According to Whitehead and Mitchell, *OCD*<sup>3</sup> 747, Ilium was "an Aeolian foundation ... on the site of ancient Troy." The Troy-Ilium complex consisted of the great citadel of Homeric Troy and a town nearby. See F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius I* (Oxford 1957) ad 5.78.6.

unsurpassable splendour" (Diod. 18.4.5). Nor is the name "Alexandria" for the city lacking. Lysimachus busied himself with that "Alexandria" (Strabo 593).<sup>31</sup> Livy wrote twice of "Alexandria Troas" (35.42, 37.35). Stephanus Byzantinus included in his list of cities named "Alexandria" one πόλις Τροίας. The *Alexander Romance*<sup>32</sup> mentioned Ἀλεξάνδρεια τὴν πρὸς Τρωάδα and it recurs in *Excerpta Latina Barbara* and in the *Paschal Chronicle*.

(b) According to Appian (*Syr.* 29), when Antiochus III negotiated with the Romans, he offered them the cities which were the origin of the war, namely "Smyrna, Alexandria the one on the Granicus, and Lampsacus." In this passage Appian was paraphrasing the text of Polyb. 21.13.3: "the city of the Lamp-sacenes and Smyrnaeans and in addition of the Alexandrians." He added his own note to Polybius' "Alexandrians" by defining the Alexandria in question as τὴν ἐπὶ Γρανίκῳ. Whether Appian was correct or not, it is certain that he believed there was an "Alexandria on the Granicus." Would he have known? He wrote about the northwest corner of Asia Minor in his (lost) "Hellenic History" (*Mith.* 11), and very extensively in his surviving *Mithridatic Wars*, especially of Ilium (53) and Cyzicus (72–76), halfway between which the river Granicus runs. He gave a wealth of topographical detail about the siege of Cyzicus by Mithridates. Since he lived in the golden age of the Imperial peace in the mid-second century A.D., he could easily have visited Ilium and Cyzicus himself, and in any case his source or sources knew that area well. It is to me inconceivable that Appian invented a non-existent Alexandria. Nor does Appian stand alone. As Fraser (24) remarks, Julius Valerius in his *Res*

<sup>31</sup>The meaning of the passage is disputed. It seems to me in view of the repeated verb ἐπεμελήθη that the original name was Alexandria; founded by Alexander and completed by Antigonos who named it after himself; changing its name back to "Alexandria" under the auspices of Lysimachus. For a different interpretation see Tarn 240. Cf. G. M. Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands and Asia Minor* (Berkeley 1995) 152–157.

<sup>32</sup>In the A-text 3.35, as cited by Fraser 203.

*Gestae Alexandri* 3.60 mentioned in his list of Alexandrias *Alexandria apud Granicum*. This mention is, of course, independent of Appian; for Julius wrote a Latin version of a Greek novel of Alexander's life. Neither Julius, writing *ca* A.D. 300, nor his source would have had any motive for foisting a non-existent "Alexandria apud Granicum" onto Alexander. Finally, an "Alexandria of Undranikos" appears in the Armenian version of the *Alexander Romance*. It is usually emended to "Alexandria apud Granicum."<sup>33</sup>

That Alexander should have founded a city to commemorate his victory at the river Granicus is not surprising. It was a demonstration of his gratitude to the gods who had given him victory and saved his life. In the same way he dedicated altars to commemorate their favour on several occasions, for instance on crossing the Hellespont unopposed (Arr. 1.11.7), on winning at Issus (Curt. 3.12.27), and on founding Barce (Just. 12.10.6). He is said to have founded a city "by Issus," and he certainly founded two cities on the banks of the Hydaspes to commemorate his victory over Porus. One of these was named Nicaea, and we hear of another Nicaea—"victory-town"—to the east of Parapanisadae (Arr. 4.22.6). An Alexandria on the Granicus, somewhere in the vicinity of Dimetoka, was well placed to control the important pass (Plut. *Alex.* 16.1 "the Gates of Asia") and to cultivate the fertile plain of Adrastus.<sup>34</sup>

(c) Ps.-Scymnus, writing in the second century B.C. of the narrow entry to the Gulf of Issus, mentioned on one side "the city of Alexander founded by the Macedonian" (GGM I 235: 923). That Scymnus, a native of Chios, could be mistaken (as Fraser 21 seems to assume) about the founder of a city so well-

<sup>33</sup>See Fraser 23–24, who set out the evidence. He says that this Alexandria "has no claim to historicity." He supposed that when Appian wrote of "Alexandria the one on the Granicus" he did so "manifestly in error for Alexandria Troas"; but how could any Greek confuse the famous city of Troy with the river Granicus some forty miles inland?

<sup>34</sup>For the terrain, which I have visited, see my "The Battle of the Granicus River," *JHS* 100 (1980) with Fig. 2 (= *Coll. Stud.* III 96).

known and not far from Chios, is to me inconceivable. Then Ptolemy (5.15.2), the geographer of the second century A.D., named the city Ἀλεξάνδρεια ἡ κατὰ Ἴσσον and Herodian in the third century wrote (3.4.3) of a trophy commemorating the victory, a city called Alexandria on the hill, and a bronze statue bearing the name of the region (presumably a statue of the local hero, Issus).<sup>35</sup> Only Alexander could have had such a statue made, as he did of the harpist Aristonicus (Plut. *Mor.* 334F). The city was mentioned quite frequently in later writings<sup>36</sup> as "Alexandria by Issus" or "Alexandria of Cilicia," and the name survived as Iskanderun and Alexandretta into modern times.

(d) At the city Gerasa, now in Jordan, then in ancient Syria, a statue of Perdiccas was dedicated by the citizens. Since in 323–321 B.C. Perdiccas was engaged in civil war and was murdered by his own officers, the statue was set up earlier during Alexander's lifetime. The best explanation is that Alexander founded Gerasa and left Perdiccas to supervise the construction of the city (see section [a] *supra* for parallels) either in 332 or in 331 B.C.<sup>37</sup> This explanation is confirmed by some coins of Gerasa, minted in a late period of the Roman Empire. On them is a head of Alexander and an inscription describing "Alexander the Macedonian" as "Founder of Gerasa."<sup>38</sup>

(2) Tarn's second dogma is "that Alexander's cities in the East all had the same official name, Alexandria," and "every one of his cities was named Alexandria" (233). This is palpably incorrect. For the ancient tradition is that Alexander founded cities which were named not Alexandria but Bucephala, Nicaea,

<sup>35</sup> Alexander will have had in mind the appearance of the hero Marathon in the battle at Marathon in 490 B.C.

<sup>36</sup> These are cited by Fraser 21–23 with nn.47, 49.

<sup>37</sup> In 332 this area came over to Alexander; in 331 he went from Egypt to Samaria (Curt. 4.8.10–11).

<sup>38</sup> Fraser (118 n.26) cited this evidence with references. He did not discuss it, but simply dismissed Gerasa from consideration as an Alexander-foundation. Tarn (233) regarded Gerasa as "a quite impossible place" for such a foundation. But see I. Benzinger, "Gerasa (2)," *RE* 7 (1910) 1243, citing further evidence; Berve I 292: "die Grundung kann sehr wohl historisch sein."

Barce, Heraclea, Prophthasia, and presumably Periteia.<sup>39</sup> When he founded several cities near one another, as in Margiane *modicis inter se spatiis* or Paropanisadae “all within a day’s march of Alexandria,”<sup>40</sup> the confusion would have been intolerable if they were all called “Alexandria.” It is of some importance to disprove this dogma. For when it is accepted, the deduction is that cities not so called were not founded by Alexander. It is only when that deduction seemed absurd, for instance when Bucephala and Nicaea faced one another, that Tarn had recourse to calling such names “nick-names” alongside “Alexandria.”<sup>41</sup>

Now that we have dealt with the dogmas we can give examples of what I regard as mistranslation or oversights in respect of the ancient evidence. I am arranging these under the sections of the last few pages.

In section 1 Curtius and Arrian were cited for their statements that the Epigonoι came to Alexander “from all provinces” and “from both the newly-founded cities and the rest of the spear-won territory.” Yet Wilcken (187) wrote of them as “young Persians,” and Green (446) as “Iranian youth,” and Bosworth (*Conquest* 158, 273) as “selected Iranians ... from the northeast satrapies.” They simply disregarded the statements of Curtius and Arrian. In addition there was a mistranslation of Arr. 7.6.1.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>39</sup> Arrian and Stephanus Byzantinus write of Bucephala; indeed the latter made it a separate entry from his “Alexandrias.” The *Romance* A-text 3.35 first introduced “Alexandria” in the phrase Ἀλεξάνδρειαν τὴν ἐπὶ Βουκεφάλω ἵππῳ.

<sup>40</sup> Curt. 7.10.15, Diod. 17.83.2. Curtius (9.10.3) mentioned the foundation of “several cities” in the area of the Indus Delta, and Justin (12.5.13) mentioned 12 cities founded in Bactria and Sogdia; there too if all were called Alexandria there would be total confusion.

<sup>41</sup> Tarn 233. Fraser (201) thought that Alexander founded six cities, and these were in his belief all called Alexandria; to one of them, Bucephala, Fraser added “Alexandria.” He did not note that according to Stephanus Byzantinus Alexander changed an existing name from Issus to Nicopolis and from Phrada to Prophthasia, not to “Alexandria.”

<sup>42</sup> See *Historia* 39 (1990) 277 with n.50 = *Coll. Stud.* II 165. See *supra* 243, where the Greek text is quoted.

In section 2 the number and the age of the Epigonoi were derived from the ancient accounts. There have, I think, been misunderstandings about them. Lane Fox, for instance, wrote of them that "like Philip's royal pages, not only would the boys be hostages against their father's misbehaviour, they would also become the dependent soldier class of the future";<sup>43</sup> and Bosworth (*Comm.* II 22) wrote of "that body of Iranian infantry, levied to serve as hostages and auxiliaries." Neither cited any ancient evidence. In fact they may have been inspired by a quip in Curtius, that Alexander ordered 30,000 of the younger men to be brought to him under arms "intending to have them as hostages as well as soldiers" (8.5.1 *obsides simul et milites*).

It is of course irrational to suppose that any taker of hostages will arm them with the best weapons and have his own men outnumbered by them. The standard practice in Greece in 1943 was that the occupying powers held the leading civilians of Larissa, for instance, and executed them if their own troops were attacked by resistance forces. Alexander did likewise; for he took the leaders of the Oxydracae "to keep as hostages, if he so desired, and otherwise to serve with him" (Arr. 6.14.3). It is absurd to suppose that he would have taken 30,000 young men as hostages, armed them completely, and kept them together under arms at Babylon, where they outnumbered the Macedonians still on active service.<sup>44</sup> There are two further fallacies. It is assumed that the 30,000 were infantrymen. But a phalanx of pikemen needed cavalry to protect its flanks. Moreover, at Arr. 7.11.3 it is clear that "the barbarian army" (*i.e.*, the 30,000) consisted of cavalrymen as well as of infantrymen. Then the view that the 30,000 were to be auxiliaries is unsound. For they were paraded as a self-standing army,

<sup>43</sup>R. Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great* (London 1975) 318.

<sup>44</sup>Curtius (10.2.5) reported the number of Macedonians who were to stay in Asia as 15,000. Lane Fox (429) said that they numbered "a mere 6,000," and that the 3,000 Hypaspists were to go to Macedonia. As he did not quote any ancient evidence, his statements seem to be speculation.

and they were seen as such by the Macedonians (Diod. 17.108.2–3).<sup>45</sup>

In section 3 it was important to bear in mind the distinction between cities and garrisons. It is clearly marked in the ancient accounts: Curtius wrote of *praesidia nuperque conditas urbes* (10.2.8), and Arrian of πόλεις as contrasted with φρούρια (4.28.4) and φυλακαί (5.21.4). Different troops were involved. The active soldiers in garrisons were to move back to the field army, when the danger had passed, as for instance at Gaza (Arr. 2.27.7 φρουρίῳ ἐς τὸν πόλεμον). The soldiers allotted to the cities were usually unfit for active service, and they were to stay in the cities. The distinction, however, is neglected by some commentators. For instance, Green (403) described Bucephala and Nicaea not as cities despite Arr. 5.19.4 (πόλεις ἔκτισεν) but as “military garrison-towns.” Whereas Diodorus and Arrian wrote of cities being founded in the terrain of the Cossaei (Diod. 17.111.6 ἀξιολόγους πόλεις; Arr. *Ind.* 40.8 πόληας), Bosworth had Alexander “install ‘cities’, military settlements to control insurgency” (*Conquest* 165). Bosworth’s concept of the cities was entirely contrary to the ancient accounts. They were, he said, “introduced as garrison points in the conquered territory”; and they “were a necessary corollary of the conquest, providing a permanent alien garrison force in unquiet territory”; and “like the *coloniae* in the Roman world, they were conceived as *propugnacula imperii*” (*Conquest* 245). Quite apart from the ancient accounts it is irrational to suppose that Macedonians unfit for service (ἀπόμαχοι)<sup>46</sup> and greatly outnumbered by the native settlers, could be expected “to control insurgency.”

In the latter half of section 3 I gave reasons for accepting Plutarch’s estimate of the cities founded by Alexander as numbering more than 70 (*Mor.* 328E). However, some commentators

<sup>45</sup>They were a different category from the Asian cavalry who served with Alexander at the Battle of the Hydaspes. For the 30,000 Epigonoι had learnt “Greek letters.”

<sup>46</sup>For instance in Arr. 4.4.1, 24.7; 5.29.3; Curt. 7.3.23.

treat his estimate with contumely. "It is a gross exaggeration" (Tarn 233); "Plutarch was either speaking irresponsibly or attributing ... later foundations" to Alexander, and "Plutarch is, in fact, a suspect source in more than one respect" (Fraser 188); and Plutarch's statement "is a brilliant outburst of Hellenic chauvinism but is totally divorced from historical reality" (Bosworth, *Conquest* 245). These statements are made without analysis of the ancient sources.

At the end of section 3 I mentioned passages in the ancient sources where Alexander was said to have founded cities with an eye to their future prosperity. Most commentators cite Alexandria-in-Egypt as an example. But Bosworth attributes its foundation primarily to Alexander's "desire for glory" and continues with the statement that "the site's potential for commerce ... was a very secondary consideration for Alexander" (*Conquest* 247).<sup>47</sup>

In section 4 I attached importance to Alexander's plans at the time of his death. They had been dismissed as fictitious,<sup>48</sup> but in 1980 I argued that they were genuine<sup>49</sup> and since then opinion has been on my side. But the full range and the scale of Alexander's intentions have been neglected as indicators of what he had already done.

In section 5 I gave the ancient evidence for the spread of Greek civilisation in Asia being a declared aim of Alexander. Fraser (181) "finds it difficult to accept," and Bosworth held that Alexander "can hardly have foreseen the development of 'hellenisation'," and that "contemporaries might have been excused for thinking that the barbarism came from the west" (*Conquest* 250). Their views are in direct opposition to the

<sup>47</sup>On the other hand, Fraser (181) credited Alexander with "the creation of a new framework for the revival and development of trade and communications" and cited Alexandria in Egypt as an example (175).

<sup>48</sup>E.g. Tarn 378-398; F. Hampl, in *Studies Presented to D. M. Robinson II* (St Louis 1953) 816-829.

<sup>49</sup>My arguments were presented in my *Alexander the Great: King, Commander and Statesman* (Park Ridge [N.J.] 1980) 281-285.

ancient evidence that Alexander aimed at coexistence and partnership between Europeans and Asians, which would inevitably result in an interaction between the two civilisations—not least in the cities of mixed population.<sup>50</sup>

In section 6 the evidence for the size of the newly-founded cities seems to be given for the first time in this context. The evidence that Alexander trained boys in the western part of the Kingdom of Asia has been misconstrued. Among the reinforcements reaching Alexander, Curtius (6.6.35) mentioned 2,600 infantrymen from Lydia “foreign troops” (*peregrinus miles*) and 300 cavalrymen “of the same race” (*gentis eiusdem*); and at 7.10.11–12 he made a contrast between “mercenaries” and the troops from Lycia and Syria. However, these troops are described by Bosworth as an example of “convoys of mercenaries” and as “mercenary forces led from Asia Minor by the satraps” (*Conquest* 148, 170). The statement of the *Suda* that 6,000 King’s Boys were being trained in Egypt is neglected.<sup>51</sup>

Towards the end of this section I mentioned Alexander’s belief that the settlers in the newly-founded cities were eager to maintain the status quo (Curt. 10.2.8). A very different picture has been drawn by Bosworth in his *Conquest and Empire*, his motto as it were of Alexander’s achievement. He sees Alexander “imposing reluctant settlers upon still more reluctant hosts”; the cities being “an undeniable hardship for the local inhabitants” with “the tribesmen being dispossessed” and forming within the city’s territory “a semi-servile rural workforce.” This is an imaginative picture. In the ancient accounts time and again Alexander found “volunteers” to be his native settlers<sup>52</sup>—even at Arigaeum where the native population had fled in terror (Arr. 4.24.6–7). The settlers of course worked the land; but there is no evidence that they were dispossessed,

<sup>50</sup> Wilcken, for instance, wrote in 1931 that “nothing actually had so strong an effect on the Hellenisation of the East ... as Alexander’s foundation of cities ... expressly designated as *Poleis*” (259).

<sup>51</sup> See my summary in *Historia* 39 (1990) 275 with nn.43–44.

<sup>52</sup> E.g. Arr. 4.4.1, 24.7; 5.29.3; 7.21.7; Curt. 7.3.23 *permissum*.

when villages were coalesced into a new city, or that they were treated as serfs—a status for which they would not have volunteered. There is indeed evidence that they did not live as serfs, for when Alexander purchased the freedom of native prisoners and made them settlers in Alexandria-on-the-Tanais, Curtius (7.6.27) noted that their descendants were honoured in memory of Alexander—not as serfs but as free men. The Macedonians and the Greek mercenaries who were allotted to the cities remained under Alexander's orders and in his service. For this he paid them. We do not know whether they were given plots of land in addition to their pay. Even if they were, we have to remember that the productivity of the land was greatly increased by Alexander's improvements in irrigation and by the introduction of the olive, fig, and vine. The events which followed the death of Alexander showed that he was correct in his belief that the Asian settlers in the cities were eager to maintain the status quo.

Tarn employed a method which many scholars have followed. After reading the ancient accounts he formed his own concept of Alexander, described Alexander's career to conform with the concept, and depreciated, dismissed, or omitted those parts of the ancient accounts which were not in harmony with the concept. The chief reaction was to form a different concept of Alexander. Subsequent scholars have provided each his own concept of Alexander, and they have tended to follow Tarn's example of depreciating, dismissing, or neglecting ancient evidence which is not supportive of their concept. I am not denying that they have made great contributions to Alexander-scholarship and provided fascinating pictures. My disagreement is with the method.

The method which seems to me to be more appropriate is to attend to all the ancient evidence, to trace the source of each statement, and to assess the credibility of each statement in the light of its ultimate source, where that is possible. Only when

this has been done will a picture of Alexander's activities and achievements emerge which is likely to be historically correct.

In this article I have contrasted these two methods in regard only to the cities of Alexander. It is for the reader to judge which method is preferable.<sup>53</sup>

*January, 1998*

4 Barrington House  
Southacre Park  
Chaucer Road  
Cambridge CB2 2TY U.K.

<sup>53</sup>I am very grateful to Professor F. W. Walbank for reading an early draft of this article and making valuable comments.