
The Impossible Dream W. W. Tarn's *Alexander* in Retrospect*

by A. Brian Bosworth
The University of Western Australia

First published in 1948, Tarn's *Alexander the Great* was soon out of print. In 1956 the first volume was republished in paperback under the auspices of Beacon Press in Boston, but the more substantial second volume remained inaccessible and was a collector's item for decades. I myself had a standing order with Blackwell's from 1967, but it was at the end of a long list and eventually after much persuasion I received personal permission to make my own photocopy of the work. At long last in 1979 both volumes were reissued in matching format, exact and uncorrected reprints of the original, and they are now available in Australia**. It must be said at once that it is twenty years too late. Virtually every major statement made by Tarn has been critically examined over the last two and a half decades and in almost every case rejected. His work on Alexander is now a historical curiosity, valuable as a document illustrating his own emotional and intellectual make-up but practically worthless as a serious history of the Macedonian conqueror. As will be seen, Tarn's attitudes and methods are interesting in their own right, but they are not interesting enough to justify the outrageous and exorbitant price that is demanded of the Australian market. Hard pressed school librarians would make a far better investment by acquiring a range of more recent publications. Ulrich Wilcken's *Alexander the Great* (WILCKEN 1967), re-edited by Eugene N. Borza in 1967, is probably still the best introduction to Alexander studies, together with J. R. Hamilton's *Alexander the Great* (HAMILTON 1973) and the first volume of P. A. Brunt's Loeb edition of Arrian: the second volume has just (1983) appeared and has all the virtues of its predecessor (BRUNT 1976-1983). All these books (the first two paperbacks) may be purchased for a total considerably less than the asking price of Tarn's *Alexander*, and they offer much more sober and reliable appreciations of the main problems.

This is a very negative verdict, I admit, and it will surprise those who read the dustjacket with its carefully edited extract from A.R. Burn's original review in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*:

"Every serious student of Alexander, probably for generations, will have to start from Tarn's analysis of the sources and discussion of the chief problems".

* Originally published in BOSWORTH 1983a. Published in *Karanos* by kind permission of the journal *Ancient Society Resources for Teachers* (Macquarie Ancient History Association). The director and editorial staff of *Karanos* wants to thank Macquarie Ancient History Association's staff and Elisabeth Baynham for her help and kind support. The editors have added some NE (=Note of the Editors) and extra footnotes, with Roman numeral, in order to include some information or bibliographical explanations. Finally, *Karanos* asks anyone who quotes this paper to add also the original reference to *Ancient Society Resources for Teachers* in the quote.

** W.W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, Cambridge University Press: Vol. I (*Narrative*), pp. x + 161, paper, \$11.95; vol. II (*Sources and Studies*) pp xiii + 477, \$71.00.

It will also surprise those who have grown up to know of Tarn as the doyen of Hellenistic historians, the most famous name in English scholarship on Alexander. The reputation is justified. Tarn's *Alexander* is the distillation of a lifetime of thought and is a literary memorial, lovingly crafted and often quite moving, to a historical figure who for its author embodied most human excellences. But it was conceived in isolation without exposure to serious academic criticism, and most of the traits of his characterisation of Alexander, for all their strong delineation, are in flat contradiction of the consensus of the ancient sources. All too often its basis is emotional intuition, and the source material becomes an embarrassment, to be explained away or selectively expurgated. The resulting picture, like the great creations of fiction, has an enormous attractive force, and the unwary reader will overlook the substructure of fallacious or unsubstantiated premises that underpins it. It is hardly surprising that when it first appeared the chorus of praise drowned the muted notes of criticism, which were confined to academic journals. The work was hailed as a classic.

“It is hard to think of a greater achievement, within its range, by an ancient historian of our time”¹.

So wrote Sir Frank Adcock in his Academy obituary, and, when it appeared in 1958, there were few to disagree.

Alexander the Great appeared in 1948, towards the end of Tarn's long life. It was not, however, principally a work of his old age. Its nucleus is volume I, re-issue of his Alexander chapters in the *Cambridge Ancient History*, which had first appeared in 1927. Comparison of the two versions shows that the text is almost unchanged, equipped with a minimum of footnotes, but, apart from a very few passages where his thoughts had evolved, not in any sense rewritten. The second volume (*Sources and Studies*) contains 133 pages of source analysis followed by 25 appendices of very unequal length and substance, which provide detailed argumentation for the principal views expounded in the text. Even here there is little that was new in 1948. Tarn repeatedly harks back to a series of articles written in the early 1920s, in which he had laid the foundation for his work in the *Cambridge Ancient History*. Even when he announces a new study his views tend to be retailed unchanged. The argumentation is often altered subtly but the bases of his investigation are exactly the same in 1948 as they had been a quarter of a century earlier. Indeed the foundations of his thinking go back much further. His earliest article, “Patrocles and the Oxo-Caspian trade route”, was published in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* in 1901 (TARN 1901) and provided almost a matrix for his subsequent work. His denial that the river Oxus flowed into the Caspian in antiquity was consistent, repeated emphatically in *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, and it served as the basis for his late dating of the historian Cleitarchus (TARN 1948, ii.5 ff.). Tarn's *Alexander* is the result of a lifetime's contemplation, a picture built up by gradual accretion of argument but never subjected to frontal criticism.

The simple facts of Tarn's life do much to explain the curious evolution of his work. He was born in 1869 and educated at Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge. As a classicist he was brilliantly successful, specialising in Greek Philosophy under the aegis of Henry Jackson. But his first and only profession was not academic. Following the wishes of his father, Tarn went to the Bar and began a promising career in London. At this stage his interests were multifarious. A keen oarsman, he rowed in Leander crews

¹ ALCOCK 1958 (the quotation occurs on p. 258). Adcock's obituary, it must be added, is a devoted and sometimes moving testimonial to his friend, well worth reading in its own right.

at Henley. His father had also given him a deep grounding in music (he was a good amateur pianist) and had introduced him to Scotland and grouse shooting, at which the young Tarn proved exceptionally gifted, developing into one of the six best game shots in Britain. At the same time he was able to keep his interests in the classics alive and contributed articles to *JHS* while professionally active as a barrister. This extremely full period of his life closed in 1905 after he and his wife had both suffered serious illnesses. Tarn gave up his career at law and retired to the country, taking up residence in Scotland close to Inverness. There he lived the life of a country gentleman, devoting himself to his family and to scholarship.

The first product of his new leisure was *Antigonus Gonatas*, published in 1913 (TARN 1913), sixteen months before the outbreak of the First World War. There was an interlude of wartime service in military intelligence, after which Tarn returned to Scotland and scholarship. At his home he was isolated from the day-to-day pressures of academic life and saw little of his colleagues. At first he would spend part of the winter in London, to work in libraries and discuss his material with scholars, and he developed a warm personal relationship with M. P. Charlesworth during their collaboration in the late Hellenistic sections of the *Cambridge Ancient History* (TARN 1927). But the isolation became more extreme with the years. When Tarn wrote the revised version of his *Hellenistic Civilisation* with the help of the young G. T. Griffith (TARN–GRIFFITH 1952), the only communication between the collaborators was by post. Tarn was courteous and amenable but kept to his domain in the north. To those who made the pilgrimage to Inverness he was an inspired and inspiring host, entertaining his guests with grouse shooting in the morning and Beethoven after dinner, then talking until the small hours on matters of scholarship. The impression he made was deep and lasting. Adcock's obituary is tinged with perceptible nostalgia for the 'golden days in far-off Inverness'. It is clear that the atmosphere of Tarn's household reinforced the impact of his historical interpretations. By the side of the Beaulieu Firth his Alexander was far more convincing and impelling than it could ever be in cold print without the personal advocacy of Tarn, at once barrister and enthusiast. His friends and collaborators in the *Cambridge Ancient History* propagated his ideas in teaching and creating an atmosphere in which it was unfashionable and unprofitable to criticise them. Tarn himself became an *éminence grise*, inaccessible and remote, retiring further and further into his private world as old age took its toll and antipathy to contemporary society became increasingly marked.

The final shaping of his Alexander came in this period of extreme isolation, and it bears the traces of it. Over the years of reflection Tarn had become almost obsessed with the idea of Alexander as a humanitarian. The culmination of his interpretation was the famous thesis that Alexander came to view his empire as an embodiment of world brotherhood. That final touch to his portrait was first expounded in an Academy lecture of 1933 and was developed in the years that followed. Tarn himself thought it the most important thing about Alexander. Passionately held, the view was thrown out as a challenge to a world that Tarn had come to dislike deeply (his uncertainty and pessimism are vividly expressed in the final footnote of Volume I)². Against the 'new and monstrous births' of the mid-twentieth century his Alexander was a champion of the ideals of his youth in the late Victorian era. Sexually continent, Alexander never had a mistress, let alone a homosexual partner (TARN 1948, i.213, ii.319 ff.). Restraint

² The German scholar, Gerhard Wirth, mentions a personal letter which Tarn wrote to him in the early fifties, admitting that his final work on Alexander was conceived as a protest against the increasing brutalisation of the contemporary world. See his comments in WIRTH 1976, 306.

in fact was the key to his character. He was passionate and impulsive by temperament but schooled himself to iron self-discipline, and only once, with the murder of Cleitus did the hidden fire break out (TARN 1948, I.123). He was an autocrat by birth and predilection, yet he was scrupulous in the observation of diplomatic niceties. The Greeks of Asia Minor were granted their inalienable freedom and were outside the scope of royal interference (I.31-36, II.199 ff.). His non-Greek subjects, though governed directly by satraps, were protected and had their interests safeguarded ('Alexander was not prepared to permit the oppression of subjects': TARN 1948, I.109; cf. II.304). This vision of enlightened monarch would lead to Tarn's final picture of universal monarchy and brotherhood, in which all men, their differences resolved, would live together in harmony and share in his realm as partners, not merely subjects. This Tarn explicitly characterised as a dream (TARN 1948, II.448) which Alexander did little more than formulate, but the dream was a natural corollary of his general view of Alexander as a ruler. A man who could honour and respect his defeated adversaries, who could respect the principle and practice of Greek autonomy, who could feel sympathy with the humblest of his subjects, such a man might go beyond the Stoic ideal of a Marcus Aurelius ('monarchy which honours above all things the liberty of the subject' [*Meditations* i.14]) and envisage an empire in which his subjects were not only free but united in their acceptance of monarchy. The differences between ruler and ruled would disappear as all men found brotherhood under the unifying influence of empire. Alexander, the rationalist and pragmatist, sublimated his actual administrative practice in a dream of universal empire.

But Alexander was allowed only one dream. The more conventional ambition of world conquest Tarn roundly rejected. Far from evolving plans of conquest in the far west, Alexander was turning away from further expansion; his last plans were for exploration and discovery, not military annexation (TARN 1948, I.121-2; II.397-8). He was no megalomaniac with delusions of divinity but a mortal fully conscious of his mortality. Nor was he an imitative character aping the achievements of Heracles and Dionysus (TARN 1948, II.50-3). He never in any sense considered himself son of the Libyan god Ammon still less did he believe in the equation of Ammon with the Greek Zeus (TARN 1948, II.47-59). If he made a request for deification in the Greek World, it was for a strictly political purpose, to legitimise his decree restoring exiles to their homes (TARN 1948, I.111-14, II.370-73). The decree was a violation of the constitution of the Corinthian League, and it could only be enacted if Alexander's status changed: the compact signed by Alexander the man was not binding upon Alexander the god. By this time we are in fairyland (and Tarn, it should be remembered, had written a highly successful fairy story, *The Treasure of the Isle of Mist*: TARN 1920) taken past the rainbow's end by a weird logic. Alexander could not revoke a contractual agreement, yet he did so. Nor could he claim divinity yet contemporary evidence seems explicit that he did. Tarn deftly slipped between the horns of this dilemma by invoking a higher justification. The king was acting in his subjects' interests, to restore the victims of Greek political struggle and end generations of *stasis*. He was precluded from acting within the conventions of the Corinthian League, so he deliberately placed himself above them, demanding a godhead which dispensed him from mortal agreements. At the bottom of the sophistry is a fixed concept of Alexander the humanitarian, a ruler with a profound pity for the sufferings of mankind. Side by side was an equally fixed concept of him as a rationalist, reacting to all problem, personal, military and administrative, with late Victorian pragmatism.

Tarn certainly believed intuitively in his portrait and felt that he knew Alexander's character, how he would behave and how he would think. It was a conviction which

went far beyond the record of the sources. Tarn had extracted his image of Alexander and could use it as a yardstick for the interpretation of the primary evidence. At times this can lead to farce. When faced by Plutarch's explicit statement that Alexander dragged the Delphic priestess by force to deliver an oracle on a forbidden day, he reacts with disbelief (TARN 1948, II.346):

“No one can even imagine Alexander using force to any woman, let alone a priestess”.

Unfortunately he wishes to accept the nucleus of the story and adds a footnote that is sheer equivocation:

“Certainly Plutarch says βίᾳ εἴλκεν, which probably means that he took her arm and said ‘O come along’, or something of the sort... any display of real force is out of the question”.

This is a patent example of rewriting the evidence to fit one's own theory, and Tarn is repeatedly driven to the expedient. Intuitive history is not bad in itself. It was advocated and practiced by Tarn's contemporary, R.G. Collingwood, and at its best it can illustrate and supplement the source tradition. Indeed every historian who writes on the Alexander period needs at some stage to extrapolate a composite picture of the king. But the first criterion must always be the degree of coherency with the ancient evidence, and here Tarn fails catastrophically. Time and time again his views can only be sustained by dismissing all but a fraction of the ancient evidence. *Sources and Studies* is largely a work of demolition. Outside the purely military chapters Tarn is rarely set on adducing new evidence. The argument is more often designed to set aside and discredit statements in the sources which are inimical to his theses. Once again that can be legitimate method. Where sources are contradictory or inconsistent they clearly cannot all be accepted. But the canon must always be to dismiss as little as possible. Otherwise the basis of the argument ceases to be evidence, but at best calculation of probability (what, the Germans term *innere Wahrscheinlichkeit*), at worst prejudice and empty dogmatism.

Fundamental to Tarn's work and to all work on Alexander is the interpretation of the sources. Our extant narrative sources are all derivative works written three and four centuries after the event. They were based directly or indirectly upon histories composed during and immediately after Alexander's lifetime, and much recent research has gone into isolating the contributions of the lost originals. The literary aims of the extant sources were largely neglected, and they tended to be seen as mirrors (or distorting mirrors) of their informants. Tarn followed this tendency to an extreme degree. The source most congenial to him was the Alexander history of Arrian of Nicomedia, which was written in the first half of the second century AD. Now Arrian's treatment of the king was overtly encomiastic, designed to do justice in literary terms to the achievements of Alexander (cf. Arr. I.12.2-5), and he selected contemporary sources which illustrated them best for his purposes. These were Ptolemy and Aristobulus, both participants in the campaign in Asia at very different levels. Tarn, like many scholars, approved the choice and went further endorsing a theory of the great German scholar Ulrich Wilcken that the narrative of Ptolemy as based on an official court journal (the royal *Ephemerides*) which gave a day by day record of transactions at court. Arrian himself was reduced to a cipher, a practical soldier who chose the right sources and there was no attempt to do him anything like justice as a

complex literary phenomenon in his own right. Here, it must be admitted, Arrian was following (for once) a mainstream of German scholarship, taken to ridiculous excess by Ernst Kornemann³, but it was a dangerous path to follow. Tarn thought that he had the seal of documentary approval, almost a Cartesian criterion of indubitability, and he had no hesitation in labelling Arrian's work the 'good tradition' (TARN 1948, II.1-2, 135 etc.). Its generally favourable view of the king was reinforced by the belief in its documentary foundation.

But Tarn's picture is not undiluted Arrian. That would have taken him close to the much earlier portraiture by J.G. Droysen, much of which is Arrian transcribed. Unfortunately for him, the Alexander of Arrian's encomium was not exactly the humanitarian and rationalist of Tarn. The main lines were detectable, but the king had too many human aberrations for comfort and Tarn often found himself in opposition to the supposedly good tradition. The famous letter to the Egyptian satrap, Cleomenes, offering pardon for transgressions past and future, is presented by Arrian as fact and is embedded in the narrative flow of the chapter (VII.23.6-8). There is no hint that it was a *logos* taken from a subsidiary source. For Tarn, however, it was anathema (TARN 1948, II.304):

"Cleomenes' offence had been oppression of subjects, the one thing that Alexander never forgave".

The letter was a fiction, concocted after Alexander's death, and it took in Arrian. It was out of the question that he found it in Ptolemy, but, even so, Tarn believed that it was Ptolemy who stigmatised Cleomenes as a 'bad man' (TARN 1948, II.306). This is the most perverse use of sources imaginable. One accepts from the passage what one wishes to believe, ascribing it to the 'good source', and rejects what is uncongenial as hostile fiction. It is an inevitable corollary of Tarn that Arrian worked with scissors and paste, forcing disparate material good and bad into an inconsistent mould.

Significantly Tarn's first discussion of material from Arrian (TARN 1948, II.10-12) falls neatly into this pattern. The basis of his argument is that Alexander and his staff were well aware of the difference between the Caspian and Aral seas in Central Asia and knew that both the rivers Oxus and Iaxartes flowed into the Aral. Unfortunately in a passage of straightforward narrative, usually derived from Aristobulus, Arrian (VII.16.2) describes a project by Alexander to find whether the Caspian was a gulf of Ocean or an offshoot of the Black Sea, and he goes on to say that both the Oxus and Iaxartes flowed into the Caspian. That is geographical ignorance that Tarn could not tolerate in a member of Alexander's entourage, and once again he posited conflation. Arrian grafted the core of Aristobulus' narrative onto a quotation from Aristotle's *Meteorologica* and garbled them both by superimposing the geographical ideas of his own day. Once he has made that assumption Tarn can extract from the text precisely what he wants; Aristobulus used the term Caspian to refer to the present-day Aral Sea, and Arrian misinterpreted him, referring it to the Caspian Sea and confusing it with his own regular name for the Caspian, the Hyrcanian Sea. According to Tarn, the same occurred at Arrian iii.29.2, where the historian used Aristobulus' description of the Oxus but 'altered the word 'Caspian' into his usual 'Hyrcanian' (TARN 1948, II.12 n. 1). The whole procedure amounts to falsification of evidence, and there is a major factual error. Dealing with nomenclature Tarn states that Arrian uses the name Caspian

³ KORNEMANN 1935. For further discussion of this schematic treatment of Arrian see my BOSWORTH 1976, 1-4.

alone only once, at vii.16.3: 'the reason can only be that Aristobulus had called it Caspian'. But the unembellished expression 'Caspian Sea' does occur again, in Alexander's speech at Opis (VII.10.6), a context where Arrian is stylistically independent of his sources. He therefore used the terms 'Hyrcanian Sea' and 'Caspian Sea' indifferently, and Tarn's thesis to the contrary is erroneous. But Tarn was not arguing out of ignorance. He was well aware of the reference to the Caspian in the Opis speech. He quotes it verbatim many pages later (TARN 1948, II.293) and concedes that the passage reflects Arrian's own terminology, even stating that Arrian used Hyrcanian and Caspian indiscriminately (TARN 1948, II.294). That is a flat contradiction of his earlier assertion that Arrian took the term Caspian from Aristobulus and used it on one occasion only, yet (incredibly) Tarn can refer back to his earlier discussion to corroboration (TARN 1948, II.294 n. 1). It is hard to avoid the conclusion that he deliberately misstated the facts of Arrian's usage to allow his argument to stand. I apologise for labouring this complex matter, but it is an object lesson in the abuse of source criticism. Tarn could not have argued as he did if he had not been convinced of his conclusions before he looked at the sources.

If Tarn's use of the supposedly good tradition was perverse, his handling of the rest of the sources was totally arbitrary. His primary intention was to demolish a canon of German scholarship, the view enucleated by Eduard Schwartz (its origins, however, are much earlier) and developed by Felix Jacoby, which held that much of the material in Diodorus Siculus, Curtius Rufus and Justin derives from a common source, namely Cleitarchus of Alexandria⁴. Cleitarchus' date of composition was a hotly debated issue, but Jacoby had been widely accepted when he argued that he wrote around the turn of the fourth century BC (*RE* xi.626). For Tarn this composite theory was a stumbling block. In the common tradition of Diodorus and Curtius there was a large amount of material hostile to Alexander, which he was reluctant to see in a writer so close to the event, but at the same time there was a good deal of evidence that he wished to use. His argument therefore went in two directions. On the one hand he insisted that Cleitarchus was a relatively late writer, active in the reign of Ptolemy II (TARN 1948, ii.5-28), whose work was fundamentally hostile to Alexander, both romantic and exaggerated (TARN 1948, ii.54-55). Cleitarchus could then be identified as the source of the unfavourable picture in Diodorus (TARN 1948, ii.68). The more favourable material he ascribed to Aristobulus 'by a process of exhaustion' (TARN 1948, ii.71: his readers will agree!). An extra complication was what Tarn called the 'mercenaries' source'. He had isolated a strand in the narrative of Curtius and Diodorus which told the story from the point of view of the Persian defenders, and he argued that this material came from the memoirs of an anonymous Greek mercenary in Persian service⁵. That source provided first hand reminiscences of the early part of the campaign, its masterpiece the defence of Halicarnassus (TARN 1948, II.71-74). The argumentation was complex but its conclusions were relatively simple. There was no single vulgate tradition attributable to Cleitarchus. Instead there was a mosaic of sources, which were variously drawn upon by Diodorus and Curtius (Tarn even argued that Curtius used Diodorus directly). In particular Diodorus was no excerptor of a single source, as most scholars had accepted; he worked from a large number of sources, including, of all things, a Hellenistic military manual (TARN 1948, II.121); moving from one to another at will. The new system had one very definite advantage. It allowed Tarn to accept the material consistent with his

⁴ For a useful review of the problem see HAMILTON 1977.

⁵ The theory is discussed and rejected by BRUNT 1962.

view of Alexander and to discredit the rest as late, romantically embellished and prejudiced.

But how did this large volume of hostile propaganda originate? Tarn is adamant that most of it is fiction, the revenge of the school of Aristotle for the death of their colleague, Callisthenes (Aristotle's nephew and Alexander's first historian). They retaliated by turning Alexander into a text-book case of the corruption of power. Aristotle's doctrine was ruined by fortune, as the king became progressively more immoderate, turning to drink and sexual indulgence and becoming ever more autocratic and tyrannical. That picture appears in full in Curtius (TARN 1948, II.96-99), but is reflected elsewhere. At the same time there was a Stoic view which represented Alexander as infected with arrogance from the beginning (TARN 1948, II.69,83 etc.). In fact Tarn saw the ancient world with few exceptions as consistently hostile to the memory of Alexander (TARN 1948, II.69, 297), and his work as a consequence often takes on a crusading spirit. And there emerges a methodological postulate which is curious and instructive (TARN 1948, II.297-8):

“Stories which show Alexander in a bad light but which are not well attested may easily be Greek inventions of any period, stories which show him in a good light, even if we cannot test them, must at any rate be early.... and are, speaking generally, likely to be true”.

The arguments which support these elaborate theses cannot be reviewed in detail here, but they follow the lines which are now familiar. Premises are dogmatically stated, not supported by evidence. Sources are taken out of context, selectively quoted and sometimes misrepresented, and there is a driving obsession to dismiss all negative elements as fiction. Tarn's misstatements are often subtle and below the surface. For example, unwary readers threading their way through the 'proof' that Aristobulus wrote before Cleitarchus will easily be bemused by the source analysis. The whole argument rests on the assumption that Strabo's description of the behaviour of monkeys is extracted from Aristobulus and the assumption is backed by two dense pages of analysis designed to show that the entire context is based on that author: 'Aristobulus then is certain' (TARN 1948, II.34). But the whole analysis is a travesty, obscuring the set that Aristobulus is virtually never mentioned in the immediate context of the main passage, and almost every statement in Tarn will be found erroneous when checked against the text of Strabo. As was emphasised by one of his first reviewers, Tarn's references must be very carefully verified. All too often they do not say what he claims.

Tarn's view of the sources has been totally rejected in recent scholarship. Rather than retail criticisms already made, I wish to examine in some detail an issue which he clearly regarded as fundamental to his picture of Alexander and which occupied his thoughts intermittently for decades. It is one of the few subjects where we can trace some evolution of thought and response to criticism, and it exemplifies most of the aspects of Tarn's methodology. Did Alexander know of the river Ganges? In 1923 Tarn had argued that he had no knowledge of the river and no plans for conquest in its direction (TARN 1923). How could he, after he had limited his ambitions to reaching the Ocean, which he believed to be just beyond the Hyphasis (the modern Beas, in the Punjab) and had no indefinite ambitions of conquest? Tarn began characteristically with an appeal to documentary evidence and an argument from silence. The satrapy list in Diodorus (18.6.2), which Tarn claimed to be based on an official list of satrapies compiled in Alexander's last year, had no reference to the Ganges. The omission presupposed ignorance. Therefore the story in Diodorus and Curtius, that Alexander

was informed about conditions between the Hyphasis and the Ganges, was an obvious fabrication, based on multiple accretions of legend. This first essay was sharply attacked by Ernst Meyer (MEYER 1927), who had discussed the problem with Jacoby at Kiel. Meyer attacked the thesis at its foundation, noting that the description of India at Diodorus 18.6.2 is essentially repeated at II.37.2-3, where the Ganges is explicitly named and described in the same terms as the unnamed boundary river in the later satrapy list. The Ganges therefore should be read in the text at 18.6.2. The river was well known in Alexander's reign. Some of Meyer's attack was misdirected. Tarn was well aware of the cross reference at Diodorus II.37 (p.100), but he dismissed it as a garbled interpolation of Diodorus' own. He knew of a story that Alexander reached the Ganges and came into contact with the Gandaridae, the most powerful people of that region. Later, when he used the satrapy list in Book XVIII, he grafted on the gist of that story, that Alexander did not attack the Gandaridae because of their elephants. Already Tarn's view of Diodorus is fully fledged; he is the incompetent contaminator of variant sources. Meyer did not address himself to that aspect of Tarn's argument, and his article was later brushed aside as unworthy of refutation (II.279 n.2).

But Tarn had been jolted into rethinking his case, and, when he wrote *Appendix 14* of *Sources and Studies*, he was prepared to make various concessions. Alexander may have heard of the name of the Ganges from local informants (but, if so, it did not affect his plans). More significantly, Tarn admitted that the river referred to in Diodorus 18.6.2 was probably the Ganges, but he extended his theory of Diodoran interpolation so as to negate the admission. The reference to the great river, like the reference to the elephants of the Gandaridae, was an incompetent aside by Diodorus, a blatant misunderstanding of the original reference. The Gandarida of the satrapy list were the Indians of the Cophen valley, the people of Gandhara, but Diodorus erroneously confused them with the eastern Gandaridae who were placed near the Ganges by later legend.

By this stage Tarn's discussion has achieved scholastic complexity and sophistry, and at first sight it is hard to see why he labours the point. But there was a deep contradiction between his own conceptions of Alexander's ambitions and the evidence of the sources. What is more, the pattern of the evidence cut across his basic postulates about the comparative value of the sources. In Tarn's campaign narrative Alexander's desire is to reach the Ocean, which he thought to be relatively close to the Hyphasis (TARN 1948, i.99); the Ganges is an irrelevancy of which Alexander may or may not have heard but which did not matter to him. That schema is incompatible with the reports of Diodorus and Curtius that he was deterred by information about a powerful kingdom to the east, and those reports had to be discredited (in 1923 he had accepted that they were one of Alexander's reasons for not going further). Unfortunately the reports occur in a context which most scholars believe derives from Hieronymus of Cardia, a near contemporary, and which Tarn himself wishes to believe based on documentary evidence. If that is so, the only possibility is incompetent interpolation by Diodorus. But the theory of interpolation can only be sustained by a further assumption, that the Gandaridae of the satrapy list are the people of Gandhara, "a name which in Alexander's day meant the country between the Parapamisadae satrapy and the Indus". Tarn gives no evidence for this assertion, and there is none. Admittedly Gandhara was the old Persian nomenclature for the gateway to India along the Cophen (Kabul) valley (*cf.* COOK 1983), but there is no indication that the terminology was still used in Alexander's day. All texts which refer to the Gandaridae place them unambiguously to the east of the Hyphasis (particularly Diodorus 17.90.1; which TARN 1948, II.279-80

ascribes to the ‘reliable’ Aristobulus)⁶. There is no explicit reference in Alexander’s or any other period to the Gandaridae of Gandhara. The theory of interpolation in Diodorus can only be sustained by creating a fictitious terminology with no basis in the sources. If the passage is read soberly and with no *parti pris*, it is evident that Diodorus began his review of the eastern empire with a description of the Ganges and the kingdom of the Gandaridae and then moved westwards to the Punjab (D.S. 18.6.2-3). It presumably derives from Hieronymus (cf. HORNBLLOWER 1981, 82-84) and represents his view of the world at the time of Alexander’s death. Tarn’s hypothesis is totally untenable and has been rightly rejected in recent years, particularly in Germany. Both Schachermeyr and Kienast have expressed total disagreement with his method, which is the sole point they have in common⁷. Schachermeyr argues that Alexander was planning a major campaign of conquest to the Ganges, Kienast that his ambitions were confined to the territory immediately east of the Hyphasis. In fact Kienast’s view is not dissimilar from Tarn’s, but unlike Tarn he bases his argument solidly upon Arrian and reaches his conclusion by a much simpler route.

These defects of argumentation are glaring and they are typical of Tarn’s approach. Not surprisingly they were criticised by his first reviewers. Behind the overt encomium of the imaginative and literary qualities of the book there were signs of a deep disquiet with the methods used to paint the picture.

A. R. Burn’s review in *JHS* is a minor masterpiece⁸, hailing Tarn’s work as the starting point of research for generations to come but making it clear that most of that research would involve demolition. Under the urbane veneer of eulogy there are basic criticisms of method and general scepticism about the historicity of the mould in which Tarn had cast Alexander. In the *Classical Review* A. H. M. Jones⁹ was more forthright in his rejection of Tarn’s views on the status of the Greeks of Asia Minor and Alexander’s deification, but he was not particularly interested in the science of source criticism and briefly endorsed Tarn’s picture of the historical tradition.

The reaction was stronger in Germany. Those scholars who took the trouble to examine Tarn’s discussion in details (it cannot have been easy for them) evidently found it difficult to believe what they read. Hermann Strasburger wrote a crushing review in *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, a very inaccessible publication, in which he refuted Tarn’s general concept of the sources¹⁰. Much more important, however, was the work of Fritz Schachermeyr. A year after the publication of Tarn’s *Alexander* there appeared Schachermeyr’s great biography, *Alexander der Grosse: Ingenium und Macht* (SCHACHERMEYR 1949). This was as romantic a conception as Tarn’s own, but its flavour was totally different. Where Tarn’s Alexander was rational and restrained Schachermeyr’s was an emanation of frightening power, conceived during the dark days of the Third Reich. His Alexander was the enthusiastic descender and imitator of Heracles and Achilles, the embodiment of Homeric virtue (this was a trait which Tarn had played down, denying that Alexander had any penchant for imitation). He was capable of impulsive acts of generosity or of savage blood lust; Schachermeyr had no

⁶ Str. 15.1.26 (697) has a passing reference to a district called Gandaritis, which was located somewhere on the course of the Choaspes, well to the west of the Indus. It is hard to evaluate this passage (Tarn does not cite it), and its source cannot be identified. But it seems beyond doubt that the area was small in extent, certainly not an entire satrapy.

⁷ SCHACHERMEYR 1955 [1966]; KIENAST 1965.

⁸ BURN 1947.

⁹ JONES 1949. E. Bickerman’s review is also worth reading: BICKERMAN 1950, 41 ff.

¹⁰ STRASBURGER 1952a, 202 ff. Strasburger’s large article contains further valuable discussion of the sources: STRASBURGER 1952b.

hesitation in retailing as fact the execution of Batis at Gaza or the mass crucifixions after the siege of Tyre both acts which Tarn had discounted as malicious invention. Above all the wish to dominate was paramount. Schachermeyr is adamant that Alexander had burning desire for world empire. At the Hyphasis his plans were to press forward to the Ganges and complete the domination of Asia; it would have meant 'the unification of the entire inhabited earth in so far as it extended eastwards'. The mutiny at the Hyphasis was accordingly one of the pivotal events of the reign. But the check there was only temporary. By the time of his death Alexander had grandiose schemes of conquest in the western Mediterranean (Schachermeyr accepted as genuine the *Last Plans* reported in Diodorus 18.4, whose authenticity had been violently impugned by Tarn), so that ultimately his empire would cover all corners of the known world. The conqueror was isolated by his categorical claim to monarchy, and, as his reign progressed, the trend to autocracy was increasingly marked. The Exiles' Decree was a universal command, issued in total disregard of the Corinthian League which was reduced to an impotent tool of empire. His claims to divinity was no political manoeuvre but made out of a deep conviction that he had passed the boundaries of mortality. The world monarch became a divine monarch, his divinity a reflection of his conquests.

Schachermeyr's Alexander was the polar opposite of Tarn's. At first the disagreements could not be argued through, for Schachermeyr's work was written in the grip of post-war austerity and was very sparsely equipped with footnotes. But over the years Schachermeyr voiced his objections in a series of articles and monographs. We have already reviewed his opposition to Tarn view that the Ganges was unimportant for Alexander. A year before, he has written a companion study attacking Tarn's critique of the Last Plans¹¹. In there he defended his main thesis that Alexander remained an aggressive imperialist his whole life long. There was a break until the early seventies. Then Schachermeyr published *Alexander in Babylon*, a detailed study of the last weeks of Alexander's life and of the succession crisis after his death¹². This work goes back beyond his Alexander history to earlier studies on the constitutional history of the Successors, and much of it is very technical attempting to establish the groundrules of Macedonian constitutional theory, an exercise which scholars have found over sophisticated and unconvincing. But its nucleus is a detailed source analysis which takes explicit issue with Tarn, underlining the sophistic complexity of his argumentation ('*die Meisterschaft der geistvollen Dialektik*'), and reaches diametrically opposite conclusions. An important appendix restates the case for an early date for Cleitarchus (before 305).

Far more important, however, is the reissue of his Alexander history, which was published in 1973¹³. Schachermeyr retained the body of his original work, but he was able to add considerably more footnotes, bringing the bibliography up to date and briefly defending some of his more salient ideas. There are important new contributions, notably the perceptive survey of modern scholarship on Alexander and the eight appendices on matters of detail. The narrative is still underpinned by Schachermeyr's sonorous and meticulously balanced prose, which gives his exposition a strongly emotional charge (the author admits that his conception of Alexander precluded his using the sober and calculated language of the lecture hall), but it is equipped with much more extensive documentation. Though his picture of Alexander

¹¹ SCHACHERMEYR 1954.

¹² SCHACHERMEYR 1970.

¹³ SCHACHERMEYR 1973.

is as subjective as Tarn's, it is far more balanced and rests more securely on the consensus of the sources. One may disagree with the details, often profoundly, but the total work is the most impressive contribution to Alexander studies this century, possibly of all time. Its translation into English would be a major service, and it is a disgrace that it has not yet been attempted. The revised *Alexander* is almost Schachermeyr's last word on the subject. Subsequently he wrote a piece on Alexander and the subject peoples for the *Fondation Hardt Entretiens*¹⁴ on Alexander¹⁴. This is an interesting development of his general view of the king, presenting him as the universal benefactor – but a benefactor whose largesse could not be refused. The 'Wohltun ohne Pardon' (inexorable benefaction) is a trait almost inevitable in Schachermeyr's idealistic and absolute autocrat. Once more nothing could be further removed from Tarn's Alexander, whose benefactions were always eminently reasonable.

In England the reaction was slower to come. Tarn had not been as enthusiastically accepted in Oxford as in Cambridge. Some preliminary criticisms were voiced in a perceptive paper by J. P. V. D. Balsdon, which cautiously but firmly rejected many of Tarn's views on deification¹⁵. But for a direct frontal attack we have to wait until 1958. In that year Ernst Badian, then a lecturer at Durham University, published two seminal papers. They were written shortly before Tarn's death in late 1957 and were the most serious criticisms of method so far. The more celebrated is his essay on Alexander and the unity of mankind, which examined and rejected point by point Tarn's elaborate thesis that Alexander dreamed of an empire based on world brotherhood¹⁶. The attack was devastating' and conclusive. Viewed in their context the scattered fragments of evidence that Tarn had used were seen to provide no substance for the conclusions he drew; all had been stretched on a procrustean bed whose framework was predetermined. Alexander's dream was now merely Tarn's fantasy. Perhaps more important still is the companion piece, explicitly subtitled a study in method¹⁷. This dealt with the eunuch Bagoas, a favourite of Alexander, whom Tarn had attempted to argue out of existence. Once more Badian examined Tarn's arguments in detail and found them arbitrary and only convincing if one believed from the start that Bagoas could not exist. There was, however, a more positive contribution. Badian insisted on taking the sources in their context and assessing their relative probability without emotional *parti pris* or absolute division of the tradition into 'good' or 'bad' authorities. An account which is generally uncomplimentary may still retail what is favourable; even an official and eulogistic source such as Ptolemy might evince honest disapproval. This observation is at the root of the attack on the 'Peripatetic portrait of Alexander', which ends Badian's article¹⁸. The view of decline in Alexander's character cannot be anchored to any school of history or philosophy, nor can the evidence be said to amount to a general theory. Writers of any period could comment adversely upon Alexander, and adverse comment does not in itself imply malice. Badian expressed his disagreement courteously and deliberately focused on a minor issue, but implicit throughout the article is a total rejection of Tarn's methodology.

Badian went on to more constructive essays which have largely replaced Tarn, at least in the English speaking world, as the starting point for research on Alexander .

¹⁴ BADIAN–VAN BERSCHEM 1976.

¹⁵ SCHACHERMEYR 1976.

¹⁶ BALSDON 1950 [1966]. There was a more implicit rejection of Tarn's final picture of Alexander by HAMILTON 1953 [1966].

¹⁷ BADIAN 1958a [1966].

¹⁸ BADIAN 1958b.

¹⁸ The Stoic portrait has now been demolished by FEARS 1974.

His own view of the king is of an almost Themistoclean figure who responded with enormous energy and inventiveness to the military and political challenges that faced him but who withdrew into a tragic isolation, plagued by insecurity and loneliness¹⁹. That conception is at the base of much of Badian's thought, but it does not dictate his argumentation. His articles are exercises in the weighing of evidence, with emphasis on accuracy of detail and chronology. There is also some cross-fertilisation with his other major field of interest the late Roman Republic. Badian's work has tended to focus on the political pressures of Alexander's court, and he has been able to exploit with profit Helmut Berve's vast prosopographical compilation, which lists every fact known (in 1926) about every character in Alexander's entourage²⁰. Accordingly in 1960 he produced a provocative study of the downfall of Philotas and Parmenion²¹. Where Tarn had seen an act of treason, quickly and justly suppressed and followed by a regrettable but necessary murder to forestall an inevitable rebellion by Parmenion, Badian viewed the episode as an intrigue by Alexander to rid himself of the dominance of a particular faction, a *coup d'état* staged with cold calculation and totally without scruple. The details have since been contested, often sharply, but Badian's methodology and his interpretation of the tensions at court have had a lasting influence.

There followed Badian's great study on Harpalus²². This is perhaps the most important single piece of work on Alexander produced over the last three decades. It is a detailed interpretation of the political history of the last two years of the reign, at the same time highly complex and highly evocative, and there are several layers of exposition. At one level Alexander himself is depicted responding to crisis, reacting against conspiracy and insubordination in the provinces by abolishing the satrapal armies and enacting the Exiles' Decree to cope with the ensuing problems of resettlement. At a lower level we see the actions of Alexander's treasurer, Harpalus, explained against that background of conspiracy: the group to which he belonged was threatened, and he could only secure his interests by rebellion and flight to the city which he judged most likely to give succour and support - Athens. That leads in turn to an analysis of Athenian politics and an elaborate explanation of how Harpalus was used and discarded there. Badian stepped sideways from the crude older analyses which portrayed Athenian statesmen in a single dimension, either for or against Macedon (Tarn's own view [in TARN 1927, 440], was simple and schematic). Instead he saw a general climate of hostility to Macedon but deep disagreement about how the Macedonian king should be handled. Different situations evoked different responses and different groupings; and there were personal ties between prominent Athenians and Macedonians (not least Demosthenes and Hephaestion) which had a subtle influence on individual reactions. The result was a far more complex picture than had been suspected hitherto, and it is not surprising that the paper provided a matrix for subsequent discussions of Alexander's last years. The subject had become much more exciting, with individuals and not labels under investigation. Badian's 'Harpalus' inspired much of my own early work, and it remains an article to be read and reread, to be disagreed with and reargued but never neglected.

¹⁹ Expressed most simply in BADIAN 1964. See also BADIAN-BERCHEM 1976, 298-299.

²⁰ BERVE 1926. This work remains the factual repository or serious research on Alexander. A thorough revision is becoming increasingly urgent. [N.E.: The revision of prosopographical research on Alexander has been done by HECKEL 2006].

²¹ BADIAN 1960. The article is published out of its chronological sequence in the volume, reflecting the difficulties caused by its then unconventional approach.

²² BADIAN 1961 [1966], 203-206.

Badian continued his political analysis with a famous paper on the death of Philip, arguing that considerations of interest inculpated the young Alexander in his father's murder²³. He also tackled the controversial Last Plans²⁴, arguing for their authenticity but insisting that they should be interpreted against the background of the struggle for the Succession. The document reflects not so much Alexander's own thought as what Perdikkas alleged he had thought (the difference is crucial). Other issues which Tarn labelled main problems have received their treatment from Badian. There is a major study on the Greeks in Asia Minor, which once again shows the king reacting to problems as they arose; he only gradually evolved the policy of organising the Greeks of Asia Minor in a league under the close supervision of his deputy Philoxenus²⁵. Most recently he has reopened the whole issue of Alexander's deification in a long and detailed essay, once more seeing a process of evolution in the king's thought²⁶. Badian has always been deeply affected by Tarn and there is a strong streak of antagonism in much of his work, understandable when one reflects that his early essays were in many quarters considered rank heresy. In some instances the antagonism has led to fruitful results. Tarn, for instance, had followed orthodoxy in placing a high value on the truthfulness of Nearchus (cf. TARN 1948, II.49); this stimulated one of Badian's most entertaining exercises in deflation²⁷, in which he argued that Nearchus was fundamentally unreliable, heroising himself retrospectively in his memoirs so as to compensate for failure during Alexander's lifetime. Though somewhat exaggerated in its details, the paper is undoubtedly right in its general interpretation. More questionable is his view of the Spartan king, Agis III²⁸.

Badian challenged Tarn's negative verdict that Agis threw away the lives of his men in a futile challenge to Macedonian power (TARN 1948, I.52 f.). That was proper and necessary, but he went much further and created an almost Tarn-like figure out of Agis himself, a far-sighted and heroic patriot who took on Macedon at the best possible time and came close to success. That, I fear, does Agis more than justice. I do not see that he was able to break the narrow confines of Spartan particularism or even wished to do so. Badian's view to the contrary goes beyond the supporting evidence. But, whatever one's reservations in detail, there is no doubt that Badian's papers have changed the face of the discipline far more radically than Tarn, and professional writing in the field will bear his imprint for many years to comeⁱⁱ. He has also produced two useful perceptive and pungent articles, reviewing post-war scholarship on Alexander²⁹.

Though Badian has been the most vocal and authoritative critic of Tarn, there have been many other challenges. Tarn's view of the sources, it may safely be said, is totally obsolete and discredited. Some of the early objections we have already reviewed. More important was Lionel Pearson's book on the lost historians of Alexander³⁰. This was a fairly conventional work, translating and commenting soberly on the extant fragments of the first generation historians from Callisthenes to Aristobulus. Unlike Tarn, Pearson

²³ BADIAN 1963.

²⁴ BADIAN 1968.

²⁵ BADIAN 1966.

²⁶ BADIAN 1981.

²⁷ BADIAN 1975a.

²⁸ BADIAN 1967. This is, however, a fundamental article [N.E.: Badian turned back to this topic in BADIAN 1994]. For a summary of the controversy it evoked see BOSWORTH 1975, 27 ff.

ⁱⁱ Most of the main works of Badian on Alexander have been recently collected: BADIAN 2012.

²⁹ BADIAN 1971, 37-56, 77-83; 1976, 279-311.

³⁰ PEARSON 1960. Pearson had already produced an important article on documentary evidence: PEARSON 1955 [1966].

had no general propositions to defend and no mould into which to recast the sources, and his exposition is balanced and lucid. It restored a sense of proportion to the major points of debate and countered Tarn's more eccentric lights of fantasy.

More importantly, the primary sources at last began to get some of the attention they deserved. In 1967 Plutarch's *Life of Alexander* had a detailed commentary by J. R. Hamilton. Arrian also received increasing study as stylist in his own right. After nearly a century of neglect there appeared three major works in less than five years. Peter Brunt's revised Loeb of Arrian (vol. I published in 1976) amounted to a minor commentary and is required reading for any one embarking on Alexander studies. In 1980 came Philip Stadter's full biography with excellent literary appreciations of Arrian's work (the minor works as well as the Alexander history) and the first volume of my own historical commentary on Arrian³¹. There is also a computer compiled concordance (by Stadter and Jay Bolter: STADTER-BOLTER 1984), available on microfiche, which make possible a scientific analysis of the minutiae of Arrian's language to a degree previously undreamed of. Diodorus has been well served by two Bude volumes (books XVII and XVIII) from Paul Goukowsky (GOUKOWSKY 1976), and the recent monograph by Jane Hornblower³² has fully clarified for the first time in English the traditional German interpretation of Diodorus. He did use a single source for the various sections of his narrative but rewrote it in his own bland prose. It can no longer be doubted that there was a single source behind his account of Alexander. Whether or not that source was Cleitarchus is more controversial, but the case has been recently restated in detail (see above, n.4) and it is the most reasonable theory yet propounded. Curtius Rufus has been comparative neglected, except for the teasing (and trivial) problem of his dating; but there is now a very full and important commentary on the first two extant books by J. E. Atkinson³³, and it is to be hoped that there will be more work to come of this author, the most difficult and elusive of all the Alexander historians it is now possible, I hope, to approach the sources in a much more systematic and unemotional way, isolating the variant traditions, explaining the divergence wherever possible and building up a reasoned synthesis of the problem without preconceived view of Alexander's character. I have recently written an elaborate reconstruction of the events of 328/7 BC (definitely not for beginner) in which, I hope, I have embodied my own methodological precepts³⁴.

Another area of research which should be mentioned is military history. This aspect of Tarn's work has been admired more than most, and his military appendices are certainly argued with less passion than the rest of the work. Unfortunately the premises for argument are not any less dogmatically stated and many of the conclusions are perverse. But military history did provide neutral ground in which Tarn's conclusions could be questioned without putting his Alexander at risk. Some of the earliest criticisms of Tarn, by G. T. Griffith and A. R. Burn³⁵, concentrated on revising his battle narratives; the sources were reworked and placed more rationally in context. In 1963 came Peter Brunt's big article on the Macedonian cavalry, explicitly written to amend Tarn on points of detail, in practice replacing him as the starting point research into the organisation of the Macedonian army³⁶. The progressive criticism has been taken

³¹ STADTER 1980; BOSWORTH 1980a.

³² HORNBLOWER 1981.

³³ ATKINSON 1980. See my review article in BOSWORTH 1983b. [N.E.: Cf. also ATKINSON 1994].

³⁴ BOSWORTH 1981.

³⁵ GRIFFITH 1947; BURN 1952. See further, MARSDEN 1964.

³⁶ MILNS 1963; BADIAN 1965, MILNS 1966a, 167 and by myself: BOSWORTH 1980, 14-17, 20-21.

further in a series of articles by R. D. Milns³⁷, and in very recent years Minor M. Markle has written two very subversive pieces on the *sarissa* (the long Macedonian pike) and the development of phalanx technique³⁸, which if correct (and I have serious reservations), will revolutionise our concepts the Macedonian army in action. On a broader front the young American scholar Donald Engels, has written a survey of Alexander's logistical planning and covered the whole Asian campaign from that point of view³⁹. This work excellently equipped with geographical and topographical data and uses the ancient sources systematically, if a little uncritically. It now provides a useful introduction to the military history of the reign, for the first time giving comparative information to determine what was physically possible for Alexander's men and pack animals. And it also shows how illuminating Alexander history can be once it relinquishes its obsession with the character of the king.

The work of the past decade has almost totally parted company with Tarn. The biographies of Hamilton, Milns and Peter Green⁴⁰ are relatively sober in tone and inimical to his romanticism. Rather more sympathetic is Hammond's recent biography⁴¹, which like Tarn's is the result of many years of cogitation and which presents a favourable picture of Alexander not dissimilar from Tarn's own but without the excitement of Tarn's flights of fancy. At the opposite pole is the large biography by Robin Lane Fox⁴². First published in 1973 when Fox was in his mid-twenties, it has a highly romantic view of Alexander the king and explorer, and it is in some ways reminiscent of Tarn. Flashes of brilliance alternate with unvarnished orthodoxy, the argumentation only sketchily supported by a running commentary of annotation which combines sharp polemic with extreme carelessness of citation (his book was finished in tearing haste). Like Tarn's his work is a blend of high romanticism and rather perverse eccentricity and like Tarn he is a very dangerous (though inspiring) author for the beginner to use. But it is only the general flavour that recalls Tarn. Fox's creation is a totally different and much darker character, and its author explicitly ignores Tarn's work in its entirety, 'persistently mistaken both in method and in evidence'. That rejection has become almost standard in recent works in English, except for such curiosities as Mary Renault's historical novels, where Tarn's Alexander will be found alive and well but living in sin with the eunuch Bagoas.

Paradoxically Tarn's work has found some acceptance in recent years in Germany. His *Alexander* was belatedly translated into German in 1968 (Schachermeyr, a connoisseur of language, claims to have been less than enthused by the result) and became available to a much wider public. Its most notable effect was on the posthumously published monograph of Konrad Kraft⁴³ who used Tarn extensively to create his own 'rational Alexander', a figure which embodied Kraft's own reflection of the academic radicalism of the author's personal ideals as was Tarn's own and as far removed from actual history. Tarn's work will no doubt continue to have that kind of

³⁷ Notably; MILNS 1966b; 1967; 1976.

³⁸ MARKLE 1977; 1978. See now RAHE 1981.

³⁹ ENGELS 1978. See also his article ENGELS 1980.

⁴⁰ HAMILTON 1973; Milns 1968; GREEN 1974.

⁴¹ HAMMOND 1980. His most recent work, (HAMMOND 1983) gives a technical and eccentric analysis of Diodorus, Curtius Rufus and Justin. Though his approach to the sources is very different from that of Tarn, his view of Alexander is almost identical.

⁴² LANE FOX 1973. A Revised Edition (LANE FOX 1980), was issued to coincide with the exhibition of the same name at Washington.

⁴³ KRAFT 1971. On this peculiar work see Badian's detailed review (BADIAN 1975, 48 ff.) and his more general comments in BADIAN – VAN BERCHEM 1976, 292.

inspirational effect and ultimately it may become a classic in the history of ideas, a potent symbol of humanity and moderation in power. But its value will be moral and aesthetic. Tarn's Alexander has little or nothing to do with the Alexander documented by the ancient sources; and as a work of scholarship it retains only curiosity value, a blind alley which attracted too much attention in its time. *Requiescat in pace.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALCOCK, F. A. (1958): "Sir William Woodthorpe Tarn", *Proceedings of the British Academy* 44: 253-262.
- ATKINSON, J. E. (1980): *A Commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus' Historiae Alexandri Magni Books 3-4*, Amsterdam–Uithoorn.
- (1994): *A commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus' Historiae Alexandri Magni. Books 5 to 7.2*, Amsterdam.
- BALSDON, J. P. V. D. (1950 [1966]): "The "divinity" of Alexander the Great", *Historia* 1: 363-88 [Reprinted in G. T. GRIFFITH (ed.): *Alexander the Great. The Main Problems*, Cambridge: 179-204].
- BADIAN, E. (1958a [1966]): "Alexander the Great and the unity of mankind", *Historia* 7: 425-44 [Reprinted in G. T. GRIFFITH (ed.): *Alexander the Great. The Main Problems*, Cambridge: 287-306].
- (1958b): "The eunuch Bagoas: a study in method", *CQ* 8: 144- 57.
- (1960): "The death of Parmenio", *TAPhA* 91: 324-338.
- (1961 [1966]): "Harpalus", *JHS* 81: 16-43 [Reprinted in G. T. GRIFFITH (ed.): *Alexander the Great. The Main Problems*, Cambridge: 206-215].
- (1963): "The death of Philip II", *Phoenix* 17: 244-250.
- (1964): "Alexander the Great and the loneliness of power", *Studies in Greek and Roman History*, Oxford: 192-205.
- (1965): "Orientals in Alexander's Army", *JHS* 85: 160-161.
- (1966): "Alexander the Great and the Greeks of Asia", in E. BADIAN (ed.): *Ancient Society and Institutions: Studies presented to Victor Ehrenberg*, Oxford: 37-69.
- (1967): "Agis III", *Hermes* 95: 170-192.
- (1968): "A King's notebooks", *HSCPh* 72: 183-204.
- (1971): "Alexander the Great, 1948-67", *CW* 65: 37-83.
- (1975): "Nearchus the Cretan", *YCS* 24: 147-170.
- (1975b): "[Review] K. Kraft, *Der 'rationale' Alexander (1971)*", *Gnomon* 47: 48–58.
- (1976): "Some recent interpretations of Alexander", in E. BADIAN – D. VAN BERCHEM (eds.): *Alexandre le Grand: Image et réalité*, Geneva: 279-311.
- (1981): "The deification of Alexander the Great", in H. J. DELL (ed.): *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*, Institute for Balkan Studies 158, Thessaloniki: 27-71.
- (1994): "Agis III Revisited", in I. WORTHINGTON (ed.): *Ventures into Greek History*, Oxford: 258-292.
- (2012): *Collected Papers on Alexander the Great*, London.
- BADIAN, E. –VAN BERCHEM, D. (eds.) (1976): *Alexandre le Grand: Image et réalité*, Geneva.
- BERVE, H. (1926): *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, München.
- BICKERMAN, E. (1950): "Alexander the Great. Vol. I: Narrative; Vol. II: Sources and Studies by W. W. Tarn", *CPh* 45: 41-45.

- BOSWORTH, A. B. (1976): "Arrian and the Alexander Vulgate", in E. BADIAN – D. VAN BERCHEM (eds.): *Alexandre le Grand: Image et réalité*, Geneva: 1-33.
- (1975): "The Mission of Amphoterus and the Outbreak of Agis' War", *Phoenix* 29: 27-43.
- (1980a): *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander, vol. I*, Oxford.
- (1980b): "'Alexander and the Iranians", *JHS* 100: 1-21.
- (1981): "A missing year in the history of Alexander the Great", *JHS* 101: 17-39.
- (1983a): "The Impossible Dream. Tarn's Alexander in Retrospect", *Ancient Society Resources for Teachers* (Macquarie Ancient History Association) 13.3: 131-150.
- (1983b): "History and Rhetoric in Curtius Rufus", *CPh* 78: 150-161. Brunt, P. A. (1962): "Persian accounts of Alexander's campaigns", *CQ* 12: 141-55
- BURN, R. A. (1947): "[Review] *Alexander the Great* by W. W. Tarn", *JHS* 67: 141-144.
- (1952): "Notes on Alexander's campaigns 332- 330" *JHS* 72: 81-91.
- BRUNT, P. A. (trans.) (1976-1983): *Arrian: History of Alexander and Indica*, Loeb Classical Library, 2 vols, Cambridge, Mass.
- COOK, J. M. (1983): *The Persian Empire*, London.
- ENGELS, D. W. (1978): *Alexander the Great and the Logistics of the Macedonian Army*, Berkeley.
- (1980): "Alexander's Intelligence System", *CQ* 30: 327-340.
- FEARS, J. R. (1974): "The Stoic view of the career and character of Alexander", *Philologus* 118: 113-130.
- GOUKOWSKY, P. (trans.) (1976): *Diodore de Sicile, Bibliotheque historique, livre XVII*, Paris.
- GREEN, P. (1974): *Alexander of Macedon 356-323 BC. A historical biography*, London
- GRIFFITH, G. T. (1947): "Alexander's generalship at Gaugamela", *JHS* 67: 77-87.
- HAMILTON, J. R. (1953 [1966]): "Alexander and his "so-called" father", *CQ* 3: 151-157 [Reprinted in G. T. GRIFFITH (ed.): *Alexander the Great. The Main Problems*, Cambridge: 235-41].
- HAMILTON, J. R. (1977): "Cleitarchus and Diodorus 17", in K. H. Kinzl (ed.): *Greece and the E. Mediterranean in History and Prehistory. Studies presented to Fritz Schachermeyr on the occasion of his 80 birthday*, Berlin: 126-46.
- (1973): *Alexander the Great*, London.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L. (1980): *Alexander the Great: King, Commander and Statesman*, Park Ridge, N. J.
- (1983): *Three Historians of Alexander the Great*, Cambridge.
- HECKEL, W. (2006): *Who is who in the age of Alexander the Great. Prosopography of Alexander's Empire*, Oxford.
- HORBLOWER, J. (1981): *Hieronymus of Cardia*, Oxford.
- JONES, A. H. M. (1949): "[Review] W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great*", *CR* 63: 122-125.
- KIENAST, D. (1965): "Alexander und der Ganges", *Historia* 14: 180-188.
- KORNEMANN, E. (1935): *Die Alexandergeschichte des Königs Ptolemaios I von Aegypten. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion*, Leipzig.
- KRAFT, K. (1971): *Der 'rationale' Alexander*, Kallmunz.
- LANE FOX, R. (1973): *Alexander the Great*, London.
- (1980): *The Search for Alexander*, London.
- MARKLE, M. (1977): "The Macedonian Sarissa, Spear, and Related Armor", *AJA* 81: 323-339.
- (1978): "Use of the Sarissa by Phillip and Alexander of Macedon", *AJA* 82: 483-497

- MARSDEN, E.W. (1964): *The Campaign of Gaugamela*, Liverpool.
- MEYER, E. (1927: "Alexander und der Ganges", *Klio* 21: 183-91.
- MILNS, R. D. (1963): "Alexander's Macedonian Cavalry", *JHS* 83: 68-74.
- (1966a): "Alexander's Macedonian Cavalry and Diodorus XVII 17.4", *JHS* 86: 167–8.
- (1966b): "Alexander's seventh phalanx battalion", *GRBS* 7: 159-166.
- (1967): "Philip II and the Hypaspists", *Historia* 16: 509-512.
- (1968): *Alexander the Great*, London.
- (1976): "The army of Alexander the Great", in E. BADIAN – D. VAN BERCHEM (eds.): *Alexandre le Grand: Image et réalité*, Geneva: 87-136.
- PEARSON, L. (1960): *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great*, New York.
- (1955 [1966]): "The diary and the letters of Alexander the Great", *Historia* 3: 429-55 [Reprinted in G. T. GRIFFITH (ed.): *Alexander the Great. The Main Problems*, Cambridge: 1-27].
- RAHE, P. A. (1981): "The Annihilation of the Sacred Band at Chaeronea", *AJA* 85: 85-87.
- SCHACHERMEYR, F. (1954 [1966]): "Die letzten Pläne Alexanders des Grossen", *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts* 41: 118-140 [Reprinted in G. T. GRIFFITH (ed.): *Alexander the Great. The Main Problems*, Cambridge: 322-344].
- (1955 [1966]): "Alexander und die Ganges – Länder", *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kultureschichte* 3: 123-35 [Reprinted in G. T. GRIFFITH (ed.): *Alexander the Great. The Main Problems*, Cambridge: 137-149].
- (1949): *Alexander der Grosse: Ingenium und Mach*, Graz.
- (1970): *Alexander in Babylon und die Reichsordnung nach seinem Tode*, Wien.
- (1973): *Alexander der Grosse. Das Problem seiner Persönlichkeit und seines Wirkens*, Wien.
- (1976): "Alexander und die unterworfenen Nationen", in E. Badian – D. van Berchem (eds.): *Alexandre le Grand: Image et réalité*, Geneva: 47-86.
- STADTER, P.A. (1980): *Arrian of Nicomedia*, Chapel Hill.
- STADTER, P. A. – BOLTER, J. D. (1984): *A Concordance to Arrian*, Chico, CA.
- STRASBURGER, H. (1952): "[Review] Tarn, W. W., *Alexander the Great: I. The Narrative; II. Sources and Studies*", *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 9: 202-211.
- (1952b): "Alexanders zug Durch die Gedrosische Wüste", *Hermes* 80: 456-493.
- TARN, W. W. (1913): *Antigonos Gonatas*, Oxford.
- (1920): *The Treasure of the Isle of Mist*, London.
- (1927): "Alexander: The Conquest of Persia", in J. B. Bury – S. A. Cook – F. E. Adcock (eds.): *The Cambridge Ancient History, vol. VI. Macedon, 401-301 BC*, New York: 352-386.
- (1948): *Alexander the Great*, 2 vols., Cambridge.
- (1923): "Alexander and the Ganges", *JHS* 43: 93-101.
- TARN, W. W. – GRIFFITH, G. T. (1952²): *Hellenistic Civilisation*, London
- WIRTH, G. (1976): "Comments", in E. BADIAN – D. VAN BERCHEM (eds.): *Alexandre le Grand: Image et réalité*, Geneva: 306.
- WILCKEN, U. (1967): *Alexander the Great [Edited by Eugene Borza]*, New York.