

THE GOVERNMENT OF SYRIA UNDER ALEXANDER THE GREAT

ALEXANDER's satrapal appointments in Syria have long been a focal point of scholarly dissension, for the relevant passages in the ancient sources are uniformly inconsistent and sometimes disconcertingly corrupt. A running debate continued until 1935, when Oscar Leuze presented a monumental survey of the ancient evidence together with exhaustive refutation of the hypotheses advanced by earlier scholars.¹ Since then the problems of Syria under Alexander have been left virtually undisturbed,² which is a pity. In the first place, Leuze's treatment is not impregnable. His massive discussion tends to convince through sheer accumulation of argument rather than by the cogency of its logic, which can often be faulted. Furthermore, Syria is an important area. Alexander spent the entire campaigning year of 332 B.C. there, and the satrapy formed the hub of the communications system of his empire. His administration of the area is an important subject in its own right, quite apart from the challenge presented by the sources. It is high time for a fresh examination of the problem.

A. SYRIA FROM 333 TO 331 B.C.

Arrian's account of the early appointments in Syria is detailed but leaves tantalizing gaps. In winter 333/2 Alexander is said to have appointed Menon, son of Cerdimmas, satrap of Coele Syria, assigning him allied cavalry for the defence of the territory.³ The narrative proceeds with the entry into Phoenicia, and, preoccupied with the epic sieges of Tyre and Gaza, Arrian gives no hint of the state of the domestic administration of Syria. The next we hear is in the context of late summer 331. Immediately before his arrival at Thapsacus and his crossing of the Euphrates Alexander deposed the incumbent satrap of Syria, a certain Arimmas, and replaced him with Asclepiodorus, son of Eunicus.⁴ In the course of eighteen months Menon, son of Cerdimmas, has disappeared without trace, and an incompetent Arimmas has surfaced only in the context of his dismissal. Clearly, if the detail given by Arrian is correct, there were rapid administrative changes in Syria, changes which have been very incompletely documented by our major source.

But these difficulties are compounded when we turn to Curtius. In the first place he differs about the initial appointment. The advance into Phoenicia is described in terms similar to Arrian's, but in the passage immediately pre-

¹ O. Leuze, *Die Satrapieneinteilung in Syrien und in Zweistromland von 520-320* (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft: Geisteswiss. Kl. xi [1935]), 413-65 (cited Leuze). Leuze's two principal stalking horses were the discussions of U. Kahrstedt, *Syrische Territorien in hellenistischer Zeit* (Abh. Gött. Gesell.: Phil.-Hist. Kl. xix [1926]), 10 ff., and W. Otto, 'Beiträge zur Seleukidengeschichte', *S.B. Munich* xxxiv (1928), 33 ff. See also P. Julien, *Zur Verwaltung der Satrapien unter Alexander dem Grossen*: Diss. Leipzig 1914 (cited Julien);

C. F. Lehmann-Haupt, 'Satrap' *R.E.* ii. A 141 ff.; H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich*: 1926 (cited Berve). I also refer to the general histories of Droysen, Niese, and Beloch by the author's name alone.

² W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* (hereafter Tarn), ii. 176-9, virtually reproduces Leuze's conclusions, though differing over the interpretation of Arrian 4. 7. 2. Apart from Tarn's brief comments the problem has remained untouched since Leuze's work.

³ Arr. 2. 13. 7.

⁴ Arr. 3. 6. 8.

ceding he states that it was Parmenion who was placed in charge of Coele Syria.¹ This is not an insuperable difficulty. We know that Parmenion conducted a campaign in the Syrian hinterland parallel to Alexander's advance down the coast, and he only joined the main body of the Macedonian army during the middle stages of the siege of Tyre.² There had been a very similar division of forces over the winter of 334/3, when Parmenion had commanded a separate army corps in the Phrygian highland during Alexander's operations in Lycia and Pamphylia.³ If Parmenion had a separate military commission in Syria, it fits into the pattern established the previous year. There is still room for Menon's appointment as satrap with responsibilities for the district already acquired, while Alexander and Parmenion pushed on the process of annexation to the south. Arrian and Curtius are not mutually exclusive, but there is no common ground in the detail they transmit.⁴ The two accounts continue independent of each other. After the capture of Tyre Curtius adds a resumptive note to the effect that Parmenion had handed over Coele Syria to Andromachus when he departed for the war which still remained.⁵ That must have been the occasion when Parmenion joined the siege of Tyre in summer 332. Curtius continues the story with a note that Andromachus fell into the hands of Samaritans and was burned alive. On receipt of the news, in spring 331, Alexander left Egypt, punished the culprits, and put a certain 'Memnon' in Andromachus' place.⁶ The story is consistent, but none of the details recur in Arrian. Conversely none of Arrian's Syrian appointments is mentioned by Curtius with the solitary exception of Asclepiodorus, whose name occurs once in a controversial context much later. It should be noted, however, that Arrian's Menon, son of Cerdimmas, resembles very suspiciously the Memnon who in Curtius' account is substituted for the defunct Andromachus.

Modern scholars have usually been sceptical about Curtius. At best his reference to 'Memnon' succeeding Andromachus in Samaria has been taken as a confused account of the appointment of Menon, son of Cerdimmas.⁷ Menon,

¹ Curt. 4. 1. 4-5. Like Arrian, he continues with the surrender of Straton of Aradus and the arrival at Marathus (cf. Arr. 2. 13. 7-8).

² According to Polyaeus 4. 3. 4 Parmenion was in charge of operations at Tyre during Alexander's temporary absence in the Antilibanus (cf. Arr. 2. 20. 4-5; Curt. 4. 2. 24). But Curtius 4. 3. 1 states that Alexander left Perdicas and Craterus in charge of the siege while he was campaigning. Polyaeus or Curtius may be wrong, but alternatively Parmenion may have returned from the interior in the course of Alexander's absence and taken over operations. In any case Curtius 4. 5. 9 implies strongly that Parmenion had rejoined the main army before the siege ended. Cf. Berve ii. 302 (no. 606).

³ Arr. 1. 24. 3; 25. 4; 29. 3.

⁴ Arrian totally omits Parmenion's campaign in the interior. At 2. 11. 10 he notes that Darius' baggage train fell into his hands at Damascus, and at 2. 15. 1-2 he gives additional details about the capture and disposal of the treasure. There is, however,

no hint of any military commission south of Damascus.

⁵ Curt. 4. 5. 9 'Syriam, quae Coele appellatur, Andromacho Parmenio tradiderat, bello quod supererat interfuturus.'

⁶ Curt. 4. 8. 9-11 'oneravit hunc dolorem nuntius mortis Andromachi, quem praefecerat Syriae; vivum Samaritae cremaverant, ad cuius interitum vindicandum quanta maxima celeritate potuit contendit . . . Andromacho deinde Memnona substituit.' See also Syncellus, p. 496. 3; Eusebius, *Chronicon* 2. 229 (Aucher); these minor texts are conveniently assembled in R. Marcus's Loeb edition of Josephus (Vol. vi, Appendix C, p. 524).

⁷ Cf. Droysen i². 326 (i³. 210); Lehmann-Haupt *R.E.* ii. A 155-8; Berve i. 259; ii. 39. Droysen and Lehmann-Haupt work exclusively from Arrian. Berve accepts the historicity of Andromachus' appointment, but says nothing of a successor. Julien, p. 21, n. 2, dismisses Curtius' reports as confused, but he admits that there might be some factual basis. That was essentially the

it is argued, was already in office in the north, and in 331 his competence was extended to the south also. The fullest recent discussion, that of Leuze, has reached strikingly different conclusions.¹ Leuze argues that it is Arrian who is wrong. The appointment of Menon is too early. Arrian, he rightly observes, concentrates his narrative on the coastal operations of Alexander, saying nothing about Parmenion's activity in the interior. He might easily have displaced the notice of Menon's original appointment. If Leuze is right, some very unpalatable conclusions follow not only about Arrian's reliability but also about the veracity of his sources. Menon's appointment is tied chronologically to the invasion of Phoenicia,² and the chronological link surely comes from Arrian's main narrative source. It would be a bitter pill to swallow if either Ptolemy or Aristobulus has misdated a major appointment by a clear fifteen months. Leuze's main argument is that at the time when Arrian says Menon was appointed satrap, Coele Syria was as yet unpacified and was the object of a vigorous offensive by Parmenion. The appointment of a civil satrap was premature and superfluous, and in any case the troops allocated to Menon were earmarked for defence,³ not for the acquisition of new territories. Behind this argument lies the assumption that the areas designated Coele Syria by Arrian and Curtius were one and the same, namely the totality of Syria west of the Euphrates, excluding Phoenicia and the littoral to the south. The assumption is crucial, and it demands careful investigation.

Arrian's division of Syria is clear and consistent. On two occasions he refers to Coele Syria and 'Syria between the rivers' as though the area was divided into two by the river Euphrates.⁴ But in his version of Alexander's great speech at Opis Arrian gives a triple division of Syria: *ἡ τε Κοίλη Συρία καὶ ἡ Παλαιστίνη καὶ ἡ μέση τῶν ποταμῶν*.⁵ Coele Syria is here distinct from Palestine, which covered the area south of Phoenicia. The same division recurs in the *Indica*, where Arrian says that the western boundary of Arabia was *τὴν κατὰ Φοινίκην τε καὶ τὴν Παλαιστίνην Συρίην*.⁶ Lastly, in his introduction to the siege of Gaza he states explicitly that the city belonged to Palestine.⁷ Arrian, then, seems to envisage the Levant as divided from north to south into three sectors, Coele Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine. This seems to have been the recognized geographical division in Arrian's own day. The near contemporary Appian divides the Levant in exactly the same way in his introductory review of the provinces of the Roman Empire.⁸ Cassius Dio also seems to pre-empt the

conclusion of Niese i. 88 n. 3: 'Vielleicht liegt ihr etwas Richtiges zugrunde, und ist sie nur nicht im richtigen Zusammenhang dargestellt'.

¹ Leuze, 413-18.

² Arr. 2. 13. 7 *Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ σατράπην μὲν Συρίᾳ τῇ Κοίλῃ Μένωνα . . . ἐπέταξε . . . αὐτὸς δὲ ἐπὶ Φοινίκης ἦει*. Leuze, 417, supposes that Arrian was faced with two parallel narratives in his sources, one describing Parmenion's campaign in the interior and the other Alexander's activities in Phoenicia. Arrian decided to concentrate exclusively on Alexander and accordingly pruned down operations in the interior to the bare minimum, recording only the fact of subjugation and the final appointment of

Menon. Leuze prudently refrained from adducing parallels, which would have proved difficult. Arrian has no hesitation in breaking his narrative for episodes like the Aegean War (2. 1-2; 13. 4-6; 3. 2. 3-7), and, if Parmenion's exploits in Syria had been described by Ptolemy or Aristobulus, there was no earthly reason to have omitted them.

³ Arr. 2. 13. 7 *δοὺς αὐτῷ εἰς φυλακὴν τῆς χώρας τοὺς τῶν ξυμμάχων ἱππέας*.

⁴ Arr. 3. 8. 6; 11. 4; 5. 25. 4.

⁵ Arr. 7. 9. 8.

⁶ Arr. *Indica* 43. 1.

⁷ Arr. 2. 25. 4 *καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα τῆς Παλαιστίνης καλουμένης Συρίας προσκεχωρηκότα ἦδη κ.τ.λ.*

⁸ App. *Praef.* 2. 4: *ἐπιστρέφοντι τὸν πλοῦν (from Pelusium) καὶ περιούντι Συρίᾳ τε ἡ*

term Coele Syria for the Roman province of Syria outside Phoenicia and uses Palestine to describe the area south of Phoenicia.¹ That this geographical division was common currency in the second century A.D. is amply proved by the history of the nomenclature of the Syrian provinces during that period. In about 129 Hadrian had renamed the province of Judaea as Syria Palaestina,² and in 194 Septimius Severus divided the consular province of Syria into two.³ The southern area, centred on Tyre, now became Syria Phoenice, and the northern sector, based on Antioch, became the consular province of Coele Syria. It is perfectly clear that in the Antonine age Coele Syria designated the extreme northern strip from the mouth of the Orontes across to the Euphrates.⁴

But the geographical limits of Coele Syria were not consistent in antiquity. For Polybius Coele Syria designated the entire Levant from the borders of Egypt to Phoenicia.⁵ In the Seleucid era it seems that ἡ Κοίλη Συρία καὶ Φοινίκη was used as a blanket expression for the Ptolemaic holdings in Syria. After the re-annexation of the area by Antiochus III there was a separate στρατηγία Κοίλης Συρίας καὶ Φοινίκης,⁶ though later the administration became fragmented and Coele Syria was divided into four satrapies.⁷ In the Hellenistic period, then, Coele Syria was the southern district from Phoenicia to Egypt, almost precisely equivalent to Arrian's Palestine. This usage can be traced back to the immediate period of the Succession. Diodorus' digest of Hieronymus of Cardia refers on numerous occasions to Coele Syria, and in every instance it has the Polybian sense, designating the areas adjacent to and north of Egypt.⁸ But, strikingly, Diodorus has another term, ἡ ἄνω Συρία, which he uses to describe the northern district neighbouring Cilicia.⁹ In particular it is attested that the key area around the Orontes mouth fell within this northern

Παλαιστίνη καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτὴν μοῖρα Ἀράβων, ἐχόμενοι δὲ τῶν Παλαιστινῶν Φοίνικες ἐπὶ τῇ θαλάσῃ καὶ Φοινίκων ὑπερθεῖν ἢ τε Κοίλην Συρίαν . . . Cf. *Syr.* 50. 251; *Mithr.* 106. 499; 115. 562; 118. 580; *B.C.* 5. 7. 31.

¹ Dio 53. 12. 7; cf. 37. 15. 2 with 37. 7a (Xiphilinus).

² For this dating, before instead of after the Jewish revolt, see R. Syme, *J.R.S.* lii (1962), 90.

³ Cf. M. Platnauer, *The Reign of the Emperor Septimius Severus* (1918), 191; Fluss, *R.E.* ii. A 1984. This division may have been projected as early as Hadrian: S.H.A. *Hadr.* 14. 1.

⁴ Pliny's geographical survey of Syria is more complex and elaborate, but the same divisions occur. Palestine is immediately contiguous to Egypt (*N.H.* 5. 68), and the northern boundary is Caesarea (5. 69). Coele Syria is to the north of Phoenicia; it comprises the northern extremity of the Libanus range (5. 77), and inland it contains the cities of the extreme north of Syria, such as Cyrrhus and Bambyce near the Euphrates north of Thapsacus (5. 81).

⁵ Polyb. 5. 66. 6; 67. 10; 8. 17. 11 etc. At 16. 22a. 3 he describes Gaza as part of Coele

Syria; for Arrian the city was at the southern extremity of Palestine.

⁶ *O.G.I.S.* 230. 3; cf. H. Bengtson, *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit* ii. 159 ff.

⁷ Strabo 16. 2. 4 (750) = Poseidonius, *F. Gr. Hist.* 87 F 65.

⁸ 18. 6. 3; 43. 1 (Coele Syria convenient for an attack on Egypt); 19. 80. 1-5; 93. 1; 20. 73. 2; 113. 1.

⁹ 18. 6. 3. Here in the existing text Upper Syria is said to be adjacent to Babylonia, which implies that it comprised the inland regions between Palestine and the Euphrates (similarly Eratosthenes' geographical schema has a line of longitude running through Cyrene, Egypt, Coele Syria, Upper Syria, Babylonia, and, ultimately, India: Strab. 2. 5. 38 [133 f.]). But Diodorus also describes Upper Syria as the nodal point between Cilicia and Pamphylia on the one hand, and Coele Syria and Phoenicia on the other. This is only compatible with Northern Syria between the Amanus range and the Euphrates. Reiske's emendation, *Μεσοποταμίας* for *Βαβυλωνίας* is therefore generally accepted (cf. Leuze, 466-7). Elsewhere Diodorus says explicitly that Upper Syria was adjacent to Cilicia: 19. 93. 1.

territory.¹ The Diodoran nomenclature, Upper and Coele Syria, corresponds to the imperial divisions of Coele Syria and Palestine, but Coele Syria in the two cases denotes different and mutually exclusive areas. But what does Curtius understand by Coele Syria? At 4. 1. 4 Parmenion, already at Damascus, is said to have been placed over Coele Syria. Damascus is far to the south of the region of Issus, where Alexander issued the commission, and it is well outside the boundaries of Coele Syria as it was understood in the Imperial period.² Without doubt Alexander envisaged a two-pronged operation, with Parmenion continuing hostilities in the interior³ while he himself pacified the coast of Phoenicia. By the time of his orders to Parmenion the northern Syrian districts around the mouth of the Orontes, the administrative hub of northern Syria, were firmly occupied and could be left under a holding force while the burden of fighting moved south. Later Parmenion handed over operations in Coele Syria to Andromachus, and Andromachus, we are explicitly told, came to grief at the hands of the Samaritans.⁴ His area of competence therefore extended south of Phoenicia, squarely in the territory of Hellenistic Coele Syria. Curtius, then, has reproduced uncritically the terminology of his source. If, as is generally assumed, that source was Cleitarchus of Alexandria,⁵ who most probably wrote in the last decade of the fourth century, the use of Coele Syria to designate the coast and hinterland south of Phoenicia is perfectly natural. Curtius' use of the anachronistic terminology is perhaps annoying, but his negligence is more than matched by Appian, who uses Coele Syria in the Hellenistic sense when he follows Hieronymus, but returns to the terminology of his own day when he works from Roman sources.⁶

We can now return to Alexander's administrative arrangements in the winter of 333/2. After Issus the Macedonians had complete control of Syria down to the Phoenician border. The northern area between Phoenicia and the Syrian Gates in the Amanus Range could be left under a satrap with sufficient forces to frustrate any attack from the north by the Persian survivors of Issus.⁷ That amply explains Arrian's notice about Menon, son of Cerdimmas. His was a

¹ Diod. 20. 47. 5—the site of Antigonus' foundation in 307; 19. 79. 6—Poseideon (Al Mina) fell within Upper Syria.

² Pliny *N.H.* 5. 66 and 74 lists Damascus as the head of Decapolis, parallel with Judaea and south Phoenicia, well to the south of Coele Syria.

³ Curt. 4. 1. 5 'novum imperium Syri, nondum belli cladibus satis domiti, aspernabatur.' Curtius is the only source to refer to the unrest in Syria, but it is presupposed by Josephus' apocryphal story of Alexander's relations with the Jews and Samaritans. In particular he insists that most of the populace of Syria had been firmly convinced that Alexander would be crushed by the Persian national army (Jos. *A.J.* 11. 315–16). Issus apparently came as a complete surprise, and it took time for the indigenous Syrians to modify their attitude.

⁴ Curt. 4. 8. 9.

⁵ For a convenient modern restatement of Schwartz's view that Cleitarchus was the

common source of Curtius and Diodorus, see L. Pearson, *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great* (1960), 217 ff. Unfortunately Cleitarchus' date of composition cannot be fixed with any degree of precision, but it seems clear from Pliny that he wrote after Theopompus and before Theophrastus (Plin. *N.H.* 3. 5 = *F. Gr. Hist.* 137 F 31). This places Cleitarchus squarely in the first generation after Alexander, a contemporary of men like Hieronymus of Cardia. For further discussion see J. R. Hamilton, *Historia*, x (1961), 448 f.; E. Badian, *P.A.C.A.* viii (1965), 5–10; Fr. Schachermeyr, *Alexander in Babylon und die Reichsordnung nach seinem Tode* (Österreichische Akademie d. Wiss.; Phil.-hist. Kl.; *S.B.* cclxviii. 3 [1970]), 211–24.

⁶ App. *Syr.* 1. 1; 5. 18; 53. 271 (the Seleucid terminology). For instances of the Roman usage see the passages cited above, p. 48, n. 8.

⁷ Diod. 17. 48. 5–6; Curt. 4. 1. 34–5; 5. 13.

defensive appointment, to secure the territory already annexed, and it contrasted with Parmenion's commission to crush any resistance in the hinterland to the south. There were two complementary tasks, civil and military, and they took place in different areas. The difficulties so far have been caused by the peculiarities of our two main sources, which are selective in their reporting and differ in their geographical terminology. Next we move to the appointment of Andromachus. Parmenion delegated the remaining operations to him when he joined the siege of Tyre, and by the time Alexander moved into Egypt, in November 332, Andromachus had become governor of all Syria south and east of Phoenicia.¹ Because of the military situation in 333/2 Syria had been divided into two administrative areas with Menon in the north and Andromachus in charge of the relatively unpacified south. There is no problem that an existing Achaemenid satrapy was divided into two. Alexander did not annex Syria at a stroke, and it is only natural that his satrapal appointments followed the course of the military conquest. At this time moreover Alexander's administrative arrangements have a tendency to subdivide. The appointments in Egypt in early 331 are dual; there are two native 'nomarchs' and two commanders of the military forces of the satrapy.² In all probability Alexander had divided the country into two for administrative purposes, preserving the immemorially old division of Egypt into the Upper and Lower Kingdoms.³ In Syria also the division was militarily and administratively convenient, and traces of it seem to have survived in the early Hellenistic distinction between Upper Syria and Coele Syria.

In 331 two Syrian administrative changes are recorded, and they are both problematic. According to Curtius, Alexander left Egypt immediately on receipt of the news of Andromachus' death in Samaria, and after rapid reprisals he appointed 'Memnon' in Andromachus' place.⁴ The name Memnon has attracted suspicion.⁵ Not surprisingly. The name is extremely rare, and outside the family of Memnon of Rhodes it recurs only once in Alexander's reign; the insurgent governor of Thrace at the time of Agis' revolt was named Memnon.⁶ What is more, the Memnon of Curtius is seductively reminiscent of Arrian's Menon, son of Cerdimmas. Nobody who is familiar with the incessant bizarre corruptions of proper names in the manuscripts of Curtius would deny that the corruption of *Menona* to *Memnona* is eminently possible.⁷ The emendation has been almost

¹ Cf. Curt. 4. 8. 9 'Andromachi quem praefecerat Syriae'. For the chronology of Alexander's movements in 332/1 see Beloch iii². 2. 314 f.

² Arr. 3. 5. 2-5. Arrian lists together the appointments of Upper and Lower Egypt in pairs. Curtius 4. 8. 4 tends to give only one of each pair (omitting the native nomarchs altogether), and it looks as though his source mentioned only the settlement of Memphis and the Delta area. At an earlier stage, before the visit to the Ammonium, he mentions a trip up the Nile and the settlement of Lower Egypt (Curt. 4. 7. 5).

³ This was proposed by U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge der Papyrskunde* i. 9 n. 6, and endorsed by V. Ehrenberg, *Alexander und Ägypten*, 48 (= *Polis und Imperium* [1965], 438).

⁴ Curt. 4. 8. 11 'Andromacho deinde Memnona substituit.'

⁵ Cf. Julien, 21 n. 2; Leuze, 415.

⁶ Cf. Berve, ii., nos. 497-9. E. Badian, *Hermes*, xcv (1967), 179-80, goes so far as to identify the Memnon who was governor of Thrace (Berve, no. 499) with the Memnon honoured by the Athenians in late 327 (Tod, *G.H.I.* ii., no. 199; Berve, no. 498).

⁷ A few lines later the familiar word *Spartanorum* is corrupted progressively to *parthanorum* and *Parthorum* (4. 8. 15). For a truly bumper crop of Curtian corruptions see 4. 5. 13-14, where within four lines the manuscripts have managed to transform *Miletum* into *militum*, *Hegelochus* into *eghilocus*, and *Tenedo recepta Chium* into *Tenedon quoque receptaculum*.

universally accepted, but it poses another problem. How is the change in Menon's area of competence to be explained? If we accept that Curtius' account is substantially correct in detail and chronology, there can be only one explanation. No ancient source affords any information about the unrest in Samaria, but after Andromachus' débâcle the king must have felt it prudent to place a fairly experienced man over the area to ensure its future quiet. Who better than Menon who had already shown his competence in the north? I am assuming that Menon changed satrapies, moving from the north to the south, and that he was replaced in the northern sector. The Syrian administration remained divided.

This solution helps explain another crux. At the end of the summer of 331 Alexander, so Arrian says, appointed Asclepiodorus, son of Eunicus, satrap of Syria in place of Arimmas who had been deposed for incompetence.¹ Now Arimmas is completely unknown apart from this reference, and, if we accept this unknown as satrap of Syria, Menon, son of Cerdimmas, disappears most mysteriously from the record of Alexander's reign. Droysen tried to remove Menon from the list of missing persons by emending him back into Arrian; for ἀντὶ δὲ Ἀρίμματα read ἀντὶ δὲ <Μένωνος τοῦ> Κερδίμματα.² But this would be a very complex corruption, involving both a lacuna and a misreading. What is more, Arimmas is a perfectly respectable Macedonian name,³ and it is most improbable that a medieval scribe could have substituted one rare Macedonian name for another through simple misreading. Droysen's emendation is totally unconvincing, and we must be content with our otherwise unattested Arimmas. Now, if Menon had been transferred to the south in spring 331, there was a vacancy in the northern command. Arimmas could have been appointed to that vacancy, in which case there is ample time for his tenure during the spring and summer of 331. He was dismissed for his negligence in the logistical preparations for Alexander's march into the interior. The army's crossing point on the Euphrates was Thapsacus, and Alexander's march there from Tyre would have passed virtually from end to end of the northern satrapy. He would have had plenty of opportunity to inspect the efficiency of his new satrap. Arimmas, then, replaced Menon, and after a tenure of about three months he was himself replaced by Asclepiodorus, son of Eunicus.

This juxtaposition of contrasting sources may seem questionable, and certainly it offends against Leuze's dictum that one must opt either for Arrian or for Curtius.⁴ But my argument has shown that Arrian and Curtius are not contradictory but complementary. None the less, each author only reports a part of the administrative arrangements in Syria. If we look at the general context in both Arrian and Curtius, we shall find that in each case these particular omissions fall inside larger lacunae. Curtius covers Alexander's progress from Egypt to Tyre in some detail, whereas Arrian mentions nothing between the crossing of the Nile and Alexander's arrival in Tyre.⁵ In the gap falls the

¹ Arr. 3. 6. 8.

² Droysen, i². 326, accepted by Lehmann-Haupt, *R.E.* ii. A 156 and, with modifications, Niese, i. 77; 88.

³ O. Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen* (1906), 193, suggested that Ἀρίμματος is a contracted form of Ἀρίμαχος. In addition to the Cerdimmas of Arr. 2. 13. 7 note also the Tyrimmas who is attested as the father of Agathon at

3. 12. 4.

⁴ Leuze, 416: 'Man muss sich entweder für Arrian oder für Curtius entscheiden.'

⁵ Curt. 4. 8. 9-16; cf. Arr. 3. 6. 1. There is clearly a long lacuna in Arrian's narrative. On his own admission (3. 6. 1) Alexander left Egypt εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν ὑποφαινόντι, and he crossed the Euphrates in Hecatombaeon (July/August) 331. There are nearly four

murder of Andromachus and the appointment of Menon in south Syria. Similarly Arrian expatiates on Alexander's stay in Phoenicia and concentrates on Alexander's actions and appointments there. Curtius, however, moves directly from Alexander's arrival in Tyre to Darius' preparations for Gaugamela,¹ and our next contact with the Macedonian king is his arrival at the Euphrates.² In the gap came the deposition of Arimmas. Both Arrian and Curtius, it should be emphasized, are secondary authors using a limited number of sources, and any omissions in their primary authorities were necessarily inherited by them. Omissions of this kind should disturb us much less than variations over factual detail.

B. SYRIA FROM 331 TO 323 B.C.

When Alexander left Syria in 331 the area was still on its war footing and had separate commanders for the north and south. At the end of the reign, however, Syria was a single satrapy, governed after the Babylon settlement by Laomedon of Mytilene.³ When precisely did the change occur? The sources for Alexander's reign are extraordinarily scanty in their treatment of events in Syria, and there are only two relevant episodes. Both, however, are of crucial importance and controversial interpretation. The first is the mission of Menes of Pella. This is placed by Arrian during Alexander's stay in Susa, somewhere around mid-December 331.⁴ Alexander sent down Menes to the coast as *ὑπαρχος Συρίας καὶ Φοινίκης καὶ Κιλικίας*, giving him no less than 3,000 talents, which Antipater was allowed to draw upon for the war against Agis.⁵ The details are clear enough; at first sight it is only Menes' precise functions which need clarification, in particular Arrian's enigmatic term *ὑπαρχος*. Unfortunately Diodorus and Curtius compound the difficulties.⁶ Both are clearly working from the same source, and that source differed in detail from Arrian about both the chronology and the scope of the appointment. It is placed not at Susa but during the stay in Babylon from late October to mid-November 331. More importantly, Menes' appointment is correlated with that of Apollodorus of Amphipolis. Diodorus describes the two together as *στρατηγούς τῆς τε Βαβυλώνης καὶ τῶν σατραπειῶν μέχρι Κιλικίας*, and Curtius uses the same terminology, though his version is truncated and somewhat inaccurate.⁷ Lastly, only 1,000 talents is mentioned, and the sum is earmarked for raising troops; there is no mention of Antipater.

Some of these differences are relatively unimportant, the chronology in

months for the march from Egypt to Tyre, which in Arrian is completely eventless. One might compare the similar absence of detail about the march across Anatolia from Gordium to the Cilician Gates during the summer of 333 (2. 4. 1-2).

¹ Arr. 3. 6. 2-8; cf. Curt. 4. 8. 16 'his compositis Herculi Tyrio ex auro cratero . . . dicavit, imminensque Dareo ad Euphraten iter pronuntiari iussit. at Dareus . . . '.

² Curt. 4. 9. 11 ff.

³ Diod. 18. 3. 1; Arr. *Succ.* F 1. 5 (Roos); Dexippus, *F. Gr. Hist.* 100 F 8. 2; Curt. 10. 10. 2; Just. 13. 4. 12.

⁴ For the chronology of Alexander's

movements after Gaugamela see, most recently, E. N. Borza, *C. Phil.* lxxvii (1972), 236-7, and, in substantial agreement, G. Wirth, *Historia*, xx (1971), 600. It seems certain that Alexander was in Babylon between roughly 20 October and the end of November (cf. Diod. 17. 64. 4). He will have reached Susa by about 20 December 331.

⁵ Arr. 3. 16. 9-10.

⁶ Diod. 17. 64. 5; Curt. 5. 1. 43.

⁷ Curtius omits the domicile of the two commanders and inaccurately states Menes' satrapy to have been Cilicia alone. He adds that the two had military forces 2,000 strong, a detail not in Diodorus.

particular. Arrian and the so-called vulgate sources are often in disagreement about the precise dating of administrative arrangements, even when they are in substantial agreement about the details. In this instance the two dates for Menes' appointment are only a month apart, and there is little of historical significance that depends on a closer dating.¹ Similarly it is not of world-shattering importance whether Menes had 1,000 or 3,000 talents. One might attempt a reconciliation by suggesting that Diodorus' 1,000 talents for recruiting was supplemented by a grant of 2,000 talents for the war exchequer and Antipater's expenditures. Alternatively the figures may have been corrupted in transmission. But the main crux is the bracketing together of Menes and Apollodorus. Now Apollodorus was the commander of the military forces of Babylonia. That emerges explicitly from Arrian and can be deduced from Curtius.² Alexander had placed a distinguished Persian noble, Mazaeus, over the satrapy of Babylonia, and, as was usual when he placed an Iranian over the administration, he appointed a Macedonian to command the military forces. The same system was adopted at Susa a month later,³ and it seems to have been anticipated by the arrangements in Caria in 334, when the native dynast Ada was allowed to retain the satrapy while the substantial mercenary forces were placed under the Macedonian officer Ptolemy.⁴ If, then, Menes' appointment was parallel to that of Apollodorus, we should expect him to have commanded the military forces of the Syrian satrapies. That would be wholly exceptional. Syria was governed by Macedonian satraps, and such men seem invariably to have had complete control of their troops. There may have been other Macedonian officers in their satrapies, but they were restricted to garrison and fiscal posts.⁵ If Menes was appointed commander of the Syrian armies, his post was both exceptional and superfluous. After the Samaritan insurgency of 332/1 there is no further trace of troubles in the Syrian sector which might have justified a separate military commander. It seems that the common source of Diodorus and Curtius has bracketed together two different types of command. That is not a unique phenomenon. In his account of the settlement of Lower Egypt Curtius states that Alexander placed over the province Aeschylus of

¹ There has been some debate over the precise chronological relation between Menes' mission and the progress of Agis' revolt. Badian, *Hermes*, xciv (1967), 187 f., has argued that the mission was Alexander's immediate response to news of the outbreak of hostilities in the Peloponnese, supposedly brought by Amyntas, son of Andromenes, whose reinforcements arrived at the same time as Menes' departure. But, even if Amyntas did bring news of the outbreak of revolt, it makes no difference to Badian's hypothesis whether that news came in November or December. The precise chronology is more important for G. Wirth's hypothesis (*Historia*, xx [1971], 626 ff.) that Amyntas' troops were sent off immediately after the battle of Megalopolis. If, as Wirth does, one accepts Curtius' synchronism of Megalopolis and Gaugamela, it is physically impossible that Amyntas' 15,000 troops were shipped off from the Peloponnese and reached

Babylon in a bare two months, and the impossibility is equally blatant whether one accepts Arrian's or the vulgate account of Amyntas' arrival.

² Arr. 3. 16. 4 Ἀπολλόδωρον τὸν Ἀμφιπολίτην στρατηγὸν τῶν μετὰ Μαζαίου ὑπολειπομένων στρατιωτῶν . . .

³ Arr. 3. 16. 9; Curt. 5. 2. 16-17.

⁴ Arr. 1. 23. 6-8. For further examples see Berve, i. 277-9.

⁵ Lydia is perhaps typical. In 334 Alexander had made separate specialist appointments, Pausanias as citadel commandant and Nicias as financial superintendent. The satrap, Asander, is said to have been given command of the mercenary holding force (1. 17. 7), and he figured prominently as an army commander in the bitter fighting which continued in Caria long after Alexander's departure from the area (cf. Arr. 2. 5. 7).

Rhodes and Peucestas of Macedon.¹ Arrian's parallel account makes it clear that Peucestas was the commander of the military forces, while Aeschylus was the civil ἐπίσκοπος.² The two functions were quite different, but Curtius, and presumably his source, has bracketed them together. The same could well have happened with Menes and Apollodorus. We certainly cannot use Apollodorus' known position to infer that of Menes. The problem of Arrian's terminology must therefore be resolved from independent evidence.

Arrian describes Menes as ὑπαρχος of Syria, Phoenicia, and Cilicia. The terminology is peculiar. 'Hyparch' is indeed an administrative term for an under-governor, attested in Syria during the Succession and in the Seleucid period.³ But the Seleucid hyparchs governed small portions of satrapies and were relatively minor officials, whereas the geographical scope of Menes' command was vast, overlapping a plurality of satrapies. He certainly was not an under-governor in the Seleucid sense. But there are parallels in Arrian. In the *Anabasis* ὑπαρχος recurs a number of times, and on occasion it is used as a variant of σατράπης. Two instances are conclusive. In his review of the Persian commanders at the Granicus Arrian mentions Arsites and qualifies him ὁ τῆς πρὸς Ἑλλησπόντῳ Φρυγίας ὑπαρχος.⁴ But in the immediately following council of war at Zelea Arrian speaks as though Arsites had sole control of Hellespontine Phrygia, and indeed he is explicitly attested elsewhere as satrap.⁵ The same is true of Mazaeus, who is unequivocally attested as satrap of Babylonia from 331, yet is once described by Arrian as ὑπαρχος.⁶ There is another usage of the word to designate a minor, quasi-independent ruler. The Bactrian and Sogdian nobles are three times described as hyparchs,⁷ as are the petty local

¹ Curt. 4. 8. 4 'itaque Aegypto praefecit Aeschylum Rhodium et Peucesten Macedonem.'

² Arr. 3. 5. 3-5. I disagree with the orthodox view of the role of Aeschylus and Ehippus, that they were inspectors of the mercenary establishment of Egypt (cf. Berve, i. 146; 260; Ehrenberg, *Polis und Imperium*, 437; Pearson, *L.H.A.* 61-2). Arrian's wording is hardly explicit—ἐπισκόπους δὲ αὐτῶν. Now αὐτῶν has been taken as an objective genitive, referring back to τῶν ξένων, i.e. 'inspectors of them (the mercenaries)'. But, if one accepts this interpretation, the mercenary forces seem to have been absurdly overstaffed. Arrian has already allotted them a commander and a secretary, and the two inspectors look disquietingly supernumerary. Further, Curtius brackets Aeschylus the ἐπίσκοπος with Peucestas the general, and one would expect a more elevated post than the lowly inspectorship of the orthodox interpretation. There is another possibility. αὐτῶν could be partitive and refer back to τῶν ἑταίρων. In that case the appointment—and Arrian's construction—is exactly parallel to 3. 28. 4 τῶν ἑταίρων Νειλόξενον τὸν Σατύρου ἐπίσκοπον ἀπολιπών. At 3. 5. 3 Arrian has already used τῶν ἑταίρων twice in the partitive sense, the words appearing in different

positions in their respective clauses. He was obviously reluctant to repeat τῶν ἑταίρων only two words after its last occurrence, and so he substituted αὐτῶν to give the desired variety. Aeschylus and Ehippus, then, were 'ἐπίσκοποι from the ranks of the *hetairoi*', and their appointment is an anticipation of the roles of Neilo Xenus and Tlepolemus in Parapamisadae and Parthia (Arr. 3. 22. 1; 28. 4). They were Macedonian 'advisers', placed alongside the native rulers of the eastern Iranian provinces to supervise the administration. In Egypt too Aeschylus and Ehippus were clearly intended to act as advisers to the native 'nomarchs', Petisis and Doloaspis, supervising the civil administration while Peucestas and Balacrus controlled the military forces.

³ Diod. 19. 58. 1 (ὑπαρχοι in Syria in 315 B.C.); *O.G.I.S.* 238 (Eriza in Phrygia); C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence*, no. 20. 5 (the Troad); cf. E. Bickerman, *Institutions des Séleucides* (1938), 203.

⁴ Arr. 1. 12. 8.

⁵ Cf. Arr. 1. 12. 10. Pausanias 1. 29. 10 calls Arsites σατράπης τῆς ἐφ' Ἑλλησπόντῳ Φρυγίας.

⁶ Arr. 4. 18. 3; cf. 3. 16. 4; 7. 18. 1; Curt. 5. 1. 44.

⁷ Arr. 4. 1. 5; 21. 1; 21. 9.

dynasts of India on numerous occasions.¹ But once again Arrian's usage oscillates. Sisicottus, appointed merely garrison commander at Aornus, is termed satrap,² while Sambos and the ruler of Patala, neighbouring dynasts of equal status in south India, are termed respectively satrap and hyparch.³ The usage and its variation are by no means peculiar to Arrian. Xenophon, for instance, describes Mania, that formidable female dynast of the Troad, alternately as satrap and hyparch.⁴ But in Xenophon, as in Thucydides, hyparch is only used to designate an under-governor.⁵ A hyparch may be a satrap by courtesy, but a satrap is not termed hyparch. Arrian's oscillation goes further and applies to governors of the highest rank, like Arsites and Mazaeus. The usage, moreover, is Arrian's own, and cannot be attributed, as some have maintained, to Ptolemy.⁶ In his description of the Egyptian settlement Arrian appends a note about the Roman administration of the province, and he refers to the Roman prefect of Egypt as *ὑπαρχος Αἰγύπτου*.⁷ In the second century A.D. the universal Greek translation of *praefectus* was *ἐπαρχος*, and the prefect of Egypt is regularly called *ἐπαρχος Αἰγύπτου*.⁸ Arrian's *ὑπαρχος* is unique, and it can only be that he has self-consciously transferred one of his regular expressions for governors in the time of Alexander to describe an official of equivalent rank in his own day.⁹

Two characteristics of Arrian's writing now need to be stressed. Firstly, of all classical authors, Arrian in the *Anabasis* is most influenced by Herodotus. There are six explicit references to him in the text,¹⁰ and Arrian is dominated by his style. Time and time again he repeats words otherwise used uniquely in prose by Herodotus.¹¹ Now Herodotus' regular word for the satraps of the Achae-

¹ Arr. 4. 22. 7-8; 5. 20. 6-7; 29. 4; 6. 17. 5.

² At 4. 30. 4 Arrian says that Sisicottus was only garrison commander at Aornos (so Curt. 8. 11. 25). At 5. 20. 7 Sisicottus has become a satrap, reporting the death of a hyparch at the hands of insurgent Assaceni. This 'hyparch' is usually, and plausibly, identified as the Nicanor who at 4. 28. 6 is said to have been satrap of the territory west of the Indus (cf. Niese, i. 501; Berve, ii. 276, no. 556).

³ Arr. 6. 16. 3; 17. 5. Note also 7. 6. 1 *ἤκον δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ σατράπαι οἱ ἐκ τῶν πόλεων τε τῶν νεοκτίστων καὶ τῆς ἄλλης γῆς τῆς διοικιᾶς*.

⁴ Xen. *Hell.* 3. 1. 10-12.

⁵ At *Anabasis* 4. 4. 4 Tiribazus is described as *ὑπαρχος* of Armenia. The satrap of the area in 401 is known to have been Orontes (Xen. *Anab.* 3. 5. 17; 4. 3. 3-4). For Thucydides' usage see 8. 16. 3; 31. 2; 108. 4.

⁶ This is explicitly stated by Tarn, ii. 172 n. 3.

⁷ Arr. 3. 5. 7.

⁸ Cf. *O.G.I.S.* 677. 3; 678. 5; 702. 5 etc. In the Julio-Claudian era presidial prefects of equestrian rank are occasionally termed *ὑπαρχοι* (Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium* 38. 302; Strabo, 4. 6. 4 [203]). But in these cases relatively small commands are designated, and the

prefects involved seem to have been subordinate to the neighbouring consular legate. The prefect of Egypt, however, was formally equivalent in rank to senatorial governors, and he seems always to have been termed *ἐπαρχος*; cf. Strabo 17. 1. 12 (797); 17. 1. 53 (819). An isolated use of *ὑπαρχία* in the sense of *provincia* occurs in the newly discovered Greek fragment of Augustus' *laudatio funebris* for Agrippa (L. Koenen, *Zeitschr. f. Papyrol. u. Epigraphik* v [1970], 235-41). But the very uniqueness of this terminology caused the editor severe embarrassment, and it is clearly inadmissible to argue that *ὑπαρχία* was at all common in the early Empire as a Greek expression for a Roman province (cf. also E. W. Gray, *J.P.E.* vi [1971], 230).

⁹ Significantly Herodotus describes Aryandes, satrap of Egypt under Darius I, as *τῆς Αἰγύπτου ὑπαρχος* (4. 166. 1).

¹⁰ Arr. 5. 6. 5; 2. 16. 3; 3. 30. 8; 5. 7. 2; 7. 13. 1 and 5.

¹¹ See, for instance, 3. 2. 1-2, where Arrian uses *ἐπιφρασθέντα* absolutely; this is a word and usage only paralleled in Herodotus (cf. Hdt. 7. 239. 4). A few lines later occurs *τοῦτο δὲ ἐπιλεξαμένους*, meaning 'reflecting on this', a wholly Herodotean expression not found elsewhere in prose (cf. Hdt. 1. 78. 1; 2. 130. 1 etc.).

menid empire is ὑπαρχος.¹ In fact *σατραπή* is only used twice in the *Histories*, both times in explanatory glosses;² *σατράπης* never occurs. It is hardly surprising if Arrian borrowed his terminology for the governors of the Persian empire from his principal stylistic model. The other consideration, which cannot be stressed too strongly, is that Arrian is a very self-conscious stylist in his own right and saw himself in the forefront of Hellenic letters.³ In the second century A.D. one of the most frequent literary devices was variation, the deliberate avoidance of repetition in close proximity of the same words and constructions. Industrious writers would compile lists of synonyms to improve the elegance of their prose style.⁴ Arrian shared the literary tastes and prejudices of his own day, and we find him moving heaven and earth to introduce variety of construction and expression into the long catalogues which his subject-matter forces him to retail. This brings us to the crux of the matter. In virtually every case where ὑπαρχος is used in the irregular sense as a synonym of satrap, it is in a context where *σατράπης* has occurred once or twice.

1. 12. 8 *Σπιθριδάτης ὁ Λυδίας . . . σατράπης καὶ Ἀρσίτης ὁ τῆς πρὸς Ἑλλησπόντῳ Φρυγίας ὑπαρχος.*
1. 16. 3 *Σπιθριδάτης ὁ Λυδίας σατράπης καὶ ὁ τῶν Καππαδοκῶν ὑπαρχος.*⁵
4. 18. 3 *Στασάνορα δὲ ἐς Δράγγας σατράπην ἐκπέμπει, ἐς Μήδους δὲ Ἀτροπάτην ἐπὶ σατραπείᾳ . . . ὅτι Μαζαῖος ὁ Βαβυλώνιος ὑπαρχος τετελευτηκέναι αὐτῷ ἐξηγγέλλετο.*

Menes' commission occurs in a similar catalogue. We are first told that Alexander appointed Abulites satrap of Susiana, Mazarus commander of the citadel at Susa, and Archelaus general of the holding force. Menes' commission as ὑπαρχος of Syria, Phoenicia, and Cilicia follows immediately.⁶ This fits beautifully into the pattern so far established. Three lines before Arrian used the term *σατράπης*, and now, following his usual stylistic practice, he varies it with ὑπαρχος. Menes, then, was appointed satrap of Syria and Cilicia in 331.

This hypothesis is not new. It was advanced very briefly by Beloch in 1923,⁷ but without success. Berve passed the suggestion over in silence while Leuze argued trenchantly against it.⁸ Leuze's refutation has been accepted as conclusive, and nothing subsequently has been heard of Menes the satrap. But how cogent is this supposed refutation? Leuze based his attack on two main points, the appearance of Cilicia and Syria as a single unit and the alleged fact that Menes was not satrap of Syria in 329. Both arguments are important and require investigation. The union of Cilicia and Syria, Leuze argued, was extraordinary, and, if Arrian had wished to say that Menes was satrap of two provinces, he must have used the unambiguous word *σατράπης*. But this argument is completely *a priori*, and indeed it rebounds against Leuze's own reconstruction. On his view Menes was a glorified communications officer, superintending the sea routes between Cilicia and Macedonia.⁹ This was an extraordinary appointment

¹ Hdt. 3. 70. 3; 126. 2; 4. 166. 1-2; 7. 6. 1; 9. 113. 2.

² Hdt. 1. 192. 2; 3. 89. 1.

³ Cf. *Praef.* 3; 1. 12. 4-5, with my observations, *C.Q.* xxii (1972), 167.

⁴ Fronto, *ad M. Antoninum* 4. 7, p. 144. 20 ff. (v.d.H.). Quintilian, 10. 1. 7, protests against excessive use of the device.

⁵ Diodorus 17. 21. 3 styles Mithrobuzanes ὁ τῶν Καππαδοκῶν ἡγούμενος. It seems accepted that he was satrap; cf. Berve, ii. 257.

⁶ Arr. 3. 16. 9.

⁷ Beloch, iii². 2. 337 f.

⁸ Leuze, 438-9; cf. Tarn, ii. 176, n. 3.

⁹ Leuze, 436: 'es die Angabe Menes' war, die Verbindung von der dem inneren Asien

by any account, and, if Arrian had been as preoccupied with administrative niceties as Leuze supposed, one would have expected terminology more precise than the ambiguous and anachronistic *ὑπαρχος*. But Arrian was far more concerned with stylistic variation than pedantically accurate reporting of minor details. In any case, eastern Cilicia had formed part of the province of Syria between the reigns of Augustus and Vespasian,¹ and a satrap of Cilicia and Syria may not have looked so anomalous to an inhabitant of the eastern Roman Empire as it does to a modern student of the Achaemenid period.²

But what of the coupling of Syria and Cilicia in 331? Can any historical explanation be adduced? Little is known of the history of Cilicia under Alexander and still less of its chronology. Arrian says that after Issus Alexander appointed satrap Balacrus, son of Nicanor.³ Diodorus confirms that Balacrus was satrap of Cilicia, and in an excursus to Perdiccas' Cappadocian campaign of 322 he adds that he died fighting the inhabitants of Isaura and Laranda *ἐν τῷ ζῶντος Ἀλεξάνδρου*.⁴ No further chronological details are given, and Balacrus might have fallen at almost any time during Alexander's reign. The orthodoxy that he died about 324 is mere guesswork.⁵ Isaura and Laranda were situated in Lycaonia, at the headwaters of the Calycadnus directly north of Rough Cilicia. The area had never been a tranquil part of the Persian Empire, and Cyrus in 401 had given his troops free licence to pillage Lycaonia as though it were enemy country.⁶ The area had been left untouched by Alexander in his rapid transit of Asia Minor during the summer of 333. After Issus it must have been one of the areas chosen by the groups of Persian survivors to continue their resistance. At least Antigonos, the great pacifier of Asia Minor, fought a campaign in Lycaonia in 332, advancing from the west, from his own satrapy of Greater Phrygia.⁷ Balacrus may have conducted similar raids from the south. Alexander in 333 had penetrated into Rough Cilicia, probably as far as the mouth of the Calycadnus,⁸ and Balacrus presumably followed him up the river valley (which was one of the main routes into central Anatolia), until he came into collision with the Isaurians. Unfortunately his death cannot be dated more precisely. There is an enigmatic hint in Curtius. In a resumptive note placed after the siege of Tyre he states that Alexander had previously handed over Cilicia to 'Socrates'.⁹ This is much too early for the death of Balacrus. If Socrates was his successor, we should in any case have expected that the

... nächstgelegenen Küste des Mittelmeers aus mit Makedonien und Griechenland aufrechtzuerhalten.' This was also the view of Tarn, apparently conceived independently of Leuze (cf. Tarn, ii. 176-8).

¹ Cf. D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, ii. 1271-2 (n. 44); 1419-20 (n. 68); 1439-40 (n. 27).

² There is in fact a parallel from the Achaemenid period. The famous Mazaeus, satrap of Cilicia from 360 onwards and Alexander's first satrap of Babylonia, was governor of a united satrapy of Syria and Cilicia some time during the 340s. The reasons for the arrangement, and its duration, are totally obscure, but the fact of the amalgamation is proclaimed on Mazaeus' coinage and seems indubitable. Cf. Head, *H.N.²*, 731 f.; Six, *Num. Chron.* (1884),

97 ff.; Stähelin, *R.E.* xv. 1-2; Leuze, 387; 398 ff.

³ Arr. 2. 12. 2. ⁴ Diod. 18. 22. 1.

⁵ Cf. Julien, 20; Berve, i. 258; ii. 100, no. 200.

⁶ Xen. *Anab.* 1. 2. 19; cf. A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*², 126 f.

⁷ Curt. 4. 5. 13; cf. 4. 1. 34-5. At Triparadeisus in 321 Antigonos' satrapy was expanded to include the Lycaonians (Arr. *Succ.* F 1. 37), but there is no hint at what period he acquired control of the district.

⁸ Arr. 2. 5. 6. Schachermeyr, 170 suggests that Alexander's aim was to open up a second route over the Taurus into Anatolia. But Alexander's entire Cilician campaign took only seven days, surely too little time for any serious penetration into the Calycadnus valley. ⁹ Curt. 4. 5. 9.

circumstances of his death would have been recorded. Alexander, who promptly avenged the death of Andromachus in 331, could easily have spared an expeditionary force in the previous year when he was almost stationary in the Levant. What is more, if Socrates succeeded Balacrus as satrap, the latter would have had to die within a few months of his appointment. Berve, then, may be right that Socrates was a subordinate officer in Cilicia, concerned primarily with recruiting.¹ Alternatively and preferably, Socrates may be a mistake for Balacrus. The transmission of names in the context is extraordinarily bad, even for the manuscripts of Curtius, and a complex corruption may have taken place. The passage is explicitly resumptive, a review of previous appointments, and Curtius had not bothered to mention the settlement of Cilicia in the immediate sequel to Issus.

Balacrus died after 332, but there is no evidence at what point. There is nothing to exclude the possibility that Menes was sent to replace him. If Arrian is right, Menes was given two satrapies to administer, Syria and Cilicia. The reason, no doubt, lies in the military situation of 331. When Menes was sent out, Alexander was on the point of invading Persia. Darius was still at large, and there was no foreseeable end to hostilities. There was a continual demand for reinforcements, and the drying up of the Macedonian sources of supply, thanks to the war with Agis,² diverted the recruiting to the Near East. It is no surprise to find considerable bodies of troops sent up to Alexander from Lydia, Anatolia, Cilicia, and Syria,³ and Menes, so the vulgate sources say, had a particular commission to levy troops.⁴ The holding forces of the Levant must have been extremely stretched. If there had been trouble north of Cilicia and Balacrus had died before the end of 331, there would have been considerable logic in placing the military forces of Syria and Cilicia under a single satrap. Menes would have been able to deploy a much larger pool of troops to tackle trouble anywhere from the Taurus to Thapsacus. It was not that he needed the extra forces to tackle the insurgents of Isaura and Laranda. The world-wide shortage of troops meant that no major offensives were feasible on a regional scale. The insatiable vortex of Alexander's own campaigning monopolized the mercenary reserves of the Mediterranean. It was not until the king's death that the focus of interest reverted to Asia Minor, and in 322 Perdiccas belatedly avenged the loss of Balacrus. In 331 the essential priority was to keep Cilicia and Syria quiet, not to risk troops in offensive operations but to channel the maximum possible through to Alexander's operations in Asia. The Levant must have been intended from 331 onwards to be the quiet hub of a turbulent world, the vital centre for troop movements. It was only logical that Syria and Cilicia should now have been united under the one governor. By 331 the Levantine

¹ Berve, ii. 367, no. 732. Berve, however, goes much too far when he identifies as this Socrates the 'Platon Atheniensis', who is attested by Curtius conveying mercenary troops from Cilicia to the east (Curt. 5. 7. 12; cf. Berve, ii. 429, no. 67).

² In 331 Antipater was clearly short of troops. Amyntas' recruiting must have depleted the manpower of the home army, and, if we can believe Aeschines (3. 165), the assembly of a field army after the death of Corrhagus was a protracted business.

Antipater had no troops to spare for his king's campaigns in Asia, and it is virtually impossible that any reinforcements were sent from the Greek mainland in the interval between Amyntas' departure in 331 and the sending of the 3,000 Illyrians who reached Drangiana at the end of 330 (Curt. 6. 6. 35).

³ For details see the useful table in Berve, i. 182.

⁴ Diod. 17. 64. 5 *προσέταξε ξενολογεῖν στρατιώτας ὡς πλείστους*. So Curt. 5. 1. 43.

coast had been thoroughly pacified and there was no further need for two independent satraps in Syria, each with his own military force. A reduced army could now control the entire area from the Taurus to Egypt. Maybe it was Balacrus' death which precipitated the reorganization, but in any case Syria had ceased to present a military problem by the end of 331. Menes, it should be added, was a man of great distinction. The rarity of the name guarantees that he is identical to the Menes, son of Dionysius, who was appointed in 333 to the élite circle of Bodyguards, the very nucleus of the nobility.¹ That alone should be enough to prove that he was an independent commander, not subordinate to anybody.²

We now have to face Leuze's second objection that an appointment of Menes to the Syrian satrapy is inconsistent with our other information about the Syrian administration under Alexander. Previous to Menes' appointment the last information we have is Arrian's notice that Asclepiodorus was placed over (northern) Syria shortly before Gaugamela.³ By 327 Asclepiodorus was no longer satrap in Syria. His son was implicated in the Pages' Conspiracy, and in that context Asclepiodorus is described as the ex-satrap of Syria (*τοῦ Συρίας σατραπεύσαντος*).⁴ But when did his tenure end? There is only one piece of relevant evidence. In the depths of winter 329/8 reinforcements reached Alexander's headquarters at the Bactrian city of Zariaspa. Arrian lists the leaders of this convoy. They comprised the commanders who had escorted the moneys sent down with Menes in late 331 and the Hellenic troops discharged from Ecbatana in summer 330. *καὶ Ἀσανδρος δὲ ἐν τούτῳ ἦκεν καὶ Νέαρχος, στρατιᾶν Ἑλλήνων μισθοφόρων ἄγοντες, καὶ Βῆσσός τε ὁ Συρίας σατράπης καὶ Ἀσκληπιόδωρος ὁ ὑπαρχος, ἀπὸ θαλάσσης καὶ οὗτοι στρατιᾶν ἄγοντες*.⁵ The first part of this quotation is uncontroversial. Asander and Nearchus had been the respective satraps of Lydia and Lycia,⁶ and they were conveying troops raised in their satrapies to Alexander's main army in the east. The real crux is presented by the second limb of the sentence. A certain Bessus is said to have been satrap of Syria. No such appointment is attested elsewhere, and Bessus is an extremely rare name. The only Bessus known in the Alexander period, or indeed in any other, is the celebrated regicide and satrap of Bactria. But that is not all. Asclepiodorus, otherwise known as satrap of Syria, is here termed *ὑπαρχος*.

Leuze refused to admit any difficulty and argued that an otherwise unknown Persian named Bessus succeeded Asclepiodorus as satrap of Syria, when Asclepiodorus supposedly died, sometime after 331. As for Asclepiodorus the hyparch, he was a relatively minor troop commander, in no way connected with the ex-satrap of Syria.⁷ That is conservatism taken to an extreme and

¹ Arr. 2. 12. 2. No other Menes is attested in the entourage of Alexander (cf. Berve, ii. no. 507).

² The only other Bodyguards known to have been given provincial posts, Balacrus (Berve, ii. no. 200) and Peucestas (Berve, ii. no. 634), were appointed to full satrapies.

³ Arr. 3. 6. 8.

⁴ Arr. 4. 13. 4. The aorist participle has been taken as conclusive evidence that Asclepiodorus was no longer satrap in 327 (Leuze, 449; Berve, ii. 88, no. 167). Tarn, ii. 179, is less sanguine, and uses the passage as

proof that Asclepiodorus *was* still satrap at the time of the Pages' Conspiracy. But, if Arrian's scruples for terminological exactitude were as nice as Tarn implies, why did he not use the present participle, which is the more natural usage and which would have removed all ambiguity?

⁵ Arr. 4. 7. 2.

⁶ Cf. Arr. 1. 17. 7 (Asander); 3. 6. 6 (Nearchus).

⁷ Leuze, 444–56, accepted by Berve, *Klio*, xxxi (1938), 138 n. 4 (Griffith, *Problems*, 106).

absurd degree. It is flying in the face of coincidence to suppose that Asclepiodorus the hyparch and Asclepiodorus the satrap were two unconnected persons. In the first place, three out of the four leaders of the mercenary convoy were satraps, and one would expect the fourth to have been of similar rank. Secondly, Arrian's usage elsewhere suggests that ὑπαρχος is merely used as a variant upon the immediately preceding σατράπης. Lastly, Curtius has details similar to Arrian's, and he says explicitly that Asclepiodorus came from Syria. This is unfortunately not conclusive, for in the previous phrase Curtius says that Asander came from Lycia, not from his own satrapy of Lydia, and in any case he mentions only one commander from each of Arrian's pairs.¹ But the appearance of 'Bessus' in the role of satrap of Syria is even more problematic for Leuze's interpretation. In the passage immediately preceding Arrian describes the arrest of some of the accomplices of the famous Bessus, and in the sentence immediately following our crux Bessus is brought out to be punished for regicide.² A hitherto unknown Bessus is sandwiched between two references to the only Bessus who is historically attested. The overwhelming probability is that the text has been corrupted through an error of preoccupation.³ A scribe's eye jumped ahead to the next sentence, and as a result he inserted Bessus, the subject of the next episode, in place of a Macedonian proper name. The culprit may even have been Arrian himself. He is certainly not immune to the sin of preoccupation,⁴ and 'Bessus' may have slipped in by mistake while he was concentrating his thoughts on the next paragraph.

Apart from Leuze, modern scholars are in relative agreement that the text is corrupt. The most popular solution has been Schmieder's Ἀσκληπιόδωρος τε ὁ Συρίας σατράπης καὶ Μένης ὁ ὑπαρχος.⁵ This has the merit of restoring to the text two individuals whom Arrian had previously termed satrap and hyparch, and Tarn went so far as to declare the emendation necessarily right.⁶ But this solution involves not only an error of names but also a transposition for which there is no logical or palaeographical reason. There are also substantial chronological objections. Menes had been dispatched to the coast at the very end of 331. The troop commanders who reached Zariaspas in winter 329/8 included Menes' own military escort. If Menes himself had joined the convoy of reinforcements, one would have to allow very little time indeed for his tenure of office in Syria and Cilicia, a year at the very most. The Zariaspas

¹ Curt. 7. 10. 12 'Asander quoque ex Lycia cum pari numero peditum et D equitibus venit. totidem ex Syria Asclepiodorum sequebantur.'

² Arr. 4. 7. 1; 4. 7. 3-5.

³ On this type of corruption see, most recently, J. A. Willis, *Latin Textual Criticism* (Illinois, 1972), 98-9.

⁴ At 3. 11. 9 Arrian mentions Simmias' temporary control of his brother Amyntas' battalion during the latter's absence levying troops in Macedonia. Amyntas is here styled son of Philippos. It is, however, certain that the Amyntas in question was the son not of Philippos but of Andromenes (cf. Arr. 3. 16. 10; 1. 14. 2; Curt. 5. 1. 40). Arrian has made a mistake with the patronymic. Now Curtius and Diodorus also

describe the battalion commanders at Gaugamela, and they are listed exactly as in Arrian. There is one exception. In place of Simmias they mention an otherwise unknown Philippos, son of Balacrus (Diod. 17. 57. 3; Curt. 4. 13. 28). Presumably Arrian's sources here differed, Ptolemy mentioning the details of Simmias' temporary command and Aristobulus (?) referring instead to Philippos. Arrian accepted the Ptolemaic version, but the variant Philippos was clearly still on his mind, and it slipped into the text erroneously as Amyntas' patronymic.

⁵ Schmieder's emendation was accepted into the text by Abicht (1871) and cited with evident approval in Roos's apparatus.

⁶ Cf. Tarn, ii. 179-80.

contingent, it should be noted, contained Asander, the ex-satrap of Lydia. Now Asander's successor had been sent out in the summer of 331, at the same time as Asclepiodorus' initial appointment in Syria.¹ In the interim Asander was relieved of his satrapy, amalgamated the military forces raised in Lydia with those raised by Nearchus in Lycia, and marched inland to join Alexander in Bactria. The process took over two years to complete, and it began at least three months before Menes was dispatched from Susa. It should now be clear that the reinforcements which reached Zariaspa in winter 329/8 were the result of a recruiting drive launched by Alexander as early as 331. Asander in Lydia was replaced in the summer of 331, and presumably Nearchus was recalled at much the same time, although the sources afford no precise dating. Menes too was commissioned to raise troops, and one would expect, on the analogy of Lydia, that the officials who conducted the levies to Bactria were the previous incumbents of the satrapy of Syria.

The crux in Arrian can now be explained. Asclepiodorus must be identical with the satrap of northern Syria who was appointed in 331. Arrian's use of *ὑπαρχος* is to be explained simply by his practice of variation. Now one of Leuze's arguments against the identification was that *ὑπαρχος* is unqualified in the text; *ἀπὸ θαλάσσης*, which follows, must be taken with *ἄγοντες*, 'these too leading a force from the sea'.² It is impossible that the phrase refers backwards; a meaning such as 'hyparch in charge of the sea' cannot be extracted from the Greek. Asclepiodorus' hyparchy has no regional qualification, which is unusual if he was a governor. But the difficulty evaporates if we accept that Arrian is referring to two governors of Syria.³ Given that there were two satraps of Syria, we can appreciate Arrian's stylistic problem. It would have been intolerable for him to have juxtaposed 'the satrap of Syria' and 'the hyparch of Syria', and so Arrian includes the province in the first title and omits it in the second. It is risky to hazard a reconstruction of the lost source, but, if it is legitimate to use Curtius as a guide, the context may have been roughly this: 'from Lycia came a force of mercenaries, assembled by the ex-satraps, Asander and Nearchus, and from Syria a force led by the satraps "Bessus" and Asclepiodorus'.⁴ That would adequately explain the terminology in Arrian. It is now established that the commanders of the Syrian component of the Zariaspa reinforcements were the satraps of the two sectors of Syria who were replaced by Menes in late 331. Asclepiodorus had held the northern satrapy, but who was satrap in the south? The answer can only be Menon, son of Cerdimmas, who was appointed to southern Syria in the spring of 331.⁵ There is no time for any other appointment to the area before Menes was sent to the coast in

¹ Arr. 3. 6. 7.

² Cf. Leuze, 444-5; 452-3. His discussion was generally accepted by Tarn (cf. ii. 176 n. 5).

³ U. Kahrstedt, *Syrische Territorien in hellenistischer Zeit* (1926), 9-10, had already argued that Syria was divided into two under Alexander. But his hypothesis was not rigorously argued through, and he claimed, erroneously, that the division of Syria had existed under the Achaemenids and persisted after the death of Alexander. These aberrations have had the effect of obscuring Kahrstedt's correct observation that Syria

must have been divided in 332.

⁴ Compare Arr. 7. 23. 1 *ἦκε δὲ αὐτῶ καὶ Φιλόξενος στρατιὰν ἄγων ἀπὸ Καρίας καὶ Μένανδρος ἐκ Λυδίας* . . .

⁵ It has been argued (e.g. by Julien, 20) that the Menon appointed satrap of Arachosia in 330 (Berve, ii. no. 515) is identical to Menon, son of Cerdimmas. If so, he could not have brought troops from Syria in 329/8. But Menon is an exceedingly common name (Berve lists four examples in the Alexander period), and there is absolutely no hint in the sources of any identity.

November or December of the same year. The only corruption in Arrian's text, then, is the name Bessus. It has crept in through an error of preoccupation, replacing the original *Μένων* in Arrian's source.

The crucial period in the history of Syria under Alexander is 331. Faced with the urgent necessity to husband his forces, Alexander decided to unite the armies of the Levant. The death of Balacrus in Lycaonia presented the opportunity to unite Cilicia with the Syrian satrapies. Menes, son of Dionysius, was accordingly appointed satrap of the expanded province, replacing the previous incumbents of Syria, Asclepiodorus and Menon. These ex-satraps took over the command of the mercenary forces which were raised in Cilicia and Syria in the course of 330, and conducted them to Bactria, arriving in winter 329/8. Menes was left in control of the Levantine coast, commissioned to keep the area calm and peaceful, and, above all, to facilitate the flow of troops to the east. It is superfluous to invoke an irregular multi-provincial superintendency or to downgrade Menes to a kind of financial director.¹ He was simply satrap of Cilicia and Syria, performing all the normal functions of a governor of Alexander. There is only one possible objection. Diodorus says that Menes was entrusted with the satrapies 'as far as Cilicia' (*μέχρι Κιλικίας*),² and it could be that Arrian is mistaken in extending his command beyond Syria. Curtius, however, working from the same source as Diodorus, firmly associates Menes with Cilicia.³ It follows that Diodorus is using *μέχρι* in an extended sense, 'up to and including Cilicia'. The usage is perfectly logical and there are parallels.⁴ Arrian and Diodorus, then, are in complete agreement about the extent of Menes' command.

It is not attested how long Menes retained his satrapy of Syria and Cilicia. After 331 there is complete silence about the area. Even in the cosmic convulsions which struck the satrapal world after Alexander's return from India there is no mention either of Syria or Cilicia.⁵ If Menes still retained his satrapy, he presumably managed to avoid both execution and the hazards of a summons to court. The only hint we have is afforded by the settlement at Babylon following the king's death in June 323. The reassignment of satrapies is attested by a multitude of sources, all of them ultimately derivatives of the contemporary Hieronymus of Cardia.⁶ It has long been observed that the list of satraps falls into two categories, the first comprising new appointments and the second existing satraps whose appointment was confirmed by Perdiccas.⁷ In the group

¹ This was the accepted view before Leuze (and has been recently revived, without discussion, by Schachermeyr, 233), but there is not a scrap of evidence in the ancient sources to justify the assumption. Leuze's refutation (439-44) is perfectly convincing, as is Tarn's more concise footnote (ii. 176 n. 3).

² Diod. 17. 64. 5. ³ Curt. 5. 1. 43.

⁴ According to Dexippus, *F. Gr. Hist.* 100 F 8. 3, Antigonus in 323 was given control of *Παμφύλων καὶ Λυκίων μέχρι Φρυγίας*. As all other sources confirm, Antigonus controlled the whole of Greater Phrygia. Dexippus' use of *μέχρι* must therefore be inclusive. (I owe this reference to Mr. N. G. Ashton.) Cf. also Strabo 14. 4. 3 (668).

⁵ For full discussion see Badian, *J.H.S.* lxxxi (1961), 16-19. It is an impressive testimony to the silence of the sources about Syria during Alexander's later years that the satrapy is omitted from Badian's otherwise exhaustive list of areas apparently unaffected by the king's return from India.

⁶ See, most recently, the thorough discussion of Schachermeyr, *Alexander in Babylon* (1970), 81 ff.; esp. pp. 130-3. The one exception is Curtius, whose description of events in Babylon is still apparently derived from Cleitarchus.

⁷ Diod. 18. 3. 2: *τὰς δὲ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν παραλειμμένας σατραπείας ἔδοξε μὴ κινεῖν, ἀλλ' εἶναι ὑπὸ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἡγεμόνας τεταγμένας*. Cf. Leuze, 458; Beloch, iv². 2. 312 f.

of new satraps falls Philotas' appointment to Cilicia and that of Laomedon of Mytilene to Syria.¹ In 323, then, Cilicia was separated from Syria, but the satraps appointed were new. Menes might have held office until Alexander's death. There is some evidence that the king's death turned his Successors' attentions from expansion to consolidation of the empire. The grandiose invasion preparations against Arabia were immediately shelved, and hostilities were diverted instead to Asia Minor. At Babylon Eumenes of Cardia was assigned Cappadocia and Paphlagonia, the area left untouched by Alexander in his march through Anatolia. Antigonos and Leonnatus, satraps of Greater and Hellespontine Phrygia, were given explicit orders to help him pacify his satrapy and unseat the local dynast, Ariarathes.² Since Perdikkas' attention was now focussed on the unpacified bottleneck of Cappadocia, it is not surprising that he planned hostilities against Lycaonia also, where Balacrus had met disaster in 331.³ In that context it would have been logical to launch operations from Cilicia also. An independent satrap of Cilicia was therefore a desideratum, and the area may well have been annexed from Syria to provide a more convenient launching pad for operations into the Taurus.⁴ It was the military factor which was paramount both in the amalgamation of Syria and Cilicia under Menes in 331 and in the redivision of the area in 323.

University of Western Australia

A. B. BOSWORTH

¹ Diod. 18. 3. 1; Arr. *Succ.* F 1. 5; Dexippus, *F. Gr. Hist.* 100 F 8. 2; Curt. 10. 10. 2; Just. 13. 4. 12. Laomedon had been at court as late as 326, when he was one of the trierarchs in the Indus fleet (Arr. *Ind.* 18. 4). If Philotas the satrap of Syria is identical with the Philotas present at the feast of Medius immediately preceding Alexander's death (Ps-Call. 3. 31. 8; cf. R. Merkelbach, *Die Quellen des gr. Alexanderromans: Zetemata* ix [1954], 228; 130), his appointment to Cilicia must have been one of the new departures at Babylon.

² Plut. *Eum.* 3. 3 ff.; Diod. 18. 16. 1-3 (cf. 31. 19. 3-5); Just. 13. 6. 1.

³ The main assault on Isaura and Laranda was launched by Perdikkas from Cappadocia

(Diod. 18. 22. 1). It would not be surprising if there was a simultaneous assault up the Calycadnus valley from Cilicia to the south.

⁴ The presence of Craterus in Cilicia with his 10,000 veterans also posed a ticklish problem (Diod. 18. 4. 1; 12. 1; 16. 4: cf. R. M. Errington, *J.H.S.* xc [1970], 55 ff., and my own observations, *C.Q.* xxi [1971], 130). This was a large and uncommitted force, posing a threat to the Babylon settlement. Philotas is known to have been sympathetic to Craterus (cf. Arr. *Succ.* F 25. 2), and one of his assignments in Cilicia may well have been to reconcile Craterus to the new dispensation.