

## ALEXANDER AND AFRICA (332-331 BC AND BEYOND): THE FACTS, THE TRADITIONS AND THE PROBLEMS

Daniel Ogden  
University of Exeter  
Academic Associate, University of South Africa

This survey lays out the main facts and problems of Alexander's principal associations with Africa, in life, in death and in the imagination of the later ancients (it does not venture into the realm of so-called Reception Studies). Of the themes inevitably treated here two above all, the foundation of Alexandria and the visit to Siwah, are well established chestnuts of Alexander scholarship, and will be handled rather more circumspectly than they might otherwise be. The shadow of Ptolemy, both as a rival actor and as a re-packager of the deeds of Alexander, in the development of political propaganda and the writing of history alike, hangs over much of the discussion.

### The annexation of Egypt

Alexander recognised that he could achieve nothing against the large and powerful Persian fleet by sea, and so his strategy was to fight it by land, that is, by securing the ports on the Persian Empire's Mediterranean seaboard and denying the fleet access to them. This was the reason for the drawn-out sieges of Tyre, with the best port of the eastern Mediterranean, and then of Gaza, on Egypt's doorstep. Egypt's own ports were the end-point of this strategy. Although the Persian fleet disintegrated in the course of the siege of Tyre, the danger of reconstitution remained so long as the empire retained control of good ports.<sup>1</sup>

Economic considerations may also have played a part from the first. Hölbl holds that Alexander had to integrate Egypt into the east-Mediterranean empire he had hitherto constructed simply in order to retain its economic coherence. This may well be, but Alexander may more simply

---

<sup>1</sup> Alexander's general strategy: Ehrenberg 1926:8-10; Seibert 1972a:109-11; Strauss 2003:149-52; Cartledge 2004:118-19; Heckel 2008:65-67; a dissenting line at Bloedow 2004. Alexander had disbanded his own allied fleet at Miletus in 334 BC as useless against the Persian fleet and a drain upon expenses: Arr. *Anab.* 1.20.1.

have looked upon Egypt's famed wealth as a desirable prize in itself for his war fund.<sup>2</sup>

He also had every reason to suppose that Egypt would fall to him easily once he had reached it, as indeed proved to be the case. The original satrap, Sauaces, had been killed at Issus, together with the bulk of the Persians' Egyptian garrison, and one Mazaces was now satrap in a land denuded of troops.<sup>3</sup> He may not have been Darius' first choice to take over. In 333 BC, the year before Alexander's march upon Egypt, the rebel Macedonian and mercenary leader Amyntas, son of Antiochus, had brought a force of 4 000 Greek mercenaries who had fought on the Persian side at Issus to Pelusium and captured it. He had claimed that Darius had dispatched him to Egypt as general (*strategos*) to take command of the country in place of Sauaces. The native Egyptians had initially welcomed him enthusiastically and then helped him destroy such Persian troops as remained in their country, but he forfeited sympathy when he allowed his troops to plunder Memphis, and both they and he were consequently annihilated.<sup>4</sup> Whether or not Amyntas' initial claim, evidently soon abandoned, to carry Darius' authority had been genuine, his experiences in the land were promising for a Graeco-Macedonian force of so much greater numbers and such superior discipline.

The lengthy siege of Gaza gave Alexander time to prepare for the march into Egypt across the 200 km of most difficult terrain that separated Gaza from Pelusium (Port Said), the fortress at the first, eastern-most branch of the Delta. This was the zone of desert, bog and quicksand that ever constituted Egypt's superb natural defence barrier, and was the graveyard of its would-be invaders many times before and afterwards. When the occasion for the march came, it was accomplished, seemingly without let or hindrance, in seven days, and Alexander arrived in Egypt in November 332 BC. How did he manage it? He had probably directed his Macedonian fleet to lay supply dumps along the coast in advance and then had the fleet keep pace with his army and rendezvous with it to supply it with water.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Hölbl 2001:9.

<sup>3</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 2.11.8; Diod. Sic. 17.34.5, 48.3; Curt. 3.11.10, 4.1.28.

<sup>4</sup> Diod. Sic. 17.48.3-5; Curt. 4.1.27-33, 7.1-2; Arr. *Anab.* 2.13.2-3. Heckel 2006: 23-24 (Amyntas [2]) and 2008:70 believes Amyntas' claim. For the restive state of Egypt at this time, as exemplified also by the revolt of Chababash, see Lane Fox 1973:194-95; Lloyd 1994:344-45; Burstein 2000.

<sup>5</sup> Curt. 4.7.2; Arr. *Anab.* 3.1.1; cf. Lane Fox 1973:194-95; Engels 1978:60; Bosworth 1980:261, 1988:69-70.

When Alexander arrived, the native Egyptians welcomed him as a liberator. Mazaces, with no means with which to resist, ordered Egypt's cities to receive him in friendly fashion, and he may also have given orders for Alexander's fleet to be admitted to the harbour of the Pelusium fortress.<sup>6</sup> It is usually assumed that he had been in touch with Alexander prior to his arrival; the siege of Gaza would have offered ample opportunity for negotiations.<sup>7</sup> If Alexander had doubted the financial advantage of appropriating Egypt, his anxieties will have been assuaged when Mazaces met him in person before Memphis and in the course of his formal surrender made the 800 talents in the local treasury over to him.<sup>8</sup>

### Alexander in Memphis and the question of his coronation

It is much debated whether Alexander was actually formally crowned Pharaoh at Memphis. Only a single source, the maverick and often highly fictive *Alexander Romance*, asserts that he was: 'When he arrived in Memphis, they [sc. the Egyptian prophets] enthroned him on the sacred throne of Hephaestus and dressed him as an Egyptian king.'<sup>9</sup> Certainly, Alexander accepted the formal royal titlature of the pharaohs, such as 'King of Upper and Lower Egypt', 'Son of Ra', 'Beloved of Amun', and in hieroglyphic inscriptions his name was enclosed in the royal cartouche: such are the texts we find in Amun's Luxor temple.<sup>10</sup> He also took on the role of the Pharaoh in making sacrifice to the Apis bull amid lavish Greek festivals.<sup>11</sup> In light of this, one has to wonder with what purpose Alexander would have avoided the crown.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 3.1.1-2; cf. Bosworth 1980:261.

<sup>7</sup> Cf., e.g. Bosworth 1994a:810.

<sup>8</sup> Curt. 4.7.4.

<sup>9</sup> *Alexander Romance* 1.34.2 (all references to the *Romance* are to the α recension, MS A, except where otherwise indicated). As Bosworth 1988:70-71 observes, the immediate context does not give cause for confidence: before the enthronement the prophets proclaim Alexander the new Sesonchosis; after it Alexander recognises his father in a statue of Nectanebo.

<sup>10</sup> For the texts see Abd El-Raziq 1984, esp. 11-22; cf. Collins 2009:200-03.

<sup>11</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 3.1.4; cf. Ehrenberg 1926:17-20; Bosworth 1988:70.

<sup>12</sup> In favour of the crowning: Wilcken 1967:114; Hamilton 1969:66-67, 1973:74; Green 1970:269; Fraser 1972:1.3; Lane Fox 1973:196 (but a more equivocal stance at 212); Schachemeyr 1973:236; Koenen 1977:30-31; Mastrocinque 1987-1988; Huss 2001:58; Grainger 2007:78; Heckel 2008:71-72; Stoneman 2008:8 and, emphatically, Bowden in this volume. Against: Badian 1981:45; Bosworth

In order to cast the ostentatious act of Egyptian piety that the sacrifice constituted into deep relief, the myth was developed that Artaxerxes III, the Persian conqueror of Egypt a mere eleven years previously, had killed and eaten the Apis bull of his own day.<sup>13</sup> It is hard to imagine that Alexander did not visit the Apis bull itself in its Memphite temple in connection with the sacrifice.<sup>14</sup> He may also have travelled to Saqqara to visit the mortuary temple of the former Apis bulls.<sup>15</sup> It was the Apis of the mortuary temple, Osiris-Apis, that was to morph into Sarapis, the god that was to play such an important role from the first in the Alexandria of the Ptolemies, and eventually throughout the Greek and Roman worlds (see further on Sarapis below).

As to travels further afield from his Memphis base at this initial stage, Curtius (alone, but not implausibly) says that Alexander visited 'the interior' of Egypt from there, perhaps the Thebaid.<sup>16</sup>

### The foundation of Alexandria

One of the major problems of Alexander's African sojourn is the question of which came first, the foundation of Alexandria or the visit to Siwah. The tradition is split. Arrian and Plutarch place the foundation of Alexandria before Siwah, whereas Diodorus, Curtius, Justin, the *Alexander Romance*, the *Itinerarium Alexandri* and Orosius place Siwah before the foundation. The problem might seem partly soluble. Given that Alexander passed through the site of Alexandria, adjacent to the Canopic mouth of the Delta, its western edge, *en route* to Siwah (from Memphis) and – almost certainly – passed through it again on his way back from Siwah to Memphis, he may well have engaged in foundational reflection or activities both before and after Siwah, as Bosworth has noted.<sup>17</sup>

---

1988:70-71, 1994a:810; Burstein 1991:141; Hölbl 2001:9-10 (insofar as I can divine his meaning); Jouanno 2002:67; Worthington 2004:115-16; Collins 2009 esp. 181-86 (a careful and sophisticated argument).

<sup>13</sup> This was a symbolic fantasy constructed by the Egyptian priestly classes, as was the claim, accepted by Hdt. 3.27-30, that in the former Persian invasion Cambyses had done the same. Cf. Lane Fox 1973:196; Bosworth 1980:262, 1988:70.

<sup>14</sup> Hdt. 2.153 and Strabo, C807 (= 17.1.31) provide descriptions of the sanctuary.

<sup>15</sup> So Wilcken 1922-1937:1.25-29.

<sup>16</sup> Curt. 4.7.5; cf. Ehrenberg 1926:21; Bosworth 1988:71.

<sup>17</sup> Alexandria first, then Siwah: Plut. *Alex.* 26.3-10; Arr. *Anab.* 3.1-2. Siwah first, then Alexandria: Diod. Sic. 17.52; Curt. 4.8.1-6; Justin 11.11.13; *Alexander Romance* 1.30-31; Amyntianus, *Fragmentum Sabbaiticum*, FGrH 151 §§10-11; *Itine-*

But the first difficulty that then remains lies in Arrian's observation that whereas Aristobulus took Alexander back from Siwah the way he had come, along the coast and therefore through the site of Alexandria, Ptolemy took him back to Memphis directly through the desert. It seems unlikely that Alexander would have attempted such a long desert-bound route, especially after his difficulties with the shorter desert-bound route on the way coming (although such difficulties might, in theory, have been so irksome that they persuaded him to try a different route of any kind on the way back).<sup>18</sup> Borza has noted, however, that Arrian may contradict himself on what Ptolemy said when he observes, of the miraculous snakes of the Libyan desert that saved Alexander *en route* to Siwah, that Ptolemy claimed that they had also led him back again *opiso authis*, which does indeed seem to imply a return the same way.<sup>19</sup> And Bosworth has argued strongly that Arrian has misinterpreted an elliptical statement on Ptolemy's part that referred to Alexander returning from Siwah to Memphis without going into the actual details of the route taken.<sup>20</sup> But even on this reasonable line of interpretation, we must conclude that Ptolemy, by far the best placed of all our sources to know the truth about the foundation of Alexandria and its relationship to Siwah, should he be minded to impart it, placed the foundation of Alexandria prior to Siwah.<sup>21</sup>

The second difficulty we then face is that Alexandria's formal foundation date, 25 Tybi, is equivalent to 7 April (331 BC). It therefore falls in the early spring, shortly before Alexander left Egypt to return to the Persian campaign, and so on that basis must have come after Siwah. Why would Ptolemy pass over the occasion of the formal foundation of the city,

---

*rarium Alexandri* 49-50; Orosius 3.16.14. Amongst the scholarship, Alexandria, then Siwah: Wilcken 1967:117; Hamilton 1969:66-68, 1973:74; Fraser 1972:1.3-7, 2.2-3 n. 6; Lane Fox 1973:197, 218; Bosworth 1976:137-38, 1980:263-64, 1988:72-74. Siwah, then Alexandria: Welles 1962; Borza 1967; and in Wilcken 1967:335; Hamilton 1969:67; Heckel 2006:13. Discussion also at Bagnall 1979.

<sup>18</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 4.5, incorporating Aristobulus *FGrH* 139 F15 and Ptolemy *FGrH* 138 F9.

<sup>19</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 3.3.5 = Ptolemy *FGrH* 138 F8; Borza 1967.

<sup>20</sup> Bosworth 1976:136-38, 1980:274.

<sup>21</sup> Welles 1962:280 does well to ask whether Ptolemy actually accompanied Alexander to Egypt or to Siwah. We have no proof that he did either, but sight of Egypt at any rate would explain his determination to grab the land for himself at Babylon; cf. Cohen 2006:361. Howe in this volume contends that Ptolemy did indeed seriously misrepresent the circumstances of Alexandria's foundation in order to magnify the importance for Alexander and, more to the point, himself.

however cursorily it was performed?<sup>22</sup> The city was not built on virgin land, or in a spot the significance of which Alexander was the first to perceive. The harbour at Pharos had already been praised in the *Odyssey*, in a passage which, Plutarch tells, inspired Alexander in his choice.<sup>23</sup> Prior to Alexander, the Egyptians had been maintaining a settlement of some sort there with a fortified port, which, Strabo claims, they had been using to deter illegal imports, from Greeks in particular.<sup>24</sup> Carbon 14 dates the remnants of a wooden jetty to c. 400 BC. The meagre amounts of pre-Alexander Greek pottery associated with the site are insufficient to demonstrate either the presence of Greeks at the port or indeed the port's specialisation in trade with Greece. The Egyptian development, together with the advantages of the adjacent lake Mareotis, must have done much to establish the location's potential for Alexander. Strabo and others tell us that the site had previously been named Rhacotis. However, it is now often contended that the Egyptian base of this term, Raqote, signified 'building site' and so was in fact the term used by local members of the indigenous population to denote the massive construction site that constituted early Alexandria, a conclusion perhaps also pointed to by the earliest attested use of the Egyptian term in connection with the Alexandria site, which is on the Satrap Stele of 311 BC.<sup>25</sup>

The city's function appears to have been primarily commercial: a means of converting Egypt's vast natural wealth more efficiently into cash. Several have suggested that Alexander intended to divert the trade that had gone through the now destroyed Tyre through Egypt, but was disappointed by the relatively inaccessible Greek trading post of Naucratis and so determined to build a replacement for it on the seaboard.<sup>26</sup> Bosworth appealingly suggests that the main motivation for the creation of the city may have come not from Alexander himself, but from the Greeks long

---

<sup>22</sup> *Alexander Romance* 1.32; Fraser 1972:1:4; Bagnall 1979; Bosworth 1988:74, 1994a:811; Hölbl 2001:10.

<sup>23</sup> Homer *Odyssey* 4.354-55; Plut. *Alex.* 26.

<sup>24</sup> Strabo, C792 (= 17.1.6); on this text see Alston 1998; Rutherford 2000.

<sup>25</sup> Strabo, C792 (= 17.1.6); Plin. *HN* 5.62; Paus. 5.21.9; *Alexander Romance* 1.31, etc. The Satrap Stele: Cairo, Egyptian Museum no. 22182; text at Sethe 1904:14. For the technical evidence alluded to in this paragraph see Fraser 1972:1.5-6, 2.9 n. 22; Lorton 1987; Green 1996:11; Bosworth 1988:72, 246; Goddio 1998:29-31; Chaveau 1999; Depauw 2000; Hölbl 2001:10, 29 n. 2a; Baines 2003; Cohen 2006:363 n. 6; McKenzie 2007:37-38, 40, 382 n. 4.

<sup>26</sup> Hogarth 1915; Ehrenberg 1926:21-23; Wilcken 1967:116-18; Green 1970:270-71; Hamilton 1973:74. Cf. Seibert 1972a:112-13.

established in Egypt and restless under the legal and zonal trading restrictions placed upon them by the Egyptians and indeed the Persians.<sup>27</sup> The *Alexander Romance* tells that Alexander ordered all those that lived within thirty Roman miles (i.e. roughly 45 km) of the city to leave their homes and take parcels of land in it.<sup>28</sup> But whatever the motivation, the foundation of Alexandria was a momentous act for Alexander and yet more so for the Near East, for it was the first of many such Hellenic city-foundations by Alexander himself and his Successors across the region, and the first great act in pushing Hellenism out beyond its traditional borders.<sup>29</sup> Alexander himself ordained the path of its circuit walls and appointed the sites for the agora and the temples (mainly for Greek deities), though it was Dinocrates of Rhodes that was given the task of making the new city a reality.<sup>30</sup> The traditions surrounding the foundation boast a number of romantic high-points. First, the omen of the barley. The story is preserved in quite a range of variations. According to the canonical one, the architects fell short of chalk when marking out the circuit of the city for Alexander, and so they used barley instead. A huge flock of birds from lake Mareotis then descended upon it and gobbled it down. On the basis of this omen, it was then predicted, either by Alexander himself or by Greek or Egyptian prophets, that the city was destined to be a rich one that would feed many. In Arrian's version, which he introduces in such a way as to suggest that he derives it from sources other than Ptolemy or Aristobulus, the birds do not appear. Rather, Aristander of Telmessus makes his prophecy on the basis of the accidental use of the barley alone.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Bosworth 1980:264-65, 1988:246; further discussion at Ehrenberg 1926:23-28; Cavenaille 1972:102-12; Fraser 1972:1.3-4, 7, 134; Schachermeyr 1973:256-57; Lane Fox 1973:198; Hölbl 2001:9-10.

<sup>28</sup> *Alexander Romance* 1.31.

<sup>29</sup> In founding the city Alexander may also have wished to compete with the legacy of his father, who had founded Philippi: so Lane Fox 1973:198; Bosworth 1988:247.

<sup>30</sup> Vitruvius 2 *preface* 4; Val. Max. 1.4 ext. 1; Solinus 32.41; Plin. *HN* 5.11.62, 7.37.125; *Alexander Romance* 1.31.6; cf. Bosworth 1980:265, 1988:74, 246; McKenzie 2007:40; Yardley *et al.* 2011:90-91. Tac. *Hist.* 4.83.1 seems to imply that the job of completing the walls largely fell to Ptolemy, as one might have expected; cf. Fraser 1972:1.12.

<sup>31</sup> The sources, in approximate chronological order, are: Strabo, C792 (= 17.1.6), Val. Max. 1.4 ext. 1; Curt. 4.8.6; Plut. *Alex.* 26.5-6; Arr. *Anab.* 3.2.1-2; Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀλεξάνδρεια (incorporating Jason of Argos); Amyntianus, *Fragmentum Sabbaiticum*, FGrH 151 §11; *Alexander Romance* 1.32.4; *Itinerarium Alexandri* 49;

We have no way of dating this tale (irrespective of variants) prior to its first attestation in Strabo, though the general breadth of its attestations suggests that it came into existence at a fairly early point. Bosworth opts plausibly for Clitarchus.<sup>32</sup> Perhaps it too might be taken as evidence for trade having been the city's primary purpose.

The second highpoint is Alexander's indirect encounter with the *Agathos Daimon* serpent. The *Alexander Romance* tells how this serpent repeatedly interrupted the work of the builders as they were beginning to construct Alexandria. Alexander gave orders that the serpent be killed (we sense a relic of a more full-blown dragon-slaying story here), but also that it then be given a *heroon* and worshipped, inaugurating the shrine on the same day as the city. The *Romance* implies that the serpent's cult was in some way associated with that of Alexander himself.<sup>33</sup> The cult of the *Agathos Daimon* serpent itself, at any rate, was almost certainly established during the reign of Ptolemy Soter, since the serpent was integrated into the Alexander Aegiochus statue-type that was developed in Alexandria as early as 320-300 BC, and that eventually came to decorate Alexander's tomb there.<sup>34</sup>

The third highpoint is Alexander's supposed foundation, or rather refoundation, of the cult of Sarapis. The  $\alpha$  recension of the *Romance* tells

---

Amm. Marc. 22.16.7; Eust. *Commentary on Dionysius Periegetes* 254. As with Siwah (for which see below), scholars protest the local verisimilitude of this animal behaviour: Le Roy 1981:403-04. Lib. *Or.* 11.90 tells a similar story about Seleucus' foundation of Antioch near Daphne: the line of the walls is marked out with grain, the positions of the towers with elephants (!); cf. Cohen 2006:360.

<sup>32</sup> Bosworth 1980:265-66. Unfortunately, the tale is not given by Curtius' frequent Cleitarchan partner: Diod. Sic. 17.52.3 would have been the place.

<sup>33</sup> *Alexander Romance* 1.32.5-7 and 10-13 ~ Armenian 86-88 Wolohojian 1969. For *Agathos Daimon*'s domestic avatars, see Phylarchus *FGrH* 81 F27 = Ael. *NA* 17.5 and Plut. *Mor.* 755e. For *Agathos Daimon* in general see Harrison 1912:277-316; Cook 1914-1940:2.2, 1125-29; Ganszyniec 1918 and 1919; Jakobsson 1925:151-75 and *passim*; Rohde 1925:207-08 n. 133; Tarn 1928; Taylor 1930; Fraser 1972:1.209-11 with associated notes; Quaegebeur 1975:170-76 and *passim*; Mitropoulou 1977:155-68; Dunand 1969, 1981, with bibliography; Pietrzykowski 1978; Le Roy 1981; Sfameni Gasparro 1997; Hillard 1998, 2010; Jouanno 2002:75-76, 105-08; Stoneman 2007:532-34, 2008:56-58. Ehrenberg 1926:26 took the *Romance* seriously and held that the cult was indeed founded by Alexander himself.

<sup>34</sup> Schwarzenberg 1976:235 with fig. 8; with Stewart 1993:247; Stoneman 2007:533.



how Alexander searched for the ancient and long-lost Sarapeum in accordance with an oracle given him by Ammon. As he made a lavish sacrifice on a great altar of his own construction a huge eagle flew down, snatched the victim's entrails and deposited them upon an abandoned altar, which turned out to belong to the lost temple.<sup>35</sup> It is believed, however, that the historical Alexander had nothing to do with the development of the cult of Sarapis. Rather, the cult, and perhaps the Alexander-themed mythology to go with it as well, were developed by Ptolemy.<sup>36</sup>

### The Siwah expedition

Alexander's visit to the oracle of Ammon (whom the Macedonians identified with Zeus) at Siwah, where he held an anomalous direct consultation with the god, is one of the most celebrated, but also mystifying and contentious episodes of his campaign.<sup>37</sup> Its initial purpose is occluded by the layers of mythology relating to the messages given to Alexander about his paternity. But he ought to have had a good reason for undertaking the journey. As Fredericksmeyer observes, 'Alexander took six weeks and several hundred miles to visit the oracle. We should think that his reasons were compelling.'<sup>38</sup> Let us consider the visit's possible original purposes in approximate order of practicality.

---

<sup>35</sup> *Alexander Romance* 1.33. For Sarapis see Visser 1938; Rowe 1946; Fraser 1960, 1967, 1972:1:246-59, with associated notes; Welles 1962; Stambaugh 1972; Hornbostel 1973; Castiglione 1978; Clerc & Leclant 1994; Dunand 2007:259-61.

<sup>36</sup> The earliest extant inscription to mention Sarapis is *OGIS* 21 of 277-278 BC. Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 361-62 offers a tale in accordance with which it is indeed Ptolemy that establishes the cult, following a prophetic dream in which he sees an image of the god's statue.

<sup>37</sup> The principal sources: Diod. Sic. 17.49-51; Strabo, C813-14 (= 17.1.43, incorporating Callisthenes, *FGrH* 124 F14a); Curt. 4.7.5-32; Plut. *Alex.* 26-28; Arr. *Anab.* 3.3-4; Justin 11.11; *Itinerarium Alexandri* 49-50. Discussion: Ehrenberg 1926:30-42; Larsen 1932; Mederer 1936:37-68; Fakhry 1944; Gitti 1951; Wilcken 1967:121-29; Hamilton 1969:68-71; Seibert 1972a:116-25; Brunt 1976-1983:1.467-80; Bosworth 1977, 1980:269-75, 1988:71-74; Kienast 1987-1988; O'Brien 1992:87-91; Fredericksmeyer 2003:270-74; Cartledge 2004:265-70; Collins 2009; Ogden 2011:21-26, 77-8, and Bowden in this volume. For the location of Siwah, see Talbert 2000 map 73, C4.

<sup>38</sup> Fredericksmeyer 2003:270.

(1) The most practical potential purpose is one that goes unmentioned in any of the ancient sources: Siwah was not, after all, the primary goal of the expedition that struck out from the site of Rhacotis-Alexandria. The primary goal was rather surveying and securing the coast as far as Paraetonium (Mersah Matruh), some 300 km to the west. A number of considerations might be cited in support of this notion. On first principles, any major action undertaken by Alexander – at any rate the early Alexander – should have had a purpose that was either military in itself or ancillary to the military. That Paraetonium may have been a goal in its own right may be indicated by the fact that it is situated 15 km beyond the usual turn-off point for Siwah on the coastal route.<sup>39</sup> Furthermore, Alexander met with Cyrenean envoys halfway along the coastal route to Paraetonium, as Diodorus stipulates, and formed an alliance with them: this indeed looks like an attempt to secure the coast as far west as their city.<sup>40</sup> As we will see below, Alexander may have declared war on Carthage in the course of the siege of Tyre. These actions could be seen as taking Alexander's sphere of influence almost, as it were, up to Carthage's front door. It is inconceivable – isn't it? – that Alexander may originally have set off along the coast with an unrealistic notion of the distance to Carthage and the ambition of attacking it there and then, until undeceived by the Cyreneans. If it were conceivable, Siwah might then have served as a revised, face-saving destination.

Now, if security (or aggression) were the primary goals of the western expedition, then one would still need to find a reason for the digression to Siwah (on the probable assumption that Siwah itself could not also be regarded as security goal), and for this one must turn to the possibilities lower down this list. But in that case, the degree of digression involved was rather less (for all that the oracle remained a further 300 km distant inland), and less need have seemed to be at stake in the making of the

---

<sup>39</sup> Thus Lane Fox 1973:204. Of course, it may well have been worth the detour to replenish supplies, and Diod. Sic. 17.49.3 does stipulate that Alexander took up water supplies before leaving the coast and heading inland.

<sup>40</sup> Diod. Sic. 17.49.2-3. Curt. 4.7.9 says, rather more cursorily, that Alexander had met the envoys already at Lake Mareotis (i.e. the Alexandria site). See Wilcken 1967:123 (with Borza's note at 335); Bosworth 1988:72. Ptolemy's first act as satrap of Egypt was to bring Cyrene directly under his control (322-321 BC): Diod. Sic. 18.21.6-9; Arr. *Succ.*, *FGrH* 156 F9.17-18; *Parian Marble*, *FGrH* 239 B10-11; *SEG* ix.1 (the *diagramma* of Cyrene); cf. Hölbl 2001:14-15. The Cyrenean angle holds some appeal for Bowden in this volume.

decision to embark upon the digression (Alexander did not know he was going to get lost in the desert).

(2) Alexander had already determined upon the foundation of Alexandria and went to the oracle to seek divine validation for the foundation, just as the *Alexander Romance* asserts. In this case the Ammon oracle will have been chosen for its great authority, despite its remoteness.<sup>41</sup>

(3) Alexander wished to be endorsed as the true Pharaoh of Egypt and to have the god guarantee, in his own voice, the official titles that the Egyptians had already bestowed upon him at Memphis, in particular, it might be thought, that of 'Beloved of Amun'.<sup>42</sup>

(4) Alexander wished to reassure the Macedonian aristocracy that the destabilising issue of Philip's murder was now closed and that they need no longer live in fear of purges, and hence, according to Diodorus, Curtius and Plutarch, asked if he had revenged himself upon all his father's (i.e. Philip's) murderers.<sup>43</sup> If this or the following reason was the primary one for Alexander's visit to Ammon, then the motivation for choosing the Ammon oracle must have been because Ammon had some special appeal for Alexander and the Macedonians. The Macedonians were indeed already familiar with the oracular Ammon much closer to home, at Aphytis.<sup>44</sup>

(5) As Diodorus, Curtius and Plutarch (and Justin too) also indicate, Alexander wished to secure the validation of the oracle for the remainder of his Asian campaign and the reassurance of destined success in it.<sup>45</sup> In the course of his subsequent description of Alexander's Indian campaign,

---

<sup>41</sup> *Alexander Romance* 1.30; cf. Welles 1962:281-82; Borza's note at Wilcken 1967:336; Cohen 2006:360-61; McKenzie 2007:39.

<sup>42</sup> So Hölbl 2001:10-11; Heckel 2008:72; cf. also Bowden in this volume.

<sup>43</sup> Thus Diod. Sic. 17.51.2-3; Curt. 4.7.27; Plut. *Alex.* 27; Justin 11.11.9; cf. Heckel 2008:73.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Lane Fox 1973:202-03; Bosworth 1988:71; Hölbl 2001:10; Ogden 2011:25 (with further references).

<sup>45</sup> Thus Diod. Sic. 17.51.2; Curt. 4.7.26; Plut. *Alex.* 27; Justin 11.11.10. Cf. Green 1970:272, 429; Lane Fox 1973:210; O'Brien 1992:88; Fredericksmeier 2003:271.

Arrian states that Alexander was in the habit of making sacrifices to the gods that Ammon had advised him to, inevitably to achieve success.<sup>46</sup>

(6) Alexander did from the first wish to inquire into the matter of his divine birth or, as Arrian carefully stipulates, his dual paternity.<sup>47</sup> Perhaps, more particularly, he wished to confirm the lesser oracle at Branchidae's assertion that he was born of Zeus, if he had been informed of this before starting the Siwah expedition.<sup>48</sup> It is also possible that, as an Argead (Old Macedonian) king, Alexander felt a special affinity with the ram-god Ammon, given the role of 'lesser flocks' in the Herodotean version of the Argead dynasty's foundation myth (which is attested in a number of variant forms).<sup>49</sup> The source tradition focuses most strongly upon the theme of Alexander's quest for his paternity, and the oracle's confirmation of it, but it is impossible to know how much of this is retrospective. Diodorus, Curtius and Plutarch (after Cleitarchus?) famously tell that the prophet of Ammon addressed Alexander, on behalf of the god, as *o pai* ('O son') or *o pai Dios* ('O son of Zeus') and that Alexander took this as a meaningful omen for himself.<sup>50</sup> But this tale must be compared with Zeus' portentous words in the fragment from the prologue of Euripides' tragedy *Archelaus* of 408/407 BC. Here, as it seems, Zeus tells the infertile Temenus that he has somehow contrived to sire a son for him, the Macedonian founder Archelaus to be: *o pai* ('O son'), again. The Ammon story therefore seems to appeal to a Macedonian tradition established long before the king's birth. We must conclude either that it was untrue or that the prophet had been most carefully primed before he spoke.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 6.19.4; cf. Xen. *An.* 3.1.6. Cf. Hamilton 1973:77.

<sup>47</sup> Callisthenes, *FGrH* 124 F14a; Curt. 4.7.25; Plut. *Alex.* 27; Arr. *Anab.* 3.3.2; Justin 11.11.1-8; *Itinerarium Alexandri* 50.

<sup>48</sup> As Callisthenes, *FGrH* 124 F14a perhaps implies. Cf. Hamilton 1973:77; Lane Fox 1973:219; Bosworth 1980:270-71, 1988:71, 1994b:872; Hölbl 2001:11-12 and Pownall in this volume.

<sup>49</sup> Hdt. 8.137-39. Cf. Ogden 2011:57-78.

<sup>50</sup> Diod. Sic. 17.51.1-2; Curt. 4.7.25; Plut. *Alex.* 27 (the most elaborated account). Cf. Callisthenes, *FGrH* 124 F14a.

<sup>51</sup> Eur. *Archelaus* F228a *TrGF* = *P.Hamburg* 118a, with Ogden 2011:77-78. Justin 11.11.6 speaks not merely of priming, but actually of bribery.

(7) Alexander wished to make the trip to project himself into the footsteps of the heroic ancestor of the Argeads, Heracles.<sup>52</sup> Callisthenes asserted that Alexander went to Siwah in emulation of both Heracles and Perseus.<sup>53</sup> Heracles' fabled encounter with Ammon, albeit at his temple in Egyptian Thebes, not at Siwah itself, is spoken of at length by Herodotus.<sup>54</sup> There is no sign of a tradition of Perseus' visit to Ammon at Siwah (or indeed Thebes) prior to Alexander, and Callisthenes may well have invented it retrospectively because of Perseus' usefulness as a figure for bridging east and west: born in Argos, the heart of old mythical Greece, he had contrived to become the eponymous ancestor of the Persians.<sup>55</sup>

(8) The importance of Alexander's encounter with Ammon may ultimately have lain in its mode rather than in the questions asked or the answers given. Callisthenes specified that Alexander was admitted to the god's inner sanctum for a direct encounter with the god, implying that he did not have to make do just with the usual public divination method, which depended upon the 'automatic' veering of a bejewelled *omphalos* that embodied the god as it was borne in a litter by tottering priests.<sup>56</sup> As such, Alexander seems to have achieved a goal aspired to by the magicians of Egypt's Greek magical papyri and by Egyptian priest-sorcerers and their clients in later Greek literature: a *systasis*, a direct, one-to-one encounter with the god in which he exposes his mysteries to a privileged mortal. So it is that Lucian's Egyptian sorcerer Pancrates (the sorcerer of his original tale of the Sorcerer's Apprentice) received personal instruction from Isis in a crypt (*adyton*) for 23 years; so it is that Thessalus of Tralles received similar, albeit briefer, personal instruction on the astrologically determined medicinal powers of plants on a one-to-one basis from Asclepius, whilst sealed into a chamber with him by an Egyptian chief-priest; and so it was

---

<sup>52</sup> Lane Fox 1973:200; Bosworth 1980:269-70, 1988:71, 1994a:810; O'Brien 1992:88; Fredericksmeier 2003:270-71; Cartledge 2004:267-68; Bloedow 2004; Worthington 2004:116-17. Lane Fox notes that Alexander had already demonstrated his preparedness to digress from his route for the sake of his interest in heroes: he had done so to visit Troy. Bloedow goes so far as to contend that this was Alexander's reason for entering Egypt, let alone travelling to Siwah.

<sup>53</sup> Callisthenes, *FGrH* 124 F14a.

<sup>54</sup> Hdt. 2.42.

<sup>55</sup> So Lane Fox 1973:201; Bosworth 1980:270; Ogden 2008:114-15.

<sup>56</sup> Callisthenes, *FGrH* 124 F14a; for the normal divination method at Siwah see Diod. Sic. 17.50.6-7 and Curt. 4.7.23-24. Cf. Lucian *Syr. D.* 36 for a similar divination method at Hierapolis. Cf. Hölbl 2001:11 and Bowden in this volume.

that Alexander's own mother, Olympias, according to the *Alexander Romance*, sought a one-to-one encounter with Ammon under the tutelage of Nectanebo.<sup>57</sup> It is entirely compatible with these texts that the subjects of Alexander's actual conversation with the god should have remained unknown, just as Arrian stipulates that they did.<sup>58</sup>

The story of Alexander's troubled journey to Siwah was enlivened already in Callisthenes (whom Timaeus accused of flattery in the matter), by the tale that he and his army had been rescued from the desert and brought back to the path by a pair of crows.<sup>59</sup> Arrian tells us that Ptolemy, in his account, replaced the crows with a pair of talking serpents: no doubt his purpose was to salute at once the *Agathos Daimon* cult with which he had graced Alexandria (discussed above), and also Alexander's serpent sire, which had conveniently saved his own life too, when he lay dying in India.<sup>60</sup>

### The organisation of Egypt

Arrian outlines the arrangements Alexander left in place for the administration of Egypt after his departure.<sup>61</sup> He observes that Alexander 'is said' to have distributed the government of Egypt between many officers because he marvelled at the nature and defensibility of the land, and for that reason did not think it safe to give into the charge of a single man. Whether the unattributed observation derived from Ptolemy or not

---

<sup>57</sup> Systasis in *PGM*: e.g. *PGM* 4.778-829, 930-1114; 7.505-28; cf. *PGM* Vol. 3 s.vv. *σύνιστημι* B and *σύστασις*. The literary sources: Lucian *Philops.* 34; Thessalus of Tralles, *De virtutibus herbarum* 21-25; *Alexander Romance* 1.6-7.

<sup>58</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 3.4.5.

<sup>59</sup> Polyb. 12.12b.2 (incorporating Callisthenes, *FGrH* 124 T20 and Timaeus, *FGrH* 566 F155); Strabo, C814 (= 17.1.43, incorporating Callisthenes, *FGrH* 124 F14a and Timaeus?); Plut. *Alex.* 27 (incorporating Callisthenes, *FGrH* 124 F14b); Arr. *Anab.* 3.3.4-6 (incorporating Ptolemy, *FGrH* 138 F8 and Aristobulus, *FGrH* 139 F13-15); Diod. Sic. 17.49.5; Curt. 4.7.15; *Itinerarium Alexandri* 21.

<sup>60</sup> Diod. Sic. 17.103.4-8; Curt. 9.8.22-28; Cic. *Div.* 2.135 (the last for the healing snake's identity with Alexander's siring snake); discussion in Ogden 2011:29-56. Alexander scholars tend to insist that the desert around Siwah is genuinely infested with crows and snakes alike; e.g. Lane Fox 1973:205-06; Bosworth 1980: 272-73, 1988:72.

<sup>61</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 3.5; cf. Curt. 4.8.4-5. Discussion at Ehrenberg 1926:42-54; Lane Fox 1973:525; Bosworth 1980:275-78.

(Brunt doubts it), he was certainly to heed the lesson of it.<sup>62</sup> And the observation, which also explains many of Alexander's dispensations outside Egypt too, is indeed borne out by the details Arrian supplies. The military organisation remained firmly under the control of the Companions: they were appointed to be generals of the armies, commanders of the garrisons at Pelusium and Memphis and admiral of the fleet. An Aetolian Greek, Lycidas, was appointed commander of the mercenaries, presumably the mainly Greek mercenaries that had been employed by the Persians, but he was fenced around with Companions: he had two Companion 'overseers' (*episkopoi*) and a Companion secretary.<sup>63</sup>

Given full Macedonian control of the armed forces, the civilian administration could safely, Alexander may have initially thought, be relinquished to other ethnicities. The two central kingdoms of Upper and Lower Egypt were given into the hands of native Egyptians Doloaspis and Petisis with the titles of (higher) nomarchs.<sup>64</sup> Arrian tells that Petisis gave up the office and that Doloaspis thenceforth took over charge of both Egypts. Both events may suggest that little real power attached to the roles. The outer territories to the west and the east were given into the hands of Egypt-based Greeks, the Libyan zones to Apollonius son of Charinus, and the Arabian zones to Cleomenes of Naucratis.<sup>65</sup>

But the wily Cleomenes managed to triumph over the rest of the team, and was perhaps permitted to do so because, as a mere bourgeois, he could

---

<sup>62</sup> Brunt 1976-1983:1.237.

<sup>63</sup> Bosworth 1980:276, 1988:234-35 reads Arrian to mean that the overseers exercised oversight rather over the work of the higher nomarchs Doloaspis and Petisis. His arguments carry some force, but his objection that four officers were too many for the mercenaries might be countered with the point that the mercenaries had hitherto, as it seems, been in the employ of Persia and that mercenaries were in any case dangerously volatile by nature. Lane Fox 1973:525 makes the interesting suggestion that Lycidas may have needed a secretary because he was illiterate, but it was surely a waste of a Companion to assign him to the role of a mere amanuensis.

<sup>64</sup> Lane Fox 1973:525, followed by Stewart 1993:90 and Hölbl 2001:12, holds, in contradiction of Arrian's explicit affirmation, that Doloaspis was a Persian, on the basis of the *-asp-* element in his name, and therefore a remnant of the former administration.

<sup>65</sup> For Cleomenes and his career see Van Groningen 1925; Berve 1926:2.210 n. 431; Ehrenberg 1926:50-54; Seibert 1969:39-51; Vogt 1971; Le Rider 1997; Burstein 2008; Yardley, Heckel & Wheatley 2011:90-1.

never aspire to establish a power-base independent of the king.<sup>66</sup> He was also given the job of collecting and disbursing the tax from Egypt's 42 constituent (lesser) nomes.<sup>67</sup> This was work in which he excelled, and by 323 BC it had allowed him to make himself the most powerful individual of all those embraced in the settlement, with Alexander eventually appointing him satrap.<sup>68</sup> When Ptolemy subsequently returned to Egypt to take over the role of satrap himself, he found that Cleomenes had been able to store up 8 000 talents in the treasury, as Diodorus tells.<sup>69</sup> This had evidently been accrued by means of some reprehensible practices that were brought to an end, Diodorus implies, by Ptolemy's more compassionate conduct. The Aristotelian *Economics* tells of Cleomenes making a monopoly of the Egyptian grain supply, paying the farmers what they asked, but then charging the merchants three times over the odds for it; it tells of the measures he would take to avoid having himself similarly swindled by his own intermediate agents; it tells of the swingeing duties he imposed on grain exports (admittedly in a time of relative scarcity within Egypt); it tells of the money he extorted from the priests and residents of Canopus so as not to transfer their market to Alexandria, before doing precisely that; it tells of the money he extorted from priests across the country by threatening to close down their temples; it tells of how he extorted gold from the priests of an unnamed nome by threatening to hunt down all their sacred crocodiles after one of them had killed one of his slaves.<sup>70</sup> The numismatic record tells us what the literary sources do not, namely that Cleomenes also established his own mint. This was almost certainly in Alexandria.<sup>71</sup>

A notorious and strikingly informative document of Alexander scholarship is a letter written by Alexander to Cleomenes shortly before his death

---

<sup>66</sup> So Bosworth 1988:234-35.

<sup>67</sup> The combination of offices may initially seem an improbable one, but it is paralleled in Ptolemaic Egypt: see Dittenberger at *OGIS* 2 n. 570 and Bosworth 1980:277.

<sup>68</sup> Paus. 1.6.3 and Dexippus *FGrH* 100 F8.2 explicitly assert that he had been appointed satrap by Alexander. He is satrap, too, at [Arist.] *Oec.* 1252a, whilst Dem. 56.7 applies the term *arxantos* to him. I am uncertain why Heckel 2006:89, with n. 223, should doubt that Cleomenes became satrap in Alexander's lifetime.

<sup>69</sup> Diod. Sic. 18.14.1.

<sup>70</sup> [Arist.] *Oec.* 1252a-b. The monopolisation of the grain is also referred to at Dem. 56.7.

<sup>71</sup> Fraser 1972:1.7, 2.10 n. 25; Lane Fox 1973:213; Bosworth 1988:234-35; Le Rider 1997; Cohen 2006:373 n. 28.



in 323 BC, which is cited and quoted by Arrian.<sup>72</sup> At this point Arrian re-introduces Cleomenes as a wicked man (*aner kakos*: the phrase is used twice) who had perpetrated many acts of injustice (*adikemata*) in Egypt. In the letter Alexander asks Cleomenes to build hero-shrines for the deceased Hephaestion, one in the city of Alexandria and one of particular magnificence on the Pharos island (at the point where the lighthouse was subsequently to stand). Hephaestion's name was also to be written into all trade contracts. Alexander then stipulates that if he finds the temples of Egypt, and in particular the shrines to Hephaestion, in good condition, he will pardon Cleomenes' former crimes and overlook his future ones. The letter tells us that by now Cleomenes was in full control of Egypt; that he was exercising direct control of the building programme in Alexandria, unsurprisingly so if he controlled the purse upon which it depended (the *Economics*' story of his transfer of the Canopus market indicates the same and Justin describes him in lapidary fashion as 'the man who built Alexandria');<sup>73</sup> that he exercised ultimate control over trade contracts, compatible with his fiscal brief; and that Alexander valued efficacy in administration rather more than its just conduct.

In the carving of the cake at Babylon after Alexander's death, Ptolemy seized for himself the satrapy that Cleomenes had worked so hard for, whilst Cleomenes was demoted to the role of his hyparch.<sup>74</sup> He did not live long to enjoy the demotion, however, as Ptolemy soon killed him on the suspicion that he was working for Perdikkas' cause, as well he might have been, under the circumstances.<sup>75</sup>

#### Alexander's ambitions for Carthage

Almost certainly, Alexander imagined that he would one day return to Africa in life, and possibly quite soon. As we have just seen, the assumption underlies his letter to Cleomenes. Did he cherish ambitions to conquer more of Africa, Carthage in particular?

---

<sup>72</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 7.23.6-8. Most accept that the letter is genuine: see Hamilton 1953:157; Vogt 1971; Bosworth 1988:235. The alternative is that the document originates in Ptolemy's black propaganda designed to support or justify his elimination of Cleomenes in 323 BC. Cf. Tarn 1948:2:303-06; Seibert 1972b.

<sup>73</sup> Justin 13.4.11.

<sup>74</sup> Arr. *Succ.*, *FGrH* 156, 1.5; Justin 13.4.11.

<sup>75</sup> Paus. 1.6.3.

Carthage and its people must have first seriously impinged upon his consciousness when a Carthaginian delegation became caught up in his siege of Tyre, their mother city, in 332 BC. Arrian tells that they had come to pay homage to Tyre's Melqart and were spared by Alexander. Curtius, in more detail, tells that the envoys urged the Tyrians to hold out on the basis that help would soon come from Carthage, and so fired them up to resist. Subsequently, a second embassy arrived from Carthage with the unfortunate news that she could do nothing for the Tyrians after all, being fully occupied with her own war against Syracuse. However, the Carthaginians were able to evacuate at least some of the Tyrians' wives and children for them. When Tyre fell, Alexander spared the (original) envoys, but added to his pardon a declaration of war upon their city, inevitably to be deferred in light of more pressing considerations.<sup>76</sup> The second embassy's apparent revelation of its city's weakness, genuine or not, may have pricked Alexander's ears, but it would seem to have been a strategic mistake to declare war if one not only had no immediate intention of acting on the declaration, but was also committed to striking off inland in the near future, leaving the Phoenician seaboard exposed to one's newly declared enemies.<sup>77</sup>

We have noted that a chief, and possibly the main, purpose of Alexander's expedition west from the site of Alexandria may have been to secure the North African coast up to the border of the Carthaginian realm.

Arrian, Diodorus and Justin report that amongst the many embassies Alexander received in Babylon in 324-323 BC to congratulate him on his victories, there came ones from Carthage, the Libyphoenicians and all the peoples that inhabited the North African coast as far as the Straits of Gibraltar. The Carthaginians and others, Justin notes, came out of a fear that they might in the future fall prey to Alexander's ambition. He draws attention again to their anxiety about Alexander's sack of Tyre, and also to their concern that Alexandria might come to rival Carthage. Together with Frontinus, Justin further reports an undated story of a Carthaginian agent, Hamilcar Rodanus (or Rodinus), infiltrating Alexander's camp to find out his plans by pretending to be an exile and joining the ranks.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 2.24.5; Curt. 4.2.10-12, 3.19-20, 4.18. On the evacuation see also Diod. Sic. 17.41.1-2; Justin 11.10.14.

<sup>77</sup> Bosworth 1980:254-55 (on Arr. *Anab.* 2.24.5) accordingly hesitates to believe in the declaration. Worthington 2004:110, 261 is readier to believe.

<sup>78</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 7.15.4; Diod. Sic. 17.133.2; Justin 12.13.1-2, 21.6.1-7; Frontin. *Str.* 1.2.3. On the 324-323 BC embassies in general, see Brunt 1976-1983:2.495-99.

Was Alexander indeed planning to attack Carthage at the time of his death? Diodorus, in material probably taken over from Hieronymus of Cardia, tells how Perdikkas discovered a series of grandiose plans in the king's notebooks (*hypomnemata*) after his death in Babylon in 323 BC. He laid them before the army assembly in order to have them set aside for their impracticality, and perhaps too, as Badian contends, to forestall rivals such as Craterus in producing spurious last plans of their own, and perhaps again to liberate his own rule from daily objections of the 'Alexander would have done it this way' variety. Of these plans, the greatest was to construct a thousand ships, bigger than triremes, in Phoenician Syria, Cilicia and Cyprus, with which to campaign against the Carthaginians and the others that lived along the coast of Libya and against those that lived on the coast of Iberia and against Sicily, in other words, against Carthage itself and its broader sphere of influence. He also planned to build a coast road along the length of Africa's Mediterranean seaboard right up to the Pillars of Heracles and to build ports and shipyards where needed to support such an expedition. It is also of African interest that he proposed to build a pyramid tomb for his father Philip on the scale of the Egyptian ones.<sup>79</sup> Though they have been doubted in the past, the consensus of current Alexander scholarship is that these plans should be taken in all seriousness, and the Tyrian episode at least lends them some plausibility.<sup>80</sup>

#### Alexander's return to Egypt in death

The tale of Alexander's final return to Egypt is beset by intriguing and insoluble mysteries. Control of Alexander's body and its fate upon his death at Babylon initially fell to Perdikkas, who emerged from the initial settlement as regent for Alexander's incapacitated half-brother Philip III

---

The  $\alpha$  recension of the *Alexander Romance* 1.30 remoulds the two major episodes into a new one: as Alexander crosses into 'Africa' the generals of the Africans meet him and supplicate him to stay away from their city. Alexander's disdainful response is that they should either acquire the strength to resist him or else pay him tribute. In the  $\beta$  recension the city acquires the curious name of (Spanish) Carthagena: African Carthage presumably lurks in both cases.

<sup>79</sup> Diod. Sic. 18.4. Arr. *Anab.* 7.1.2 lists the Libya-Carthage plan amidst a series of yet wilder ambitions foisted upon Alexander by other, unidentified historians.

<sup>80</sup> Thus Wilcken 1967:226 (with Borza's note at 343-44); Schachermeyr 1954; Badian 1968; Hamilton 1973:155; Lane Fox 1973:216, 476; Bosworth 1988:166; O'Brien 1992:218. *Contra*: Tarn 1948:2:378-98; Hampl 1953; Pearson 1960:261-62.

Arrhidaeus and his as yet unborn child, the future Alexander IV. At this precarious, consolidatory time Perdiccas had everything to gain from being seen to be the defender of the Argead blood and the upholder of cherished Argead traditions. One can well imagine, therefore, that Pausanias is right when he tells that the body's intended (sc. by Perdiccas) destination, when it finally left Babylon, was the ancient and traditional Argead royal cemetery at Aegae (Vergina) in Macedon, where Alexander would have rested alongside his father.<sup>81</sup> Justin tells that Perdiccas I had prophesied that his descendant successors must be buried at Aegae or else the throne would be lost to the Argead family.<sup>82</sup> This tale may have been concocted after the extermination of the Argeads, but it is also possible that it originated in Perdiccas' propaganda at this time.

Alexander's body had been embalmed by Egyptians and 'Chaldaeans',<sup>83</sup> but it did not leave Babylon until two years after his death, whilst a most elaborately decorated hearse was constructed for it, so heavy as to require 64 mules to draw it.<sup>84</sup> One suspects that the delay was not due simply to artistic perfectionism: Perdiccas might also have been waiting for what he felt to be the safest opportunity to release the body on its inevitably slow and painstaking journey home, or he might have been waiting for the point at which he felt he could give it to a reliable escort. If so, he was deceived.

Four sources tell broadly reconcilable stories about what happened next. Strabo speaks of Ptolemy 'diverting' the body to Egypt out of greed and his desire to appropriate the land. Pausanias speaks of Ptolemy 'persuading' the escort to hand the body over to him. Arrian rather focuses the responsibility for the diversion of the body onto the commander of its escort, the satrap Arrhidaeus (not to be confused with Philip III Arrhidaeus): it was he that left Babylon with the body without Perdiccas' leave, and (if he had not done so from the first) resolved to take the body to Egypt, once through Damascus. Perdiccas sent Polemon and Attalus to give chase. Although they were able to delay Arrhidaeus, they could not prevent him from achieving his goal. Perdiccas then attacked Egypt in person shortly afterwards with the aim of replacing Ptolemy as satrap with a man of his own and of recovering the body. He was to die in the attempt. Aelian preserves a marvellous, but heavily fictive, tale in which

---

<sup>81</sup> Paus. 1.6.3.

<sup>82</sup> Justin 7.2.1-4.

<sup>83</sup> Curt. 10.10.13.

<sup>84</sup> Diod. Sic. 18.26-28; the rich description is probably derived from Hieronymus of Cardia; discussion at Müller 1905; Stewart 1993:215-21.

Perdiccas and Ptolemy take the places of their respective agents: here Ptolemy steals the body from Babylon in person, and Perdiccas himself gives chase. He catches up with him, fights for the body and recovers it in its Persian carriage, or so he thinks. Only too late does he discover that Ptolemy has substituted a dummy: Ptolemy is by now too far ahead on the road with the real body to be caught again.<sup>85</sup>

The remainder of the relevant source tradition may be ascribed to the retelling of the Ptolemies and their proxies. Curtius reports that the dying Alexander expressed the desire to be buried at Siwah (not wholly implausible in itself).<sup>86</sup> Diodorus asserts that Alexander's cortège left Babylon with Siwah as its goal from the first, with Ptolemy coming in person to Syria (Damascus?) to receive it as a mark of respect, and then subsequently changing his mind about Siwah and retaining the body in Alexandria instead. Justin speaks of King Arrhidaeus (confusing the satrap with Philip III Arrhidaeus) being instructed (no agent supplied) to take Alexander's body from Babylon to Siwah.<sup>87</sup> These claims do not, of course, serve as a justification for the (ultimate) housing of the body in Alexandria, as they might have been expected to, but they may reflect an argument provisionally deployed by Ptolemy to get the body into his own sphere. The *Alexander Romance* speaks of a debate in Babylon, in which 'the Macedonians' wished to take the body back to Macedon, but tells that Ptolemy persuaded them to consult the oracle of Babylonian Zeus on the matter, which duly gave instruction that the body was to be taken to Memphis where Alexander was to be worshipped as the 'horned king'. As in Aelian's tale, it is then Ptolemy in person that escorts the body from Babylon itself. But once he has brought the body to Memphis, the chief

---

<sup>85</sup> Strabo, C794 (= 17.1.8); Paus. 1.6.3; Arr. *Succ.* 1.25 (*FGrH* 156 F9.25), 24.1-8 (*FGrH* 156 F10.1); Ael. *VH* 12.64. Discussion in Badian 1968; Seibert 1969:96-102, 110-12; Will 1979-1982:1.36-40; Bosworth 2002:12-13; Erskine 2002:170-71; Saunders 2006:33-34; Waterfield 2011:48-50. For the death of Perdiccas, see Diod. Sic. 18.33-36 and Strabo, C794.

<sup>86</sup> Badian 1968:186 believes that Perdiccas did initially intend to send the body to Siwah, but changed his plan two years later when the hearse was ready because Ptolemy was no longer an ally. Hölbl 2001:12 also takes Alexander's wish to be buried at Siwah seriously. Cf. Waterfield 2011:48 for the notion that Siwah was a fantasy constructed by Ptolemy. Perhaps the strongest indication that Alexander himself aspired to and was originally destined to receive an Egyptian burial is the fact that his corpse was mummified.

<sup>87</sup> Curt. 10.5.4; Diod. Sic. 18.3.5; Justin 13.4.6. Pollard & Reid 2006:21 follow Justin in confusing Arrhidaeus the satrap with King Philip III Arrhidaeus.

prophet commands him to take it rather to Alexandria because the body is destined to attract war and battles wherever it rests. Comparing the *Romance* story with the Curtian and Diodoran traditions, one suspects that Memphis may have supplanted an original Siwah as the initial destination.<sup>88</sup>

Such a supplanting of Siwah with Memphis may actually derive from something rarely associated with the *Romance*: a historical correction. Whilst Strabo, Diodorus and Aelian elide Memphis and simply assert that Ptolemy took the body to Alexandria,<sup>89</sup> Curtius tells that Ptolemy first took the body to Memphis and then, a few years later (*paucis post annis*), transferred it to Alexandria.<sup>90</sup> The *Parian Marble* speaks of Soter's burial of the body in Memphis, but has nothing to say – in its remaining portions at any rate – of its transfer to Alexandria.<sup>91</sup> But Pausanias asserts that Soter placed the body in Memphis before his successor Philadelphus transferred it to Alexandria.<sup>92</sup> Whichever Ptolemy actually made the transfer, it is possible that they had planned to deposit the body in Alexandria from an early stage, but had retained it in Memphis until the Rhacotis building site had become sufficiently presentable and was able to offer accommodation appropriate to the king's dignity.<sup>93</sup>

We learn from Strabo that Ptolemy placed Alexander's body in a golden sarcophagus in Alexandria, but that the sarcophagus was hacked up and melted down in 89 BC by Ptolemy X Alexander, one of the less impressive of the later Ptolemies, in order to pay the mercenaries he had hired to restore himself to power in defiance of the will of his own army and the population of Alexandria. The outraged Alexandrians thereupon expelled him again, this time for good, and an ignominious death soon followed. Alexander was then re-encased in a new sarcophagus of glass or alabaster.<sup>94</sup> But before this there had been a change in Alexander's outer accommodation. From Zenobius we learn that Ptolemy IV Philopator

<sup>88</sup> *Alexander Romance* 3.34.

<sup>89</sup> Strabo, C794 (= 17.1.8); Diod. Sic. 18.28.3-4 and Aelian, *Varia Historia* 12.64.

<sup>90</sup> Curt. 10.10.20.

<sup>91</sup> *Parian Marble*, FGrH 239 B11.

<sup>92</sup> Pausanias 1.6.3 and 1.7.1

<sup>93</sup> See Fraser 1972:1.15-16, 2.31-33 nn. 79-80; Hölbl 2001:15; Erskine 2002:171; Saunders 2006:52-54; Stoneman 2008:196.

<sup>94</sup> Strabo, C794 (= 17.1.8). *Alexander Romance* 3.32.16 (*Liber de morte*) also anticipates Alexander's enclosure within a golden coffin. Further details of the reprehensible Ptolemy IV's behaviour are to be found at Porphyry, FGrH 260 F2 and Justin 39.5.1. Discussion at Fraser 1972:1.15, 123.

constructed an elaborate burial complex for Alexander and the Ptolemies alike: the message of association and legitimation was clear.<sup>95</sup> As Strabo asserts that Alexander's site of burial had remained constant since he was brought to Alexandria by Ptolemy, we may assume that the bodies of the Ptolemies were brought to join him in his original position, and that he therefore only ever had one tomb-site in the city (it is hard to believe that the Ptolemies had ever been far distant). It was in this burial complex that Alexander's body was famously viewed by Octavian in 30 BC: he disdainfully refused to look at those of the Ptolemies surrounding Alexander (he had come to see a 'king', not 'corpses'), before carelessly breaking off part of Alexander's nose.<sup>96</sup> Strabo, who knew Alexandria in the 20s BC, describes the complex: he tells that it was known as a whole as the *Sōma*, literally 'Body', a synecdoche appropriately focusing on its most important constituent, and that it was located within the palace district.<sup>97</sup> The Neronian Lucan offers allusive descriptions of the tomb-complex: the Macedonian himself lies in a 'sacred cave' and an 'excavated cave', whilst the Ptolemies are enclosed in 'pyramids' and 'mausolea' of which they are unworthy. It is difficult to know how far one may press Lucan's scornful, colourful words. The plurals may be poetic. As such, Lucan may indicate that Alexander and the Ptolemies were enclosed together beneath a pyramid mausoleum, or a mausoleum of which a pyramid was the central feature, and that within this Alexander's resting place, at any rate, was in a subterranean vault.<sup>98</sup>

Strabo's information that Alexander's tomb lay within the palace district should be taken seriously and deserves the attention of the fantasists who continue to hunt for it in the basements of Alexandria's

---

<sup>95</sup> Zen. 3.94.

<sup>96</sup> Suet. *Aug.* 18; Dio Cass. 51.16.5 (nose).

<sup>97</sup> Strabo, C794 (= 17.1.8). Manuscripts of various authors indicate that the tomb(-complex) may also have been known as the *Sēma*, 'Burial Memorial.' In any case, the distinctive usage of the term *Sōma* may have developed under the pull of this second term. Discussion at Fraser 1972:2.7, 15-16, 2.32-33, 220-21; and Erskine 2002:164, 166-67.

<sup>98</sup> Luc. 8.692-99, 10.19. Cf. Fraser 1972:2.35 n. 83; Saunders 2006:72-78. The pyramid design had the virtue not only of saluting the local idiom, but also Alexander's own aborted last plan to build a full-scale pyramid tomb for Philip, as mentioned above (Diod. Sic. 18.4). McKenzie 2007:64-65 is strangely reticent on the form of the burial complex.

mosques.<sup>99</sup> With the bulk of the palace district, the site of the tomb now most probably resides beneath the waves of Alexandria's harbour, whither subsidence, earthquakes and tsunamis have delivered it.<sup>100</sup> Incredible as it may seem, however, the tomb may already have been lost and its location forgotten before the end of antiquity. The last secure reference to it comes in Herodian's account of Caracalla's visit in 215 AD.<sup>101</sup> Perhaps the tomb-complex was destroyed in the riots under Aurelian in c. 273 AD, which, according to Ammianus, left large tracts of the city desolate. In c. 400 AD, John Chrysostom could ask 'where is Alexander's tomb?'<sup>102</sup> We may never have Alexander's tomb, but it is likely that we already have what we would most have wanted from it, namely a selection of Alexander's treasures. Just about all now accept that Vergina's Tomb II belonged to Philip III Arrhidaeus, not Philip II, who resided rather in Tomb I with its fine Persephone fresco. It is surely more probable than not that some at least of the grave goods buried with Arrhidaeus were inherited directly from Alexander when he succeeded him at Babylon.

The body had work to do in Alexandria. It was not unusual for a founder's tomb to become a protective hero-shrine for his city.<sup>103</sup> Libyan Cyrene, along the coast, was famous for the tomb of its founder Battus, for example.<sup>104</sup> The only incontrovertible evidence for a founder-cult for

---

<sup>99</sup> Zenobius' vague reference at 3.94 to the tomb being 'in the middle of the city' should not be over-read, as Erskine 2002:164-66 correctly appreciates; cf. also Saunders 2006:72. It is not clear to me that Achilles Tatius 5.1 refers to Alexander's tomb in any shape or form; Saunders 2006:68-69 agrees but Stoneman 2008:197 takes a different view.

<sup>100</sup> For a review of some of these fantasies, see Fraser 1972:1.16-17, 2.36-41 n. 86; Seibert 1972a:115-16; Saunders 2006:147-75; Goddio & Fabre 2008:196-98. The impact of subsidence and earthquakes on the royal quarter: Fraser 1972:1.8-10; Goddio 1998; Saunders 2006:71, 101-02; Goddio & Fabre 2008 *passim*.

<sup>101</sup> Herodian 4.8.9.

<sup>102</sup> Amm. Marc. 22.16.15; Chrysostom *Or.* 26.12 at *PG* 61:581. Cf. Fraser 1972:1.10, 2.24 n. 47, 34-36 nn. 82, 84; Lane Fox 1973:478; Erskine 2002:178-79; Saunders 2006:104-06. It is not clear to me that Libanius' rhetorical flourish at *Or.* 49.11-12, in which he speaks of Alexandria's corrupt public officials putting Alexander's corpse on display, should be pressed for literal or contemporary (c. 390-391 BC) significance. Erskine 2002:165 doubts that the body was ever on public display.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. Erskine 2002:174.

<sup>104</sup> Catull. 7.6.



Alexander is found in an inscription as late as 120/121 AD.<sup>105</sup> But the notion of a founder-cult for him thrives in the later and more fictive literary tradition. First, in Aelian's largely invented story of Ptolemy's theft of Alexander's corpse from Babylon, his action is prompted by the prophet Aristander of Telmessus' prediction that whatever city received the body of this fortunate man would be fortunate in all regards and unsackable throughout the ages.<sup>106</sup> This notion is wittily (and not inaccurately) inverted by the *Alexander Romance's* native-Egyptian Memphite prophet, who asks for Alexander's body to be shipped out of Memphis to Alexandria on the basis that it is destined to bring carnage to the city in which it lies.<sup>107</sup> The latter sentiment is akin to that expressed in the *Oracle of the Potter* by the historical native Egyptians of the early Ptolemaic period: the oracle looks forward to the demise of Alexandria and the resurgence of Memphis as *Agathos Daimon* abandons the one for the other.<sup>108</sup> Secondly, the *Alexander Romance* speaks, obscurely, of sacrifices being made to Alexander in Alexandria as a 'serpent-born hero', seemingly in connection with the killing of *Agathos Daimon* at the time of the foundation.<sup>109</sup> At a much earlier stage, some point between 320 and 300 BC, the establishment of a statue-type for Alexander as founder also seems to speak of an underlying founder-cult: this was the Alexander Aegiochus, which incorporated the *Agathos Daimon* serpent coiling around an adjacent tree-trunk.<sup>110</sup> Almost certainly, the founder-cult was instituted by Ptolemy. And it certainly was Ptolemy that initiated the (separate) dynastic cult for Alexander, first attested in papyri of 285/284 BC, which indicate that it had been in existence since at least 290/289 BC.<sup>111</sup> This dynastic cult was subsequently expanded, much like Alexander's mausoleum, to embrace the dead Ptolemies too, and then again to embrace also the living ones.<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>105</sup> SB 3.6611; but cf. also the reference to 'land sacred to Alexander' at the Ptolemaic *P.Hal.* 242-45. Cf. Ehrenberg 1926:29; Fraser 1972:1:212, 2:360-61; Dreyer 2009:223.

<sup>106</sup> Ael. *VH* 12.64.

<sup>107</sup> *Alexander Romance* 3.34.

<sup>108</sup> For the *Oracle of the Potter* see Koenen 1968. Cf. Dillery 2004; Stoneman 2008:195-96; Ogden 2011:36-38.

<sup>109</sup> *Alexander Romance* 1.32.

<sup>110</sup> Schwarzenberg 1976:235 with fig. 8; Stewart 1993:247; Stoneman 2007:533; Ogden 2011:36.

<sup>111</sup> *P.Eleph.* 2; *P.Hibeh* 84a-b.

<sup>112</sup> Fraser 1972:1:213-46, with associated notes; cf. also Heinen 1995. In the background, of course, lies the complex debate about Alexander's aspirations to

### Alexander's legend in antiquity: Nectanebo and Sesonchosis

The earliest form of the traditional *Alexander Romance* that is directly accessible to us, that of the α recension, found its form c. 200 AD, though it incorporates material of much greater antiquity, and some even originating in the years directly after Alexander's death. The opening chapters strive to appropriate Alexander for Egypt. The last native-Egyptian Pharaoh, Nectanebo, flees Egypt as it falls to invaders, comes to Macedon and uses a combination of astrology, genuine magic and con trick to seduce Olympias whilst Philip is away on campaign. He then impregnates her, in the guise of Ammon, with the child that will grow to be Alexander, and return to Egypt to take his rightful place as Pharaoh. Ammon must have been working through him, despite his disreputable behaviour, for the remainder of the *Romance* is happy to regard Alexander as child of the god *tout court*. This wonderful conceit is usually thought to have emerged from the early Ptolemaic dynasty, as part of these kings' attempts to legitimate their own rule in Egypt before both the Graeco-Macedonians and the native Egyptians alike. The *Romance* appropriately closes the circle with the dying Alexander's dictation of his will, in which he bequeaths the rule over Egypt, to which he has acquired such strong title, to Ptolemy, by declaring him satrap.<sup>113</sup>

Native Egyptian literature of the early Ptolemaic period projects Nectanebo in ways that exhibit strong resonances with his role in the *Romance*. The prophecies of the *Demotic Chronicle* seemingly look forward to his return to Egypt in some form.<sup>114</sup> The *Dream of Nectanebo*, an originally Egyptian text that survives only in a fragmentary second-century BC Greek translation found at the Memphis Sarapeum, tells how Nectanebo prays for a divinatory dream and sees all the gods of Egypt gathered around an enthroned Isis in a papyrus boat. Onuris charges Nectanebo before Isis for failing to complete his temple at Sebennytus. Upon awakening, Nectanebo orders his best sculptor, Petesis, to complete the work, but instead of getting on with it he drinks and pursues a

---

divinity in his own lifetime, for which see Balsdon 1950; Seibert 1972a:192-206; Badian 1981; Bosworth 1988:278-90; Fredericksmeier 2003.

<sup>113</sup> *Alexander Romance* 1.1-14 (Nectanebo), 1.30 (Alexander as son of Ammon) and 3.32 (Ptolemy declared satrap of Egypt). For the roots of the *Romance* in Ptolemaic Alexandria, see Stoneman 2008:12.

<sup>114</sup> Bibliothèque Nationale Paris Pap. dem. no. 215 v, edited in Spiegelberg 1914, translated at Felber 2002:75-90. Cf. Johnson 1983; Stoneman 2008:16.

beautiful girl. At this point the papyrus breaks off, but presumably events culminated in the fall of Egypt to the Persians.<sup>115</sup> And the central motif of the *Romance's* Nectanebo tale is reminiscent, in a kaleidoscopic way, of the old Egyptian conceit that Pharaohs-to-be were sired upon the existing Pharaoh's queen by the god Ammon adopting his shape, whilst flooding the palace around with a divine fragrance.<sup>116</sup> The *Romance* uses other techniques, too, to pull Alexander into the Egyptian past, not least his repeated identification with Sesonchosis, the legendary Egyptian Pharaoh who had himself once, supposedly, conquered the world. This is the figure known to Herodotus as Sesostris and to Diodorus as Sesosis, and is vaguely reflective of the great Rameses II of the 13th century BC, whilst the name is probably borrowed from the Senwosret Pharaohs of the 20th and 19th centuries BC. In the early Ptolemaic period he became the subject of a Greek romance of his own, the so-called *Sesonchosis Romance*, which survives in papyrus fragments. In the *Alexander Romance* it is Sesonchosis' inscriptions that direct Alexander to honour Sarapis; the prophets of every Egyptian city proclaim Alexander 'the new Sesonchosis, world-conqueror'; Alexander encounters Sesonchosis in a divinised form in the Cave of the Gods, where he tells him that, unlike himself, he will be remembered; and the people of Memphis greet Alexander's corpse as it turns to Egypt as 'the semi-divine Sesonchosis'.<sup>117</sup>

#### Alexander's legend in antiquity: Ethiopia and Meroe

Curtius alone tells us that Alexander sailed up the Nile from Memphis to dispose matters in the interior of Egypt. If so, he cannot have gone far, or

<sup>115</sup> *P.Leiden* i 396 = P. d'Anastasy 67 = *UPZ* i 81. Translation at Maspéro 1967: 239-42. See Koenen 1985; Spalinger 1992. The inconstant Petesis: surely no connection with the inconstant Petesis, who, eleven years after the fall of Nectanebo, abandoned his position as nomarch in Alexander's administration, in mysterious circumstances (*Arr. Anab.* 3.5: see above, note 61).

<sup>116</sup> This narrative is inscribed in the Mortuary Temple of Hatshepsut (r. c. 1479-1458 BC) at Deir-el-Bahari and the Temple of Amenhotep III (r. c. 1386-1349 BC) at Luxor; see Stoneman 2008:20.

<sup>117</sup> *Alexander Romance* 1.33 (Sarapis), 1.44 (Alexander proclaimed), 3.17 (Sesonchosis reaches the Indian Ocean), 3.24 (Cave of the Gods), 3.34 (corpse). Discussion at Jouanno 2002:65-67, 96-98, 250, 256, 281, 340, 358, 386, 399, 442, 444, 456 (also for the Senwosrets). Sesostris: *Hdt.* 2.102-03. Sesosis: *Diod. Sic.* 1.53-58. The *Sesonchosis Romance*: *P.Oxy.* 1826, 2466, 3319; Stephens and Winkler 1995:246-66.

have spent much time in doing it.<sup>118</sup> He subsequently tells us that upon his return to Memphis, after the foundation of Alexandria, Alexander conceived the desire to travel down the Nile to visit not only the Egyptian interior but also Ethiopia, but that the demands of the Persian war held him back (perhaps some dittography here).<sup>119</sup> Another indication of Alexander's interest in Ethiopia may be found in the supposed Aristotelian mission he dispatched to Ethiopia to investigate the sources of the Nile. A fragment of Aristotle tells that Alexander sent such a mission at the behest of the philosopher.<sup>120</sup> A fragment of Callisthenes, who was cousin (of some sort) to Aristotle, and, like Alexander, a pupil too, has him declaring that he had visited Ethiopia in person during Alexander's campaign:<sup>121</sup> he was thus able to pronounce that the Nile was created by the mountainous Ethiopia's abundant rainfall.<sup>122</sup> However, Strabo may imply rather that Callisthenes derived his knowledge of the sources of the Nile from Aristotle,<sup>123</sup> and one must wonder why Alexander was content that several weeks' worth of his Egyptian adventure should go unobserved by his court historian.<sup>124</sup> Arrian tells that amongst the many ambassadors that greeted Alexander in Babylon in 324-323 BC, some came from Ethiopia.<sup>125</sup> He also tells us of the claim, which he does not himself explicitly endorse, that amongst Alexander's last plans was a project to circumnavigate Africa, going through the Straits of Gibraltar and taking in the coasts of the 'Nomads' and the Ethiopians (not necessarily for purposes of conquest).<sup>126</sup>

The historical Alexander never did get to Ethiopia, but the fictional Alexander did manage to get as far as Meroe. The historical Meroe, situated at the Nile's sixth cataract, close to Khartoum in the modern Sudan, was the capital of the Nubian kingdom of Kush, but the Greeks from Herodotus onwards usually imagined it to belong to Ethiopia, always a

---

<sup>118</sup> Curt. 4.7.5. Cf. Bosworth 1980:263, and the interesting remarks of Bowden on the passage in this volume.

<sup>119</sup> Curt. 4.8.3.

<sup>120</sup> Aristotle, F246 Rose (= Photius, *Bibliotheca* cod. 249 [the key text here] + Proclus on Plato, *Timaeus* 37d + Strabo, C786).

<sup>121</sup> Callisthenes' relationship with Aristotle: Callisthenes, *FGrH* 124 *testimonia*, *passim*.

<sup>122</sup> John Lydus, *De mensibus* 4.107 = Callisthenes, *FGrH* 124 F12a.

<sup>123</sup> Strabo, C790 (= 17.1.5), incorporating Callisthenes, *FGrH* 124 F12b.

<sup>124</sup> Scepticism about the reality of this mission: Bosworth 1980:263, with references.

<sup>125</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 7.15.4.

<sup>126</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 7.1.2.

semi-mythical place for them with ill-defined boundaries. One of the glories of the third book of the *Alexander Romance* is the tale of Alexander and Candace, the queen of Meroe.<sup>127</sup> The tale is an elaborately complex one, but its principal arc is as follows. Queen Candace offers Alexander ample tribute, and as it is handed over by her courtiers she has one of them secretly paint Alexander's likeness, which she then conceals. Subsequently, Alexander infiltrates Candace's court disguised as his bodyguard Antigonus, but is, of course, recognised by the queen on the basis of the portrait. She declares that, although he has conquered the whole of the east, she, a mere woman, has captured him without battle. Alexander eventually returns to his camp with more royal gifts and an escort from Candace. As Richard Stoneman has observed, the wealthy kingdom of Meroe reflected in the *Romance* is that of the central Ptolemaic period, the time of the 'Meroitic miracle' reflected in Agatharchides of Cnidus' account of the place, preserved for us by Diodorus.<sup>128</sup>

The historical peoples of Ethiopia, in due course, repaid the *Romance's* interest in them, confused though it was, by composing an Ethiopic version of the narrative on the basis of a lost Arabic model, in which the Candace episode is included. The single surviving manuscript of the Ethiopic version derives from the 14th century AD, but is thought to represent a much older tradition.<sup>129</sup>

#### Abbreviations

FGrH Jacoby *et al.* 1923.

LIMC Kahil *et al.* 1981-1999.

<sup>127</sup> *Alexander Romance* 3.18-23; cf. Armenian version 225-46 Wolohojian 1969.

<sup>128</sup> Stoneman 2008:134-38; cf. Jouanno 2002:88-90. The Meroitic miracle: Agatharchides of Cnidus (second-century BC), *FGrH* 86 F19 (= Diod. Sic. 1.32-41); cf. Török 1988. Intriguingly, the name 'Candace', frequently given by the Greeks and Romans to queens of Meroe and Ethiopia alike, may ultimately derive from the Meroitic word for 'wife of the king', *ktke*. Cf. Török 1988:161; Jouanno 2002:123-24 n. 381; Stoneman 2008:270 n. 29. The *Alexander Romance's* Candace episode mutates into the substantial Kundaka episode of the *Syriac Alexander Romance*, 3.8-14 transl. Budge 1889:117-27, and the also substantial Qaydafeh episode of Ferdowsi's *Shahnameh*, C1313-27 transl. Warner & Warner 1912:6.123-43 and Davis 2007:490-503.

<sup>129</sup> For text and translation see Budge 1896 and 1933 (a repaginated reprint), with the Candace episode at §11; see also Stoneman 2008:272 n. 19, with further bibliography.

OGIS Dittenberger 1903-1905.  
 PGM Preisendanz & Henrichs 1973-1974.  
 P.Oxy Grenfell *et al.* 1898-.  
 SEG *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*  
 SB Preisigke *et al.* 1915-.  
 UPZ Wilcken 1922-1937.

### Bibliography

- Abd El-Raziq, M. 1984. *Die Darstellungen und Texte des Sanktuars Alexanders des Grossen im Tempel von Luxor*. Mainz am Rhein.
- Alston, R. 1998. 'The revolt of the *boukoloï*: geography, history and myth.' In K. Hopwood (ed.), *Organised Crime in Antiquity*, 129-154. London.
- Badian, E. 2012. *Collected Papers on Alexander the Great*. London.
- Badian, E. 1968. 'A king's notebooks.' *HSCP* 72:183-204. Reprinted in Badian 2012:174-192.
- Badian, E. 1981. 'The deification of Alexander the Great.' In H. Dell (ed.), *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*, 27-71. Thessaloniki. Reprinted in Badian 2012:244-281.
- Bagnall, R. 1979. 'The date of the foundation of Alexandria.' *AJAH* 4:46-49.
- Baines, J. 2003. 'Possible implications of the Egyptian word for Alexandria.' *JRA* 16:61-63.
- Balsdon, J.P.V.D. 1950. 'The "divinity" of Alexander.' *Historia* 1:363-388.
- Berve, H. 1926. *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*. 2 vols. Munich.
- Bloedow, E.F. 2004. 'Egypt in Alexander's scheme of things.' *QUCC* 77: 75-99.
- Borza, E.N. 1967. 'Alexander and the return from Siwah.' *Historia* 16:369.
- Bosworth, A.B. 1976. 'Errors in Arrian.' *CQ* 26:117-139.
- Bosworth, A.B. 1977. 'Alexander and Ammon.' In K. Kinzl (ed.), *Greece and the Ancient Mediterranean in History and Prehistory*, 51-75. Berlin.
- Bosworth, A.B. 1980. *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*. Vol 1. Oxford.
- Bosworth, A.B. 1988. *Conquest and Empire: The Reign of Alexander the Great*. Cambridge.
- Bosworth, A.B. 1994a. 'Alexander the Great Part 1: The events of the reign.' In Lewis *et al.* 1994:6.791-845.
- Bosworth, A.B. 1994b. 'Alexander the Great Part 2: Greece and the conquered territories.' In Lewis *et al.* 1994:6.846-875.

- Bosworth, A.B. 2002. *The Legacy of Alexander. Politics, Warfare and Propaganda under the Successors*. Oxford.
- Brunt, P.A. 1976-1983. *Arrian. History of Alexander and Indica*. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge, Mass.
- Budge, E.A.W. 1889. *The History of Alexander the Great*. London. [The Syriac text.]
- Budge, E.A.W. 1896. *Life and Exploits of Alexander the Great*. 2 vols. London. [The Ethiopic text.]
- Budge, E.A.W. 1933. *The Alexander Book in Ethiopia*. London. [The Ethiopic text.]
- Burstein, S. 1991. 'Pharaoh Alexander: A scholarly myth.' *Ancient Society* 22:139-145.
- Burstein, S. 2000. 'Prelude to Alexander: The reign of Khababash.' *AHB* 14:149-154.
- Burstein, S. 2008. 'A note on the career of Cleomenes of Naucratis.' In T. Howe & J. Reames-Zimmerman (edd.), *Macedonian Legacies. Studies in Ancient Macedonian History and Culture in Honor of Eugene N. Borza*, 183-194. Claremont, Calif.
- Cartledge, P. 2004. *Alexander the Great. The Hunt for a New Past*. London.
- Castiglione, L. 1978. 'La genèse du culte de Sarapis.' In Vermaseren *et al.* 1978:1.208-232.
- Cavenaille, R. 1972. 'Pour une histoire politique et sociale d'Alexandrie. Les origines.' *AC* 41:94-112.
- Chaveau, M. 1999. 'Alexandrie et Rhakôtis: le point de vue des Égyptiens.' In J. Leclant (ed.), *Alexandrie: une mégapole cosmopolite*. Cahiers de la Villa 'Kérylos' 9:1-10. Paris.
- Clerc, G. & Leclant, J. 1994. 'Sarapis' *LIMC* 7.1:666-692, 7.2:504-518.
- Cohen, G.M. 2006. *The Hellenistic Settlements in Syria, the Red Sea Basin and North Africa*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Collins, A. 2009. 'The divinity of Alexander in Egypt: A reassessment.' In P. Wheatley & R. Hannah (edd.), *Alexander and his Successors. Essays from the Antipodes*, 179-205. Claremont, Calif.
- Cook, A.B. 1914-1940. *Zeus. A Study in Ancient Religion*. 3 vols. Cambridge.
- Davis, D. (transl.) 2007. *Albolqasem Ferdowsi. Shahnameh, the Persian Book of Kings*. New York.
- Depauw, M. 2000. 'Alexandria the building yard.' *CdÉ* 75:64-65.
- Dillery, J. 2004. 'Alexander's tomb at "Rhacotis": Ps.-Callisthenes 2.34.5 and the Oracle of the Potter.' *ZPE* 148:253-258.

- Dittenberger, W. 1903-1905. *Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae*. 2 vols. Leipzig.
- Dreyer, B. 2009. 'Heroes, cults and divinity.' In W. Heckel & L.A. Tritle (edd.), *Alexander the Great. A New History*, 218-234. Oxford.
- Dunand, F. 1969. 'Les représentations de l'Agathodémon; à propos de quelques bas-reliefs du Musée d'Alexandrie.' *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 67:9-48.
- Dunand, F. 1981. 'Agathodaimon.' *LIMC* i.1:277-282. Zurich.
- Dunand, F. 2007. 'The religious system at Alexandria.' In D. Ogden (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Religion*, 253-263. Oxford.
- Ehrenberg, V. 1926. *Alexander und Ägypten*. Leipzig. Reprinted in V. Ehrenberg 1965. *Polis und Imperium*, 399-448. Zurich.
- Engels, D.W. 1978. *Alexander the Great and the Logistics of the Macedonian Army*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Erskine, A. 2002. 'Life after death: Alexandria and the body of Alexander the Great.' *G&R* 49:163-179.
- Fakhry, A. 1944. *Siva Oasis. Its History and Antiquities*. Cairo.
- Felber, H. 2002. 'Die demotische Chronik.' In A. Blasius & B. Schipper (edd.), *Apokalyptik und Ägypten: Eine kritische Analyse der relevanten Texte aus dem griechisch-römischen Ägypten*, 65-111. Leuven.
- Fredericksmeyer, E.A. 2003. 'Alexander's religion and divinity.' In J. Roisman (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great*, 253-278. Leiden.
- Fraser, P.M. 1960. 'The cult of Sarapis in the Hellenistic world.' *Opuscula Atheniensia* 3:1-54.
- Fraser, P.M. 1967. 'Current problems concerning the early history of the cult of Serapis.' *Opuscula Atheniensia* 7:23-45.
- Fraser, P.M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols. Oxford.
- Ganzsyniec, R. 1918. 'Agathodaimon.' *RE Supplementband* 3:37-59.
- Ganzsyniec, R. 1919. *De Agatho-daemone*. Warsaw.
- Gitti, A. 1951. *Alessandro Magno all'oasi di Siwah*. Bari.
- Goddio, F. (ed.) 1998. *Alexandria. The Submerged Royal Quarters*. London.
- Goddio, F. & Fabre, D. (edd.) 2008. *Egypt's Sunken Treasures*. Second edition. Munich.
- Grainger, J.D. 2007. *Alexander the Great Failure*. London.
- Green, P. 1970. *Alexander the Great*. London.
- Green, P. 1996. 'Alexander's Alexandria.' In K. Hamma (ed.), *Alexandria and Alexandrianism*, 3-25. Malibu, Calif. Reprinted in P. Green 2004.



- From Ikaria to the Stars: Classical Mythification, Ancient and Modern*, 172-196. Austin, Texas.
- Grenfell, B.P. et al. (edd.) 1898-. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. London.
- Hamilton, J.R. 1953. 'Alexander and his "so-called" father.' *CQ* 3:151-157.
- Hamilton, J.R. 1969. *Plutarch's Alexander: A Commentary*. Oxford.
- Hamilton, J.R. 1973. *Alexander the Great*. London.
- Hampf, F. 1953. 'Alexanders des Grossen Hypomnemata und letzte Pläne.' In G.E. Mylonas, D.M. Robinson & D. Raymond (edd.), *Studies presented to David Moore Robinson on his Seventieth Birthday*, 2:16-29. 2 vols. Saint Louis, Washington. Reprinted in: G.T. Griffith 1966. *Alexander the Great: the Main Problems*, 307-321. Cambridge.
- Harrison, J. 1912. *Themis*. Cambridge.
- Heckel, W. 2006. *Who's Who in Alexander's Empire*. Oxford.
- Heckel, W. 2008. *The Conquests of Alexander the Great*. New York.
- Heinen, H. 1995. 'Vostufen und Anfänge des Herrscherkultes im römischen Ägypten.' *ANRW* 2.18.5:3144-3180.
- Hillard, T.W. 1998. 'The *Agathos Daimon* abandons Alexandria: The Potter's Oracle and possible Roman allusions.' In T.W. Hillard, R.A. Kearsley & C.E.V. Nixon (edd.), *Ancient History in a Modern University*. 1. *The Ancient Near East, Greece and Rome*, 160-172. Grand Rapids, Mich.
- Hillard, T.W. 2010. 'The god abandons Antony: Egyptian street theatre in 30 BC.' In A. Woods, A. McFarlane & S. Binder (edd.), *Egyptian Culture and Society. Studies in Honour of Naguib Kanawati*, 2:201-217. 2 vols. Cairo.
- Hogarth, D. 1915. 'Alexander in Egypt and some consequences.' *JEA* 2:53-60.
- Hölbl, G. 2001. *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*. London. Transl. of *Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches*. Darmstadt 1994.
- Hornbostel, W. 1973. *Sarapis. Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte, den Erscheinungsformen und Wandlungen der Gestalt eines Gottes*. EPRO 36. Leiden.
- Huss, W. 2001. *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit 332–30 v. Chr.* Munich.
- Jacoby, F. et al. (edd.) 1923-. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Berlin & Leiden.
- Jakobsson, O. 1925. *Daimon och Agathos Daimon*. Lund.
- Johnson, J.H. 1983. 'The *Demotic Chronicle* as a statement of a theory of kingship.' *The Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities Journal* 13:61-72.

- Jouanno, C. 2002. *Naissance et métamorphose du Roman d'Alexandre. Domaine grec.* Paris.
- Kahil, L. et al. (edd.) 1981-1999. *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae.* 8 vols. Zurich.
- Kienast, D. 1987-1988. 'Alexander, Zeus and Ammon.' In Will & Heinrichs 1987-1988:2.309-334.
- Koenen, L. 1968. 'Die Prophezeiungen des "Töpfers".' *ZPE* 2:178-209.
- Koenen, L. 1977. *Eine agonistische Inschrift aus Ägypten und drüth-  
ptolemäische Königsfeste.* Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 56. Meisenheim am Glan.
- Koenen, L. 1985. 'The dream of Nektanebos.' *Bulletin for the American Society of Papyrologists* 22:171-194.
- Lane Fox, R. 1973. *Alexander the Great.* London.
- Larsen, J.A.O. 1932. 'Alexander at the oracle of Ammon.' *CP* 27:70-75.
- Le Rider, G. 1997. 'Cléomène de Naucratis.' *BCH* 121:71-93.
- Le Roy, C. 1981. 'Les oiseaux d'Alexandrie.' *BCH* 105:393-406.
- Lewis, D.M., Boardman, J., Hornblower, S. & Oswald, M. (edd.) 1994. *The Cambridge Ancient History.* Vol. 6. Second edition. Cambridge.
- Lloyd, A.B. 1994. 'Egypt, 404-332 BC.' In Lewis et al. 1994:6.337-360.
- Lorton, D. 1987. 'The names of Alexandria in the text of the Satrap Stela.' *GöttMisz* 96:65-70.
- McKenzie, J. 2007. *The Architecture of Alexandria and Egypt 300 BC-AD 700.* New Haven, Conn.
- Maspéro, F. 1967 [1882]. *Popular Stories of Ancient Egypt.* Transl. C.H.W. Johns. New York.
- Mastrocinque, A. 1987-1988. 'Alessandro a Memfi.' In Will & Heinrichs 1987-1988:1.289-307.
- Mederer, E. 1936. *Die Alexanderlegenden bei den ältesten Alexanderhistorikern.* Stuttgart.
- Mitropoulou, E. 1977. *Deities and Heroes in the Form of Snakes.* Second edition. Athens.
- Müller, K.F. 1905. *Die Leichenwagen Alexanders des Grossen.* Leipzig.
- O'Brien, J.M. 1992. *Alexander the Great: the Invisible Enemy.* London.
- Ogden, D. 2008. *Perseus.* London.
- Ogden, D. 2011. *Alexander the Great. Myth, Genesis and Sexuality.* Exeter.
- Pearson, L. 1960. *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great.* New York.
- Pietrzykowski, M. 1978. 'Sarapis-Agathos Daimon.' In Vermaseren et al. 1978:3:959-966.
- Pollard, J. & Reid, J. 2006. *The Rise and Fall of Alexandria.* New York.

- Preisendanz, K. & Henrichs, A. 1973-1974. *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*. 2 vols. Second edition. Stuttgart.
- Preisigke, F. et al. 1915-. *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten*. Multiple vols., places of publication.
- Quaegebeur, J. 1975. *Le dieu égyptien Shai dans la religion et l'onomas-tique*. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 2. Leuven.
- Rohde, E. 1925. *Psyche. The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks*. Translated from the 8th German edition. London.
- Rowe, A. 1946. *The Discovery of the Famous Temple and Enclosure of Serapis at Alexandria*. Cairo.
- Rutherford, I. 2000. 'The genealogy of the *boukoloï*: how Greek literature appropriated an Egyptian narrative motif.' *JHS* 120:106-121.
- Saunders, N.J. 2006. *Alexander's Tomb*. New York.
- Schachermeyr, F. 1954. 'Die letzten Pläne Alexanders des Grossen.' *JOAI* 41:118-140.
- Schachermeyr, F. 1973. *Alexander der Grosse: Das Problem seiner Persönlichkeit und seines Wirkens*. Vienna.
- Schwarzenberg, E. 1976. 'The portraiture of Alexander.' In E. Badian (ed.), *Alexandre le grand. Image et réalité*. *Entretiens Hardt* 22:223-267.
- Seibert, J. 1969. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Ptolemaios*. Munich.
- Seibert, J. 1972a. *Alexander der Grosse*. Darmstadt.
- Seibert, J. 1972b. 'Nochmals zu Kleomenes von Naukratis.' *Chiron* 2:99-102.
- Sethe, K. 1904. *Hieroglyphische Urkunden der griechisch-römischen Zeit*. Leipzig.
- Sfameni Gasparro, G. 1997. 'Daimon and Tyche in the Hellenistic religious experience.' In P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen & L. Hannestad (edd.), *Conventional Values of the Hellenistic Greeks*. *Studies in Hellenistic Civilisations* 7:67-109. Aarhus.
- Spalinger, A. 1992. 'The date of the *Dream of Nectanebo*.' *Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur* 19:295-304.
- Spiegelberg, W. 1914. *Die sogenannte demotische Chronik des Pap. 215 der Bibliothèque Nationale zu Paris nebst den auf der Rückseite des Papyrus stehenden Texten*. Leipzig.
- Stambaugh, J.E. 1972. *Sarapis under the Early Ptolemies*. Leiden.
- Stephens, S.A. & Winkler, J.J. 1995. *The Ancient Greek Novels. The Fragments*. Princeton, NJ.
- Stewart, A. 1993. *Faces of Power. Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics*. Berkeley, Calif.

- Stoneman, R. (ed. and transl.) 2007. *Il romanzo di Alessandro*. 1. Mondadori editions. Milan.
- Stoneman, R. 2008. *Alexander the Great. A Life in Legend*. Yale, New Haven, Conn.
- Strauss, B.S. 2003. 'Alexander: the military campaign.' In J. Roisman (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great*, 133-158. Leiden.
- Talbert, R.J.A. (ed.) 2000. *The Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*. Princeton, NJ.
- Tarn, W.W. 1928. 'The hellenistic ruler-cult and the daemon.' *JHS* 48: 206-219.
- Tarn, W.W. 1948. *Alexander the Great*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- Taylor, L.R. 1930. 'Alexander and the serpent of Alexandria.' *CP* 25:375-378.
- Török, L. 1988. 'Geschichte Meroes. Ein Beitrag über die Quellenanlage und den Forschungsstand.' *ANRW* 11.10.1:107-341.
- Van Groningen, B.A. 1925. 'De Cleomene Naucratis.' *Mnemosyne* 53:101-130.
- Vermaseren, M.J., de Boer, M.B. & Edridge, T.A. (edd.) 1978. *Hommages à Maarten J. Vermaseren*. EPRO 68. 3 vols. Leiden.
- Visser, C.E. 1938. *Götter und Kulte im ptolemäischen Alexandrien*. Amsterdam.
- Vogt, J. 1971. 'Kleomenes von Naukratis: Herr von Ägypten.' *Chiron* 1: 153-157.
- Warner, A.G. & Warner, E. (transl.) 1912. *The Shāhnāma of Firdausi*. 9 vols. London.
- Waterfield, R. 2011. *Dividing the Spoils. The War for Alexander the Great's Empire*. New York.
- Welles, C.B. 1962. 'The discovery of Sarapis and the foundation of Alexandria.' *Historia* 11:271-298.
- Wilcken, U. 1922-1937. *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*. 2 vols. Berlin.
- Wilcken, U. 1967. *Alexander the Great*. Transl. C.G. Richards, ed. E.N. Borza (Preface and Introduction). New York.
- Will, E. 1979-1982. *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique*. Second edition. 2 vols. Nancy.
- Will, W. & Heinrichs, J. (edd.) 1987-1988. *Zu Alexander d. Gr.: Festschrift G. Wirth zum 60. Geburtstag am 9.12.86*. 2 vols. Amsterdam.
- Wolohojian, A.M. (transl.) 1969. *The Romance of Alexander the Great by Pseudo-Callisthenes*. Translated from the Armenian Version. New York.
- Worthington, I. 2004. *Alexander the Great. Man and God*. London.

Yardley, J., Heckel, W. & Wheatley, P. 2011. *Justin. Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus. ii. Books 13-15. The Successors to Alexander the Great.* Oxford.