

ALEXANDER THE GREAT
SOURCES & STUDIES

*

PART ONE

*THE SO-CALLED 'VULGATE' AND
ITS SOURCES*

*

A. THE PROBLEM

IN writing Hellenistic history, one of the modern historian's most powerful weapons should be source-criticism. It has taken more than one form, though its failures need not be noticed here. Its real business, as I understand it, should be to attempt to find the original source, the beginning, of the statements made by the secondary writer under investigation; and as it is certain that in many cases the original source cannot be found, then at least to attempt to get clear the school or type of thought which such source represented; it may, for example, in the Alexander-story, be of more importance to know that some item originated with the Stoics or with Cassander's friends the Peripatetics or with some group of poets than to know what writer actually started it or through what channels it has been transmitted to us, for in this way one can get at its tendency and evaluate its worth.

This study deals with the three extant writers who have long been classed together as having certain common characteristics and as representing the 'vulgate', viz. Diodorus, book xvii, Curtius, and Justin's *Epitome of Trogus* (with *Trogus' Prologues*); they have generally been distinguished as a body from the 'good' tradition, meaning primarily Arrian, though this excessive simplification has often been subject to various qualifications. Arrian will naturally figure largely in some Appendices (Part II), but the question of *his* sources, with one exception, seems in its general lines to be well settled; I take it as certain now that his principal source was Ptolemy and that he only used Aristobulus to supplement Ptolemy; that Ptolemy, who had better opportunities of knowing than most people, was also able to use the *Journal* and other official material; that, though the military part of

Section A

Arrian comes from him, he wrote a real history of Alexander and not merely a military study; and that Arrian's λόγοι, stories prefaced by the statement 'so they say', are neither from Ptolemy nor from Aristobulus, but may be from anybody, their authority, if any, depending on their source in each particular case. The matter which is not settled, and which will require careful consideration, is what sort of writer Aristobulus was and what is his real place among the Alexander-historians. In the same way, I am not here considering Plutarch's *Life* of Alexander, which belongs neither to the 'good' nor to the 'vulgate' tradition, but stands apart; I am dealing with certain aspects of it in App. 16.

The subject of this study, then, is essentially the three writers I have named—their characteristics, their sources, and the question whether there is, or ever was, such a thing as the so-called vulgate tradition; but the source-problems involved have come to centre primarily on Cleitarchus of Alexandria, and to a certain extent on Arrian's second source, Aristobulus, and in a sense Cleitarchus will be the central figure in what I have to say. The thorny group of questions connected with the vulgate writers was investigated many years ago by that brilliant critic Eduard Schwartz,¹ and the results he reached have dominated nearly all study since (including my own before I looked into the matter properly). When he wrote, it was believed that, generally speaking, Diodorus in each book took one source and copied it; and as he found a few cases in Diodorus XVII of the use of Cleitarchus, whom he regarded as a primary authority, he said that he had no hesitation in taking Diodorus XVII directly back to Cleitarchus.² This theme has been well worked up since; its most modern expression is that we can get a pretty good idea of the contents of Cleitarchus' history from the direct excerpt (*das direkte Exzerpt*) Diodorus XVII, which with care can be supplemented from Curtius,³ and that the vulgate is in essence Cleitarchus worked up;⁴ indeed it is sometimes called the Cleitarchean vulgate. This is one branch of Schwartz' theory; the other relates to Aristobulus. His work, it is laid down, was not original; he was only a secondary source, and was in no wise independent of the Alexander-Romance (here meaning Cleitarchus); he is nearer to the vulgate than

1 Arts. 'Aristobulos' (14), 'Curtius' (31), and 'Diodoros' (38) in PW.

2 'Diodoros' (38) in PW, 683: 'auf Kleitarch direkt zurückzuführen.' He gave a second reason, for which see § F, p. 86.

3 Jacoby, 'Kleitarchos' (2) in PW, 629; repeated *F.Gr. Hist.* BD, p. 484.

4 Jacoby, *F.Gr. Hist.* BD, p. 484: Cleitarchus' book 'beherrscht die vulgata, die im wesentlichen ein immer wieder bearbeiteten K(leitarchos) ist'

The Problem

to the good tradition, and was a sceptical rationalist, who wrote late and made it his business to explain things away.¹ Through all changes and chances these views have substantially held the field since, whatever else may have happened meanwhile. It has never, for example, been explained why, if this view of Aristobulus be correct and he sometimes copied Cleitarchus, Arrian, a sensible man who knew far more about the Alexander-writers than has been vouchsafed to ourselves, chose Aristobulus as his second source. Few now believe that Diodorus' method of work was what Schwartz supposed, even if there be small agreement as to what it really was. Some, including the chief modern exponent of Schwartz' view, Dr F. Jacoby, have come to doubt whether Cleitarchus did accompany Alexander, i.e. whether he was really a primary source at all. None of this has made any difference, any more than the fact that so little is really known of Cleitarchus himself. To turn from the enormously swollen figure of modern literature to the thirty-six slight fragments which are all that remain of him is to court something of a shock. Naturally I entirely agree with the view that the named fragments of a lost writer are only a starting-point for the study of that writer, seeing that Greek authors all too seldom name their sources. But one's deductions about a lost writer must follow the indications given by the named fragments; it is no use proceeding against or across the direction they indicate; and one trouble with the Cleitarchus fragments is that so few of them point in any recognisable direction at all. Instead of patiently proceeding from this, items from Diodorus xvii have merely been quoted, copiously quoted, as being Cleitarchus himself. Thus a figure called Cleitarchus has been built up from Diodorus xvii, with help from Curtius and others, and been used in its turn to show that Diodorus xvii *is* Cleitarchus.

The time is ripe, and over-ripe, for a fresh detailed examination of the whole subject. I may just indicate the contents of what follows. Section B examines the question whether Cleitarchus is a primary or secondary authority, and § C his date; the answers to both questions largely depend on Greek knowledge of the Caspian and Aral being arranged in the order of its historical development, which has never been attempted and which is done in § B. Section D deals with Aristobulus, and in particular with Cleitarchus' relation to him. Section E attempts to see what can be made of Cleitarchus' book from the named fragments; § E' examines a neglected source, the poetasters contemporary with Alexander. Section F gives a long analysis of Diodorus xvii; in § F' a single chapter is dissected to exhibit, in part, his method

1 'Aristobulos' in PW, 916.

Section A

of work. Section G contains a similar analysis of Curtius; § G' gives the proofs that he knew and used Diodorus xvii. Section H is Trogu-Justin. Probably few people really read this sort of analytical study, for it is wearisome, though (as I see it) it is the only way of approximating to the truth; I have, therefore, in § J given a summary of results, which is rather more than a mere summary.

One general remark. It is impossible to suppose that a source can be found for everything given by our extant writers; for, other things apart, it is known that a considerable number of writers on Alexander must have perished without trace, over and above those whose names, but nothing more, have survived. They were, of course, not all formal historians; every kind of monograph on special points, long or short, good or bad, must have existed; we have the names of one or two,¹ and such writing became a regular feature of Hellenistic literature. I give one or two pieces of evidence. The name, though not the contents, of a monograph on Hephaestion's death has survived.² But Arrian (vii, 14, 2 *sqq.*) mentions, without any names, either eight or nine different versions of Alexander's grief for Hephaestion, and for each version he gives a plurality of writers, ἄλλοι—ἄλλοι. Though in any one case a plural of this kind may denote a single writer, this can hardly be so in every one of a number of consecutive cases; the number known to Arrian must have exceeded eight or nine. How does it stand with ourselves? Plutarch (*Alex.* lxxii) gives one of Arrian's versions; Diodorus (xvii, 110, 8) partly agrees with another, but the rest of his account is quite different; Justin (xii, 12, 11) does not agree with any of them, and adds yet another version; Curtius is missing. Here then is a whole mass of writers of whose existence and names we know nothing. To take another instance. Diodorus (xvii, 118, 2) says that many historians (or writers), συγγραφεῖς, did not dare to give the story of Alexander being poisoned for fear of Cassander. He therefore knew of many works dealing with Alexander's death which were written before Cassander's death in 298;³ we, *perhaps*, know of just one, Ehippus. Add Strabo's remark that the historians of Alexander were very numerous.⁴ It seems, therefore, that at every turn we are bound to run up against our own ignorance; we can only do our best with what material we possess.

1 As regards Alexander: Ehippus, *περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Ἡφαιστίωνος τελευτῆς*, Jacoby II, B, no. 126; Strattis, *περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τελευτῆς*, *id.* no. 118; Strattis on the Ephemerides; Amyntas on the work of the bematists. They soon became very numerous. 2 Ehippus (last note).

3 298, not 297; W. S. Ferguson, *Cl. Phil.* xxiv, 1929, p. 1.

4 xi, 5, 4 (505), τοσοῦτων ὄντων.

B. CLEITARCHUS¹ AND ALEXANDER'S EXPEDITION

I WILL consider first whether Cleitarchus accompanied Alexander or not; that is, whether he is a primary or a secondary source. Both views have always had supporters; the most authoritative of recent writers, Dr Jacoby, seems to think he did not, but says that there is no conclusive proof.² Proof, however, exists, though not where it has usually been sought; and the same proof will settle, not indeed the date at which Cleitarchus wrote, but a date before which he cannot possibly have written (see § C). To find this proof, one must first get the Caspian question into its proper order; and I mean by this the Caspian question, and not the Oxus problem or the northern trade-route problem,³ which have nothing to do with the matter in hand. A great deal has been written about the Caspian, much of it of little value; I am not going through this, for no one has even attempted to get our information into its historical order, though that is the only way to understand it, and almost every one has neglected or mistranslated Aristotle,⁴ not an author to neglect. What follows should clear up some points in the Alexander-story, apart from Cleitarchus. Two seas, which could also be called lakes, will come in question, a greater one which *we* call the Caspian and a smaller one which *we* call the Aral; but as the name 'Caspian' originally belonged to the Aral, I shall, to avoid confusion, usually call *our* Caspian by its original name, the 'Hyrcanian Sea'.

One or more of the Ionian geographers before Herodotus, who only knew of one lake, had thought it was a gulf of Ocean; Plutarch's statement to this effect is confirmed by the fact that both Herodotus and Aristotle are obviously combating some such theory.⁵ There is much force in Gronovius' suggestion, made two centuries ago, that this theory came merely from the water of our Caspian being salt;⁶ to this has recently been added, as another cause, the presence of seals.

1 I quote the Cleitarchus fragments throughout merely by their number in Jacoby II, no. 137.

2 'Kleitarchos' (2) in PW, XI, 1 (1921), 624.

3 The Oxus problem is a matter for science, Tarn, *Bactria and India*, App. 15; and the trade-route problem is settled, *ib.* App. 14.

4 P. Schnabel, *Berosos*, 1923, pp. 57 *sq.* is an exception.

5 Plut. *Alex.* XLIV. Herodotus' reference to the 'other sea' (*post*). Aristotle (*post*).

6 There is said to be a drinkable belt in the north, due to the inflowing Volga; but no Greek knew anything about the north.

Section B

Herodotus too knew of one lake only, which, however, he made too small for the Hyrcanian Sea;¹ he called it ἡ Κασπίη θάλασσα, and said of it ἐστι ἐπ' ἑωυτῆς, i.e. a lake (we shall meet this phrase again), and did not join the 'other sea', i.e. Ocean. But Aristotle, ultimately from Persian information, by whatever channel it reached him,² knew of *both* the seas, which he called the Hyrcanian and the Caspian, and said that both were lakes, which had no connection with Ocean: people dwelt all round both of them.³ As his Hyrcanian Sea is identified with our Caspian by the known position of Hyrcania, his Caspian Sea is the Aral; and it has therefore to be borne in mind that, to Alexander and those about him, the word 'Caspian' did not mean what it means to-day. Aristotle's *Meteorologica* has sometimes been supposed to antedate Alexander's expedition;⁴ it is certain in any case that it was his tutor Aristotle's geography which Alexander had in his head when he started. A somewhat half-hearted attempt has been made to date the *Meteorologica* to the period 335–322 B.C.;⁵ but whether it succeeds or not is quite immaterial, for Alexander got his geography, not from the *Meteorologica*, but from Aristotle himself (see App. 22, pp. 368 sq.). Consequently, when Alexander reached Hyrcania and saw the Hyrcanian Sea, he expected to find another lake also; and though he never saw the Aral himself, he heard, as we shall see, some things about it. As the knowledge that there were two lakes had died out by or before 284, the two becoming fused into one again, any primary source which knows of, and distinguishes, the two must be contemporary with, or not long after, Alexander.—See Addenda.

1 Herod. I, 203: ἡ δὲ Κασπίη θάλασσα ἐστι ἐπ' ἑωυτῆς, οὐ συμμίσγουσα τῇ ἑτέρῃ θαλάσσῃ, which shows that he was arguing against someone who had said that it was a gulf of Ocean. On the size, see § C, p. 18 n. 2.

2 His Persian information appears again in the *Liber de inundacione Nili*, which gives Ochus' views on the Indus.

3 *Meteor.* II, I, 10. There are seas which do not join one another anywhere. The Red Sea, indeed, has a narrow connection with the sea outside the Pillars, i.e. Ocean, ἡ δὲ Ὑρκανία καὶ Κασπία κεχωρισμένα τε ταύτης καὶ περιεϊκόμενα κύκλῳ, ὥστ' οὐκ ἂν ἐλάνθανον αἱ πηγαί, εἰ κατὰ τινα τόπον αὐτῶν ἦσαν. He polemicalises against the old 'Gulf of Ocean' theory. The plural participles prove that he meant two lakes, not one, though (except Schnabel, p. 5 n. 4 ante) those writers who have not omitted Aristotle altogether have carelessly called it one lake; even Jacoby II BD, p. 490, talks of 'den binnensee' and an 'herodoteisch-aristotelische karte'.

4 See W. Capelle, 'Meteorologie' in PW Supp. Bd. VI, 1935, 339. He does not believe it himself.

5 W. Jaeger, *Aristoteles* (Eng. tr. 1934, p. 307). He is as muddled about the Caspian as anybody.

Cleitarchus and Alexander's Expedition

Our earliest document, after Alexander visited Hyrcania, is the Gazetteer, i.e. the list of the satrapies of his Empire, compiled in the last year of his life;¹ the proof of its date, which I gave briefly in 1923, is given in App. 17 in better shape and greater detail. I left it open before whether the document Diodorus gives is the official document or a compilation by Hieronymus made from official material of the year 324–323, but in fact we do not know that it came through Hieronymus at all; Diodorus was quite capable of reproducing a document himself (see § F, p. 87), witness Alexander's so-called Plans, and there is no real doubt that what we have is an official document, with some interpolations by Diodorus himself (see App. 14), an exact parallel to the reproduction by Isidore of Charax of the Parthian survey with comments of his own. The Gazetteer divides the Asiatic empire into two halves by the Taurus-Caucasus chain of mountains, a division which Eratosthenes borrowed later and made the best-known feature of his geography of Asia. It next gives the rivers flowing north and south from these mountains. Those flowing north are said (Diod. xviii, 5, 3) to fall, some into the Caspian Sea, some into the Euxine, and some into the Arctic Ocean (literally 'the ocean beneath the Bears'). Then, after describing the rivers flowing south, the Gazetteer starts on the northern satrapies (5, 4)—Sogdiana beside (παρά) the river Tanais and Bactriane, and next to these Aria, and then Parthia 'by which there happens to be embraced the Hyrcanian Sea, being by itself'.² That is to say, to the compiler of this document the Caspian and Hyrcanian Seas were two different seas, as they were to Aristotle, and the equivalent phrase is used of the Hyrcanian Sea which Herodotus had used of his Caspian, to show that it was a lake and was not connected with any other sea. At the time of Alexander's death, then, the truth was still known. Of the rivers, those that fell into the Caspian (Aral) were the Oxus and Tanais (the lower Syr Daria, see *post*); those falling into the Euxine are the Halys and other rivers of Asia Minor; and the one falling into the Arctic Ocean is probably meant for the middle Syr (Jaxartes), a reminiscence of the time when it was not known whither it went; I shall return to this. One can hardly suppose hearsay of the great Siberian rivers; stories *could* have come to Bactra along the gold route, but it is not known if that route was still functioning in Alexander's day.

A little more information comes from our next document, a fragment

1 Diod. xviii, 5, 2 to 6, 4. See App. 17.

2 δι' ἧς συμβαίνει περιέχεσθαι τὴν Ἑρκανίαν θάλατταν, οὐσαν καθ' αὐτήν.

Section B

of the historian and geographer Polycleitus,¹ a member of a well-known family in Larisa. His reference (fr. 10) to the great tortoises in the Ganges shows that he wrote later than Megasthenes;² that he was earlier than Patrocles is self-evident (see § C). He wrote therefore probably somewhere about 290–285; but his information is much earlier and admits of no doubt that he was with Alexander. For he has left one quite invaluable statement: the Caspian Sea bred snakes and its water was ‘nearly sweet’, ὑπόγλυκυ;³ this can only apply to the Aral, or more accurately to that part of it dominated by the inflow of the two great rivers, and the word identifies the Caspian of the Aristotle-Alexander geography with the Aral without any doubt, if any could still persist. When Curtius (vi, 4, 18) and Diodorus (xvii, 75, 3) quoted Polycleitus’ statement about the snakes, they added ‘and fishes of strange colour’; this also may be from Polycleitus, though Strabo omits it; to-day the fishes in the Aral, in contradistinction from those in our Caspian, are said to be all fresh-water species, but I know nothing about their colour. From the sweetish water Polycleitus argued that his Caspian-Aral was a lake, as Aristotle had said. He gave one other fact: a river called Tanais flowed into it. It is improbable that any of Alexander’s people ever saw the Aral; whence did Polycleitus get his information? Only one source is possible; it came from Pharasmanes king of Chorasmia (at this time Kwarizm) or someone in his train, when this king visited Alexander at Bactra.⁴ Naturally Pharasmanes knew all about the Aral, on which his kingdom lay, and knew that the Oxus and another river, whose name he gave as Tanais, ran into it; Polycleitus, when he wrote, reproduced the statement about the Tanais, as did the Gazetteer when it made ‘some rivers’ fall into the Aral. There

1 Jacoby II, no. 128, fr. 7 = Strab. xi, 7, 4 (509): Πολύκλειτος δὲ καὶ πίστεϊ προφέρεται περὶ τοῦ λίμνην εἶναι τὴν θάλατταν ταύτην (i.e. τὴν Κασπίαν θάλατταν of three lines earlier), ὄφεις τε γὰρ ἐκτρέφειν καὶ ὑπόγλυκυ εἶναι τὸ ὕδωρ· ὅτι δὲ καὶ οὐχ ἕτερα τῆς Μαιώτιδος ἐστὶ τεκμαιρόμενος ἐκ τοῦ τὸν Τάναϊν εἰς αὐτὴν ἐμβάλλειν (here Polycleitus ends). What follows, viz. that the Jaxartes comes down from the same Indian mountains as the Oxus and Ochus, and flows into τὸ Κάσπιον πέλαγος, is Strabo himself, as is shown by the change from ‘oratio obliqua’ to ‘recta’, and the use of the name Ochus, unknown to the Alexander-writers; Strabo himself took it from Apollodorus of Artemita, c. 100 B.C.; all this from Strabo xi, 7, 3 (509). It is this section which shows that the Ochus was the lower Arius (river of Herat); Alexander never saw the lower river.

2 Not because of the name Ganges, but because he made a statement, true or false, about it.

3 Defined, Athen. xiv, 625 A, τὸ μὴ γλυκὺ μὲν ἐγγύς δὲ τούτου λέγομεν ὑπόγλυκυ.
4 Arr. iv, 15, 4.

Cleitarchus and Alexander's Expedition

is nothing in the Polycleitus fragment about the Hyrcanian Sea, though Pharasmanes must have known of it.

Before going on, I must consider the name Tanais. The Tanais which, Polycleitus was told, entered the Caspian-Aral could only be the Syr Daria; Tanais was therefore the local name of this river in its lower course.¹ But before Pharasmanes came to Bactra, Alexander had already reached, and for a moment crossed, the Syr in its middle course, near Chodjend; for this river he got a name which Ptolemy rendered as Jaxartes and Aristobulus in the fuller form Orexartes (Ar-yaxartes, the river Jaxartes), this being, says Aristobulus, the name given it by the local natives, τῶν ἐπιχωρίων βαρβάρων.² Where this Jaxartes went to Alexander's people did not know; here was a great river flowing *northward*, and they thought of the northern ocean, an idea probably preserved, as we have seen, in the Arctic Ocean of the Gazetteer. Later there came Pharasmanes with the information that a great river which he called Tanais flowed into the Aral; Alexander also had some communication with the Sacas across the Jaxartes,³ and it became evident that this Tanais was the lower Jaxartes; before his death, as the Gazetteer shows, both names were being applied indiscriminately to the whole river. If the Gazetteer and Polycleitus be put together, it can be seen that it became known, during Alexander's lifetime, that both the Oxus and the Syr flowed into the Caspian-Aral; as they did, and do. Later writers, like Strabo and Arrian,⁴ repeated that both rivers flowed into the 'Caspian', i.e. the same sea, without understanding what they were repeating; the Syr could never have entered our Caspian unless it ran uphill.

Then Polycleitus ceased recording and began to reason, with unhappy results. He argued (fr. 7) that if the Caspian were a lake of nearly sweet water and a river called Tanais ran into it, it could not be 'other than', ἑτέρα, the Maeotis (Sea of Azov) into which ran a river

1 Different names for different stretches of the same river are still common enough and must once have been much commoner.

2 Aristobulus, fr. 25 (I cite the fragments from Jacoby II, no. 139) = Arr. III, 30, 7, where MSS. give Ὀρεξάρτης; fr. 54 = Arr. VII, 16, 3, where they give the well-known man's name Oxyartes; Plut. *Alex.* XLV has Ὀρεξάρτης, the correct form everywhere. Some of the MS. readings of Jaxartes in Pliny VI, 45 give corrupt forms beginning with IR. Ar-yaxartes = river Jaxartes: R. Roesler, *Wien S.B.* LXXIV, p. 256 n. 3, with many parallels. Demodamas later seemingly got another local name, Silis, for some part of the Syr: Pliny VI, 49.

3 Arr. IV, 15, 1 πρόσβροσι; Curt. VII, 6, 12.

4 Strab. XI, 7, 4 (510), 11, 5 (518); Arr. VII, 16, 3.

Section B

called Tanais (the Don). It *was* very confusing; but whether he actually meant to identify the two cannot be said.¹ It must be remembered that Polycleitus, like Alexander, never saw the Aral. As far as Hyrcania and the bit of the Hyrcanian Sea which he saw, Alexander had plenty of guidance; he had the Persian roads, itineraries, satrapal boundaries, official documents, etc.² and knew where he was, but none of this applied to the Aral;³ no one knew how far north it might extend, or where the Syr entered it, so Polycleitus was not really as futile as he sounds.⁴ The important matter is that Polycleitus identified his and Aristotle's 'Caspian' as the Aral, and knew that the Tanais (Syr) ran into it; i.e. he knew the truth. With him, true knowledge ended, to be alluded to again for an instant by Curtius, who in one passage distinguishes the Caspian and the Hyrcanian Seas,⁵ and who must have read Polycleitus at first hand.⁶

At the very end of his life, about the time that the Gazetteer was compiled, Alexander sent one Heracleides to build warships and explore the Hyrcanian Sea.⁷ Arrian's story comes in the middle of a number of extracts from Aristobulus, and has generally been ascribed to him.⁸

- 1 Note that Strabo xi, 7, 4 (509) distinguishes Polycleitus from the 'liars' (*post*).
- 2 On the Persian material cf. M. Rostovtzeff, *Soc. and Econ. Hist.* p. 1034.
- 3 The Persians had never ruled Chorasmia (Kwarizm); Tarn, *Bactria and India*, App. 11.
- 4 There is an almost exact parallel near my house. Into the Beaully Firth (Aral) runs a river of which the lower part (once Fraser country) is called the Beaully (Jaxartes), and the upper part (once Chisholm country) is called the Glass (Tanais). Somewhat farther to the north, another and different river Glass (Tanais) runs into the Cromarty Firth (Maeotis). Suppose that, in the illiterate period, a complete stranger from the Mediterranean (Polycleitus), hard put to it for an interpreter, had been trying to get at the lie of the country without seeing it; what are the chances that, confused by the two rivers called Glass, he would have identified the Beaully and Cromarty firths, which are anyhow much alike in character?
- 5 Curt. vii, 3, 21, the rivers from the Caucasus 'alia in Caspium mare, alia in Hyrcanium et Ponticum decidunt'.
- 6 He quotes Polycleitus in that strange mix-up, his formal account of our Caspian in vi, 4, 17 *sqq.* on which see § G, p. 104 n. 1. He knew no geography himself. On his possible knowledge of Aristotle's *Meteorologica* through Aristobulus, see *post*.
- 7 Arr. vii, 16, 1 = Aristobulus, fr. 54.
- 8 See Kornemann, *Die Alex.-Gesch. d. Ptolemaios I*, p. 166. But Jacoby on Aristobulus, fr. 54 (BD, p. 522), expresses reservations; to Kornemann himself the whole passage is a bad contamination of Ptolemy and Aristobulus. No one has noticed the quotation from Aristotle, or that Arrian is partly speaking in his own person, because no one has ever worked out the Caspian question properly.