EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF EMERGING COMPARATIVE HISTORY AND CULTURAL STUDIES

THE ELEPHANTINE ADVANCE: ALEXANDER'S CAMPAIGNS AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF ANCIENT MILITARY STRATEGY

Dr. Cassius M. Leontis
Professor of Ancient Military History, Department of Classics and Ancient History, University of Oxford, United Kingdom

Dr. Darius K. Shahin
Senior Lecturer in Hellenistic Warfare and Near Eastern Campaigns, Faculty of Historical Studies, University of Tehran, Iran

V0LUME01 ISSUE01 (2024)
Published Date: 21 December 2024 // Page no.: - 63-74

ABSTRACT

This article investigates the multifaceted encounters of Alexander the Great's Macedonian forces with war elephants, particularly during his campaigns in the Indian subcontinent. While the Achaemenid Persians introduced a limited number of elephants at Gaugamela, the true strategic and psychological impact of these formidable creatures became evident during the confrontation with King Porus at the Battle of the Hydaspes River in 326 BCE. Drawing upon primary historical accounts from Arrian, Curtius, Diodorus Siculus, and Plutarch, complemented by extensive secondary scholarship, this study examines the historical context of elephant deployment in ancient warfare, the profound tactical challenges they posed to the Macedonian military, and Alexander's ingenious adaptive strategies. The analysis highlights how the Macedonians, initially terrified, learned to neutralize the elephants' shock value through disciplined maneuvers and specialized skirmishing, ultimately incorporating captured elephants into their own army. Furthermore, the paper discusses the enduring legacy of these encounters, demonstrating how the integration of war elephants into Hellenistic military doctrines by Alexander's successors fundamentally reshaped the dynamics of warfare in the post-Alexandrian era. This historical examination underscores the importance of military adaptability, cross-cultural exchange, and the psychological dimensions of ancient combat. It critically assesses the "Roman meme" regarding elephant unreliability, demonstrating its anachronistic attribution to Alexander and its subsequent influence on military and natural science scholarship, thereby advocating for a re-evaluation of the elephant's true historical significance in ancient warfare, especially concerning the pivotal role in the formation of the Mauryan Empire and Hellenistic states.

Keywords: Alexander the Great, War Elephants, Macedonian Army, Battle of the Hydaspes, Ancient Warfare, Military History, Hellenistic Period, Porus, Tactical Adaptation, Roman Skepticism, Historiography.

INTRODUCTION

The military campaigns of Alexander the Great, spanning from the Aegean Sea to the vast plains of the Indus River, represent an epochal chapter in ancient history. These conquests, unparalleled in their scope and ambition, were not merely a demonstration of Macedonian military prowess but also a catalyst for profound cultural and technological syntheses across the ancient world. Central to these transformative encounters, particularly during the grueling and climactic Indian expedition, was the formidable presence of war elephants—colossal creatures previously unknown in a martial context to the majority of the Hellenic world [22, 37]. The Macedonian army, celebrated for its disciplined phalanx formations, innovative cavalry tactics, and swift logistical movements, was compelled to confront, adapt to, and ultimately integrate these formidable beasts into its strategic considerations. This unique military challenge and the subsequent Macedonian response offer invaluable insights into the dynamics of military innovation, the processes of cross-cultural diffusion of military technology, and the enduring psychological dimensions of ancient combat.

The employment of elephants in warfare was an ancient practice, with archaeological and textual evidence suggesting their domestication and military application in the Indian subcontinent dating back several millennia prior to Alexander's arrival [23, 24, 25, 40]. In India, a sophisticated understanding of elephant capabilities, behavior, and management had been developed over centuries, leading to their integral role in local military doctrines. The Achaemenid Persian Empire, the vast adversary Alexander sought to dismantle, had also made limited use of Indian elephants, notably at the pivotal Battle of Gaugamela in 331 BCE [17, 18]. However, these instances provided only a preliminary glimpse for the

Macedonians. It was within the lush, diverse, and heavily populated landscapes of India that Alexander's forces faced the true, concentrated power of organized elephant corps, most famously at the Battle of the Hydaspes River in 326 BCE against the formidable King Porus [2, 3, 4, 7, 29]. This engagement would prove to be a defining moment, not only for the trajectory of Alexander's grand campaign but also for the subsequent evolution of Hellenistic military thought and practice, fundamentally altering the calculus of power for his successors.

This article aims to provide a detailed and comprehensive analysis of the role of war elephants in Alexander's campaigns and their enduring impact on ancient military history. We will commence by meticulously examining the historical precedents of elephant deployment in warfare, focusing particularly on their integration within Indian military systems prior to Alexander's incursions. Subsequently, we will explore the specific encounters Alexander's army had with these animals, detailing the profound tactical challenges they posed and Alexander's ingenious and adaptive strategies to counteract their might. A significant and critical portion of this study will then evaluate the pervasive historiographical tradition surrounding war elephants, especially the notion commonly referred to as the "Roman meme"—the belief that elephants were inherently unreliable in battle and often posed a greater danger to their own side than to the enemy. This skepticism, as argued by recent scholarship [Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)], was largely a product of later Roman historical perspectives, anachronistically projected onto earlier periods, and subsequently reinforced by modern military and natural sciences, thereby distorting our understanding of their true effectiveness.

By synthesizing insights gleaned from primary ancient sources such as Arrian's Anabasis, Curtius Rufus's Historiae Alexandri Magni, Diodorus Siculus's Bibliotheca Historica, and Plutarch's Life of Alexander, alongside a rigorous engagement with contemporary and modern scholarly interpretations, this paper seeks to provide a nuanced, critically informed understanding of these pivotal military encounters. We will also delve into the intricate logistical complexities associated with the acquisition, training, feeding, and transportation of war elephants, an aspect crucial to their sustained and effective deployment in ancient armies. Finally, we will discuss the profound long-term implications of Alexander's elephantine experiences, tracing their transformative influence on Hellenistic military doctrines, the political landscape of Alexander's successors (the Diadochi), and the broader cultural and technological exchanges between the Hellenic world and the Indian subcontinent. This deep dive into the subject, often termed "following the elephant," aims to illuminate deeper truths about the interconnectedness, adaptability, and evolution of ancient empires and military thought, challenging long-held assumptions and enriching our understanding of this fascinating period.

METHODS

This research undertakes a comprehensive and multi-layered examination of Alexander the Great's encounters with war elephants, meticulously grounded in a critical analysis of both primary ancient literary sources and a substantial body of modern historical and scientific scholarship. The foundational narratives for this study are derived from the principal ancient historians who chronicled Alexander's campaigns. These include Arrian's Anabasis Alexandri and Indica [2], Quintus Curtius Rufus's Historiae Alexandri Magni [3], Diodorus Siculus's Bibliotheca Historica (Book XVII) [4], and Plutarch's Life of Alexander [7]. While acknowledging that these authors wrote centuries after the events they describe and often relied on earlier, now lost, sources, their works collectively constitute the most exhaustive and coherent accounts available for understanding Alexander's military engagements, particularly his significant confrontations with elephant forces. It is imperative, however, to approach these sources with a critical awareness of their inherent rhetorical biases, stylistic flourishes, and potential anachronisms—a key focus of this study—as meticulously highlighted by scholars such as Elizabeth Baynham [11], A.B. Bosworth [16], and Jean Tranquier [42]. These inherent textual limitations necessitate a careful, comparative, and cross-referential reading strategy to discern historical realities from later interpretive overlays or stylistic embellishments.

To contextualize and critically assess these primary accounts, a wide array of secondary scholarship has been extensively consulted. Key works include the detailed analyses by Michael B. Charles [22], H.H. Scullard [37], Thomas R. Trautmann [40, 41], and Piero Damiano Armandi [9]. These scholars offer critical insights into the broader history of elephants in warfare, delve into their physiological characteristics [13], and provide nuanced perspectives on their strategic employment across various ancient armies. Of particular methodological importance are scholarly discussions regarding the reliability and interpretation of Megasthenes' Indica—a crucial source that survives primarily through fragments cited by later authors—which provides invaluable, albeit filtered, information on ancient Indian military practices, elephant capture, and their sophisticated management systems [5, 6, 15, 41]. Furthermore, linguistic insights gleaned from sources like the Assyrian Dictionary [1] contribute to a deeper understanding of the ancient Near Eastern perception and nomenclature of these animals, offering an etymological foundation for their historical presence.

Our analytical methodology involves a systematic thematic synthesis of information extracted from these diverse historical and scholarly resources. The primary focus is on identifying recurring patterns, consistent descriptions, and shared military insights related to elephant characteristics, their strategic and tactical applications in specific battles, the Macedonian army's reactions (both initial shock and subsequent adaptation),

and the gradual, yet profound, integration of elephants into Hellenistic military structures. Crucially, this involves a rigorous process of cross-referencing details across different ancient accounts to identify points of convergence, highlight areas of divergence, and pinpoint outright discrepancies. Modern scholarly debates—particularly those concerning the origins and propagation of the "Roman meme" of elephant unreliability and its anachronistic projection onto earlier periods—are integral to our approach [14, 19, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. By engaging with these scholarly controversies, the research aims to reconcile historical ambiguities, challenge long-held assumptions, and offer a more accurate understanding of the elephant's true role.

Special attention is paid to the intricate logistical dimensions of employing war elephants. This includes investigating methods of their acquisition (capture and purchase), specialized training regimens, the extensive feeding requirements, and the complex challenges of their transportation across varied terrains, drawing upon the insights of military logistics scholarship, particularly that of Donald W. Engels [26]. The cultural and symbolic significance of elephants to both Indian polities (where they were often symbols of royal power and sovereignty) and the Hellenistic world (where they became exotic displays and instruments of prestige) is also explored, recognizing that their military utility was inextricably intertwined with their broader societal and political roles. The research also engages directly with specific scholarly critiques, such as those articulated by Thomas R. Trautmann (2025) concerning the interpretations of Curtius, Armandi, and Francis G. Benedict, specifically to illuminate the evolution of historical perspectives on war elephants and to trace the "itinerary" through which the idea of elephant unreliability became a pervasive trope. This multi-faceted, critically informed approach aims to reconstruct a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of Alexander's elephant encounters and their lasting legacy, moving beyond simplistic narratives to embrace the complexity of ancient military and cultural history.

RESULTS

The unfolding narrative of Alexander the Great's military encounters with war elephants presents a fascinating case study in military adaptation and the diffusion of technology. This journey began with a preliminary exposure in the Persian context, evolved into a direct, formidable confrontation in India, and culminated in the deliberate integration of these powerful creatures into the Hellenistic military arsenal. Each phase revealed a progressive understanding and strategic response by the Macedonian forces to the unique challenges posed by these proboscideans.

Initial Encounters: The Persian Context and Early Familiarization

Alexander's initial, documented encounter with live elephants in a martial setting occurred at the pivotal Battle of Gaugamela in 331 BCE, near the modern city of Erbil in present-day Iraq [2]. Darius III, the Achaemenid Persian King, deployed a contingent of approximately fifteen Indian elephants, strategically positioned in the center of his battle line, interspersed with his famed scythed chariots [17, 18]. This particular arrangement, as noted by Pierre Briant, reflected typical "barbarian" (non-Greek) military formations and, crucially, corresponded to the traditional "fourfold army" (chariot, elephant, cavalry, infantry) which was a hallmark of sophisticated Indian military doctrines [17, 18, 40]. While the presence of these elephants at Gaugamela is explicitly attested by Arrian, it is notably and conspicuously absent from the accounts of other major historians like Curtius, Diodorus, and Plutarch [17]. This discrepancy suggests either that their direct impact on the battle was limited, leading later historians to downplay their role, or that their presence was simply overshadowed by the broader scale of the engagement.

Despite their deployment, the elephants at Gaugamela played a minimal direct role in the battle's overall outcome. The strategic genius of Alexander's phalanx, with its unprecedented depth and maneuverability, coupled with the audacious flanking movements of his companion cavalry, effectively circumvented any sustained direct engagement with the elephant contingent. It is important to note that Alexander’s forces were likely not entirely surprised by the elephants. Their sophisticated intelligence network, a strength of the Macedonian army as detailed by Engels [27], would have gathered considerable information about Persian military assets, including those drawn from their Indian satrapies. Accounts from earlier Greek writers like Ctesias, a physician at the Persian court, had already introduced the concept of India’s immense wealth being protected by its elephants. Ctesias even described an elephant demonstrating its strength by toppling a palm tree in Babylon [14], a piece of knowledge that would have been accessible to Philip II and Alexander long before their grand expedition [14, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. After the battle, these fifteen elephants were reportedly captured by the Macedonians near the Persian camp, further indicating their limited direct combat role [2]. This initial exposure, therefore, served less as a significant military challenge and more as a preliminary reconnaissance, offering Alexander and his commanders their first direct glimpse into the capabilities and potential vulnerabilities of these formidable creatures.

Following Gaugamela, Alexander's strategic interest in elephants continued to grow. Curtius Rufus, alone among the ancient historians, records that at Susa, the satrap Abulites presented Alexander with an additional twelve elephants, which Darius had previously procured from India [3]. This acquisition, combined with the fifteen captured at Gaugamela, brought Alexander's elephant contingent to a nascent force of twenty-seven. This active pursuit of elephants, further reinforced by Arrian’s remark

about Indian kings later offering elephants as highly prized gifts to Alexander [18], strongly indicates Alexander's proactive interest in integrating these animals into his forces. The very act of the Achaemenids undertaking the complex and costly task of transporting elephants over vast distances and managing them through specialized Indian expertise foreshadowed the large-scale elephant deployment that would characterize the Hellenistic period under Alexander's successors [17, 18]. These early acquisitions suggest that Alexander was already recognizing the immense military potential of elephants and was deliberately preparing his forces for future, more substantial encounters with them.

The Indian Campaign: Confronting Sophisticated Elephant Warfare

The true crucible for Alexander's Macedonian army, and the defining period for their understanding of elephant warfare, came during the arduous invasion of the Indian subcontinent (327-324 BCE). Here, they encountered indigenous Indian polities that had honed the art of elephant-based combat over centuries, integrating these animals deeply into their military strategies and societal structures [25, 40]. Even before crossing the mighty Indus River, Alexander demonstrated a keen and strategic interest in these animals. Upon encountering the Assacenians (Assakenoi), whose very name hints at a connection to horses (derived from the Sanskrit aśva), Alexander specifically dispatched scouts to gather intelligence about their elephants, explicitly indicating his strategic foresight and preparatory measures [2]. Arrian notes that Alexander actively sought out and retained Indian elephant hunters and handlers in his retinue, personally participating in elephant pursuits and exhibiting a direct engagement with the practicalities of elephant management [2]. He acquired 28 elephants from the Assacenians, significantly bolstering his elephant contingent to a total of 55 [2, 37]. This active engagement in elephant acquisition and the recruitment of Indian experts highlight Alexander's pragmatic approach and his rapidly growing appreciation for their profound military potential.

The defining and most famous confrontation occurred at the Battle of the Hydaspes River (modern Jhelum) in 326 BCE, against the formidable King Porus of the Pauravas [2, 3, 4, 7, 29]. Accounts from the ancient historians vary regarding the exact number of elephants Porus commanded, with estimates ranging from 85 to 200, arrayed prominently along his front lines. These elephants were strategically positioned to disrupt the tightly packed Macedonian phalanx and provide mobile platforms for ranged attacks [2, 3, 4]. These were not merely static obstacles; they were living engines of war, trained to charge, trample infantry, impale enemies with armored tusks, and cause widespread chaos. They also carried armored wooden towers (purgoi xulinoi—though potentially a later Greek invention, as noted by Goukowsky [29]) or platforms from which highly skilled archers and javelin-throwers could launch projectiles, adding a devastating ranged component to their brute physical power [22, 29].

The psychological impact of these colossal beasts on the Macedonian army was profound and immediate. Arrian vividly describes the elephants causing "confusion not only to the phalanx itself but also to the cavalry," emphasizing that the Macedonians had never before "fought against such beasts" [2]. Curtius similarly underscores the sheer terror instilled by their unprecedented sight and sound, noting how their immense mass disrupted established Macedonian formations and instilled fear [3, 11, 16]. This psychological shock was a primary and often decisive element of elephant warfare, frequently proving as potent as their direct physical destructive capacity. The thundering charges, the trumpeting, and the sheer scale of the animals were designed to break enemy morale and cohesion.

Alexander's response at the Hydaspes demonstrated his unparalleled tactical brilliance and his capacity for rapid adaptation. Recognizing that a direct frontal assault against a disciplined elephant line would be disastrous, he devised a multi-pronged strategy. He meticulously planned a feigned crossing of the Hydaspes by day, diverting Porus's attention, and then executed a daring secret night crossing upstream with a significant portion of his elite cavalry and infantry. Crucially, he left the noisy and bulky elephants behind at the main camp—a pragmatic logistical decision often misinterpreted as "contempt" for elephants by later Roman historians, a point critically discussed by Trautmann (2025) [3, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. Alexander's decision was a testament to his understanding that surprise and speed were paramount for this particular maneuver, and elephants would have compromised both.

In the battle itself, Alexander exploited the elephants' known vulnerabilities: their susceptibility to loud noise, fire, and particularly, injury to their sensitive feet and trunks. Light-armed skirmishers and javelin-throwers, equipped with axes and curved swords (copides) to target the elephants' legs and trunks, were deployed to harass the elephants and their mahouts (riders), causing pain, confusion, and fear [3]. This tactic aimed to break the elephants' discipline and force some beasts to retreat or even turn on their own lines, trampling their own infantry—a phenomenon that did occur during the battle, as attested by Curtius [3]. The highly disciplined Macedonian phalanx, trained to precise maneuvers, was instructed to create open lanes for charging elephants, allowing the beasts to pass through their ranks relatively harmlessly. Once the elephants had passed, the Macedonian soldiers could then attack them from the flanks or rear, specifically targeting their vulnerable underbellies and their drivers, often with specialized weapons [2, 22]. Cavalry played a crucial role in outflanking the elephant lines and pushing back the supporting infantry into the confused mass of elephants,

exacerbating the chaos within Porus's ranks. The battle was long, arduous, and fiercely contested, fought in a difficult riverine environment, and while Alexander ultimately prevailed, it came at a significant cost in Macedonian lives and left an indelible impression of the Indian war elephant's sheer might and the challenges of fighting it [2, 4].

Following the bloody engagement at the Hydaspes, Alexander's army advanced further east along the Utarapatha (Northern Route), what the British later termed the Grand Trunk Road. Their progress brought them to the Hyphasis River (modern Beas), on the eastern edge of the Indus Valley, marking the boundary with the formidable Nanda dynasty. Here, Alexander's forces received daunting intelligence about the Nanda's Magadhan kingdom, which boasted an army of unprecedented scale, including an estimated three to four thousand elephants—an order of magnitude greater than Porus's force [23, 40]. This intelligence, combined with the gruelling nature of the Indian campaign, the prolonged fighting, and the onset of the monsoon season, led to the army's famous refusal to advance further [2, 3, 4, 7]. This refusal, often attributed by Curtius to Alexander's supposed "contempt" for elephants and their inherent unreliability, is strongly challenged by contemporary scholarship. Trautmann (2025) argues persuasively that the sheer overwhelming number and superior quality of Nanda elephants, coupled with the profound fatigue and diminished morale of the Macedonian troops after years of relentless campaigning, were the genuine and entirely rational deterrents. The memory of the Hydaspes, even if a victory, was fresh in their minds, and the prospect of facing a force ten to twenty times larger in terms of elephants was simply too much.

Acquisition and Integration: The March to Babylon and the Seeds of Hellenistic Warfare

Despite the formidable opposition posed by elephants and the exhaustion of his troops, Alexander's pragmatic military genius recognized their profound strategic value. Following the Hydaspes campaign, he actively sought to integrate these powerful assets into his own forces. He acquired more elephants, both as direct spoils of war from defeated Indian states and as valuable gifts from submitting rulers [22, 39]. By the time he commenced his return journey from India, Alexander's elephant contingent had swelled to an impressive force of approximately two hundred trained elephants [37]. This significant acquisition represented a substantial investment in resources and manpower.

Crucially, Alexander also integrated specialized Indian elephant experts—including drivers (known as indoi in the Hellenistic period, a term that would later become a specialized designation for elephant handlers [28]), trainers, and caretakers—into his expanding army. He recognized that the effective management, training, and deployment of these complex animals required sophisticated indigenous knowledge that only experienced Indian personnel possessed [2, 28, 40]. This recruitment underscored a fundamental principle Alexander consistently applied: learning from and integrating the best practices of his adversaries and allies.

The return journey from India further highlights the immense logistical importance Alexander placed on his burgeoning elephant corps. Rather than simply retracing his steps directly, Alexander meticulously planned and divided his forces. While a significant portion of his army, including his newly constructed fleet, descended the Indus River to explore the coastline, another large land-based contingent, which crucially included the elephants and soldiers deemed unfit for the arduous coastal march, was entrusted to Craterus. This force was ordered to return inland along the more established Achaemenid royal routes via Arachosia, where provisions might be more readily available [26]. Alexander's own exploratory expedition along the arid Makran coast proved to be a catastrophic ordeal, suffering immense losses, including most of its baggage animals, due to starvation and thirst [26]. The elephants, however, were spared this devastating experience by the strategic decision to route them separately, underscoring their strategic importance and the deliberate care Alexander took to preserve these valuable military assets [26, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. This careful planning for their survival contradicts any notion of Alexander's "contempt" for them. Upon the eventual reunion of forces in Carmania, the elephants were assigned to Hephaistion and ultimately returned with Alexander to Babylon [3]. The very fact that Alexander made such extensive efforts to bring 200 Indian elephants—a costly and logistically challenging endeavor—all the way back to Babylon unequivocally demonstrates his clear appreciation for their status as a vital military asset, fundamentally discrediting any anachronistic claims of his disdain for them [Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. Alexander's sudden and unexpected death in midsummer of 323 BCE, at the tender age of thirty-two, prevented his personal direct use of this substantial elephant force in further grand campaigns. However, its significant presence in Babylon upon his death irrevocably set the stage for their pivotal and transformative role in the subsequent Hellenistic period.

DISCUSSION

The profound impact of war elephants on Alexander's military perspective and, subsequently, on the entire landscape of Hellenistic warfare, cannot be overstated. The Macedonian encounters with these formidable creatures, particularly at the Hydaspes, represent a critical juncture where an elite Western army was confronted with an unfamiliar, terrifying, and highly effective military technology. This confrontation compelled a rapid process of tactical evolution and adaptation, ultimately leading to the widespread adoption of elephants throughout the successor kingdoms. This section delves into the historiographical debates surrounding war elephants, re-

examines their actual role in Hellenistic warfare, and explores the significant logistical and cultural implications of their integration.

The "Roman Meme": Dissecting a Historiographical Distortion

A central contention, meticulously illuminated by recent scholarship, particularly the work of Thomas R. Trautmann (2025), is the pervasive "Roman meme" regarding the inherent unreliability of war elephants. This meme posits that elephants were prone to uncontrollable panic in battle, frequently turning on their own forces and causing more casualties to their allies than to their enemies. This widely accepted belief in modern historical discourse, however, is argued to have an anachronistic origin, largely a product of late Republican and early Imperial Roman historical perspectives, retrospectively projected onto earlier periods, including Alexander's era.

The Romans' first significant experience with elephants in warfare occurred during their conflicts with Pyrrhus of Epirus in 280 BCE, where Pyrrhus's elephants proved initially effective, leading to Pyrrhic victories. Later, the Romans faced elephants extensively in the Punic Wars against Carthage (e.g., Hannibal's elephants) and subsequent conflicts with the various Hellenistic successor kingdoms [37]. Having ultimately triumphed over these formidable elephant-deploying adversaries, Rome progressively ceased its own use of war elephants by the 1st century BCE, notably after Julius Caesar's decisive victory at the Battle of Thapsus in 46 BCE [Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. This eventual renunciation, driven by their military victories, the development of effective counter-tactics, and perhaps the perceived logistical burdens and unpredictable nature of elephants, fostered a settled belief within Roman military and historical thought regarding the unreliability of elephants. This belief became ingrained in their collective memory and narrative.

This "Roman meme" found its most powerful and enduring rhetorical expression in the writings of Quintus Curtius Rufus. Curtius's Historiae Alexandri Magni, written centuries after the actual events, famously portrays Alexander himself as having "despised" elephants. Curtius claims that Alexander believed elephants inflicted "more damage on their own side than on the enemy" [3, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. This assertion is made most prominently in Alexander's supposed speech to his troops at the Hyphasis River, where his army famously refused to advance further into India against the formidable Nanda elephants [3]. However, as critically argued by Trautmann (2025), this portrayal fundamentally contradicts the documented actions of Alexander. As detailed earlier, Alexander actively acquired, meticulously trained, and painstakingly transported hundreds of elephants back to Babylon, demonstrating a clear strategic appreciation for their value [22, 39, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. Furthermore, a comparative analysis of other contemporary accounts of Alexander's campaigns by Arrian, Diodorus, and Plutarch consistently shows no support for this specific "contempt" for elephants [2, 4, 7, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. Arrian, for instance, attributes the army's refusal to general fatigue, the onset of the monsoon, and the daunting intelligence about the Nanda's overwhelmingly superior forces, not to Alexander's personal disdain for elephants or a belief in their inherent unreliability [2].

The anachronism inherent in Curtius's narrative is a crucial methodological point for historical analysis. As both Trautmann (2025) and Charles (2010) persuasively argue, later Roman authors, influenced by their own military history, their ultimate victory over elephant-wielding powers, and their subsequent abandonment of war elephants, likely infused earlier Hellenistic accounts with this distinctly Roman perspective. An illustrative example is found in Diodorus Siculus's description of the siege of Megalopolis, where Polyperchon's elephants were reportedly thwarted by defensive spikes, with some subsequently turning on their own side [4]. While the event itself is plausible, the specific phrase "others brought death to many of their own side" might represent a "coloration from the Roman meme, imparted anachronistically by Diodorus to his retelling of a source of the Hellenistic period," quite possibly Hieronymus of Cardia [Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. Further compelling evidence of such anachronism is seen in the Fragmentum Sabbaiticum, which describes wooden towers on elephants and the use of caltrops—tactical innovations that, according to Goukowsky's classical analysis, were Greek inventions of a later period than the events being described [29, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. These examples underscore the inherent challenge and critical importance of reconstructing accurate historical details when later accounts reflect contemporary biases and evolving military doctrines, rather than the original context.

Formalization of the Meme: Armandi, Benedict, and the Modern Scholarly Canon

The "Roman meme" regarding elephant unreliability was not merely a fleeting historical narrative; it was further cemented and given a powerful veneer of scientific and military legitimacy in later centuries, profoundly shaping modern historical interpretations. Piero Damiano Armandi (1778–1855), a distinguished 19th-century Italian military general and scholar, dedicated a substantial portion of his seminal work, Histoire militaire des éléphants (1843), to formally establishing the unreliability of elephants as a "fact of military science" [9, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. Armandi, drawing heavily on Roman sources like Curtius and figures like Pliny the Elder, Livy, and Appian, systematically argued that "barbarous nations" (referring to non-Western powers) placed "unlimited confidence in their elephants," viewing them as symbols of grand display rather than truly effective military tools. He sharply contrasted this with the "great

captains of antiquity" (explicitly naming Alexander and Caesar) whom he claimed were "always suspicious of these dangerous auxiliaries" because their "ferocity could derange all combinations of military science" [9, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. Armandi's work was deeply influenced by the contemporary European military successes in Asia and his own background in artillery, leading him to conceptualize elephant charge in terms of "elephant ballistics," thereby lending a pseudo-scientific weight to his arguments. He explicitly stated his purpose to "repair the lacuna" of lost didactic works on elephant tactics from the Hellenistic period, but his unstated goal was to validate the Roman abandonment of war elephants through military science [Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)].

Armandi's project, though meticulous in its detail and valuable for its insights into a lost military world, is fundamentally flawed by its circular reasoning. As Trautmann (2025) points out, Armandi effectively "draws a proof from material which has been salted beforehand with the very thing that it is looking for." He inferred elephant "unreliability" from historical accounts that themselves may have been contaminated by the very Roman skepticism he sought to prove [Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. He failed to critically account for the anachronistic influence on his primary sources, leading to conclusions that reinforced pre-existing biases rather than objectively analyzing the evidence. Nevertheless, Armandi's work was highly influential, serving to solidify the Roman viewpoint into the mainstream of modern military thought and historical scholarship on ancient warfare.

A century later, Francis G. Benedict (1870–1957), a distinguished physiologist and director of the Nutrition Laboratory of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, further elevated this "truth" from military science to a purported "fact of elephant physiology" in his 1936 study, The Physiology of the Elephant [13, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. Benedict's work, pioneering in its scientific investigation of elephant metabolism and drawing from the study of animals at extremes of bodily size, cited both Curtius and Armandi as key authorities for his claim that elephants are "more dangerous to their own side" [13, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. This citation is prominently featured in his epigram. Paradoxically, Benedict's own detailed observations of circus elephants and extensive interviews with their handlers revealed nuanced insights that often contradicted his stated conclusions regarding elephant temperament. He noted that elephant "flightiness" was frequently context-dependent and manageable with proper training and familiarization. He observed that unfamiliar sounds or unseen disturbances could cause restlessness, but familiar phenomena, such as thunderstorms, often did not provoke panic, and experienced elephant keepers could effectively manage their animals using instruments like the ankush (Indian elephant hook) [13, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. Benedict even allowed for individual variation in elephant temperament, which further undermines a blanket statement about their inherent unreliability. His findings, therefore, suggest that the generalized "unreliability" was an oversimplification, perhaps influenced more by the prevailing historical narrative he himself cited than by his direct scientific observations. Despite later scholarly critiques, such as those by H.H. Scullard (1974), who deemed Curtius's view "nonsense" [37, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)], the "Roman meme" became deeply embedded in scholarly literature, often accepted as a commonplace needing no further demonstration.

The persistence of this meme is evident even among highly respected scholars in various fields. Juliet Clutton-Brock, a renowned authority on animal domestication, expressed sentiments of elephant unsuitability for warfare, writing that elephants were "not made for fighting human wars" and implying their vulnerability to stampeding and turning on their own forces [24, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. Similarly, Richard Stoneman, a notable classicist, succinctly summarized the outcome of the Battle of the Hydaspes as "cavalry trumps elephants," reflecting the enduring influence of the Roman meme [39, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. This pervasive skepticism highlights how deeply ingrained the anachronistic Roman view became, obscuring the actual effectiveness, strategic value, and sophisticated management of war elephants as understood and utilized by their proponents in India and the Hellenistic world. It emphasizes the need for a critical "follow the elephant" approach, as proposed by Trautmann, to uncover the material realities of their historical use.

The Elephant in Hellenistic Warfare: A Reassessment of its Strategic Value

Contrary to the pervasive "Roman meme" of inherent unreliability, Alexander's successors, the Diadochi, demonstrated an unparalleled enthusiasm for war elephants, unequivocally recognizing and exploiting their immense strategic and tactical value. The presence of Alexander's approximately 200 Indian elephants in Babylon at his death sparked a fierce rivalry among his generals for control over these formidable assets, signifying their perceived importance [Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. Eumenes, one of Alexander's generals, for instance, earned the distinguished title elephantarchos (ruler of elephants) due to his significant contingent of these animals, underscoring their prestige and military weight [Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)].

The most prominent and illustrative example of an elephant's pivotal role in the Hellenistic world is that of Seleucus I Nicator. After the fragmentation of Alexander’s empire, Seleucus strategically consolidated control over the eastern territories. His ambitious vision led him to direct contact with India, culminating in a historic peace treaty with Chandragupta Maurya, the founder of the powerful Mauryan Empire. As a crucial component of this treaty, Seleucus famously received 500 war elephants from Chandragupta in exchange for territorial concessions

in the Indus Valley and parts of Afghanistan [10, 41]. These elephants were not merely symbolic; they proved absolutely instrumental in Seleucus's subsequent campaigns, most notably at the decisive Battle of Ipsus in 301 BCE. At Ipsus, Seleucus's elephant corps formed a massive barrier that split the enemy forces of Antigonus Monophthalmus, preventing his cavalry from returning to the main battle and ultimately contributing decisively to Antigonus's defeat and the triumph of Seleucus and his allies [10, 30]. This large-scale acquisition and successful deployment directly contradict the notion of inherent elephant unreliability and instead underscore their critical, often game-changing, role in establishing and maintaining the vast Seleucid Empire, which was a dominant force in the Hellenistic East for centuries.

Similarly, Ptolemy I Soter, who established the Ptolemaic Dynasty in Egypt, found himself geographically cut off from the direct land routes to Indian elephants, which were primarily controlled by his rival, Seleucus. This strategic disadvantage spurred the Ptolemies to establish an elaborate and extensive system for capturing and training African elephants (likely the smaller North African forest elephant, Loxodonta africana pharaohensis, distinct from the larger Asian species) from Nubia and other regions [20, 38]. Crucially, they employed Indian techniques and recruited Indian personnel to manage and train these African elephants, highlighting the valuable transfer of specialized knowledge from India [20, 38, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. The extensive archaeological and textual evidence from sites like the Red Sea port of Berenike testifies to the sheer scale and logistical complexity of this undertaking, further demonstrating the high value placed on elephants as military assets in the Hellenistic world [20, 38]. The later adoption of war elephants by other North African states, such as Carthage (famously employed by Hannibal) and Numidia, further reflects this widespread acceptance and integration of elephant warfare, albeit with a different species of elephant than the Indian one [37]. These instances firmly demonstrate that for those who understood their capabilities and invested in their proper management, elephants were considered indispensable instruments of military power.

The very fact that the Greek word Indoi (Indians) came to acquire the specialized meaning of "elephant drivers" in the Hellenistic period, as evidenced in Diodorus and explicitly documented in glossaries like Hesychius's dictionary, further highlights the critical role played by Indian expertise in the management and deployment of these animals outside their native subcontinent [28, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. This linguistic shift is a powerful, yet subtle, testament to the deep cross-cultural transfer of military knowledge and the high demand for skilled Indian personnel throughout the Hellenistic world, debunking the idea that only "barbarous nations" blindly trusted them.

Logistical and Practical Considerations: The Immense Demands of Elephant Warfare

Beyond their direct combat role, the integration of war elephants into ancient armies presented immense and often underestimated logistical challenges. As Donald W. Engels (1978) meticulously highlights in his work on Alexander's logistics, the maintenance of any large army in antiquity required sophisticated planning and a robust supply chain; elephants, being creatures of immense size and unique physiological needs, presented demands far beyond those of standard cavalry or infantry [26].

Firstly, their prodigious appetites necessitated vast quantities of fodder. An adult Asian elephant can consume over 150-200 kg (330-440 lbs) of vegetation and 150-200 liters (40-50 gallons) of water per day. For a corps of hundreds of elephants, as deployed by Porus or Seleucus, this translated into thousands of kilograms of food and tens of thousands of liters of water daily. This immense demand meant that fodder had to be constantly sourced, transported, and stored, especially during long campaigns through varied terrains or in arid regions. The logistics of feeding these animals alone would have been a significant drain on military resources and a constant concern for commanders, requiring a dedicated support infrastructure of foraging parties, supply convoys, and storage depots. The challenges of supplying Alexander's army in Gedrosia, where the men had to eat their baggage animals, sharply contrast with the deliberate decision to route the elephants separately, highlighting their specialized and costly provisioning [26, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)].

Secondly, the physical transport of elephants, particularly over long distances or difficult terrain, was a complex engineering feat. Navigating mountains, deserts, or crossing major rivers required specialized infrastructure and manpower. Alexander's meticulous planning for the return journey from India, where he ensured his elephant contingent was routed through more hospitable terrain with provisions rather than the perilous Makran coast, exemplifies the extraordinary effort involved [26, Trautmann, 2025 (PDF)]. Constructing temporary bridges, reinforced ramps, sturdy enclosures, and even large rafts for river crossings would have been necessary, showcasing a significant investment in both engineering capabilities and logistical personnel. This was a far cry from simply marching a column of infantry.

Thirdly, the training and management of war elephants demanded highly specialized skills and immense dedication. Unlike horses, which have a relatively shorter training period, elephants require years of consistent, specialized care and training from a young age to become reliable in battle. The mahouts (elephant drivers) were not merely riders but highly skilled professionals who possessed a profound understanding of the animals' behavior, psychology, and physical needs. They formed deep, often lifelong bonds with their elephants, which were crucial for effective control and communication amidst the chaos, noise, and violence of battle. The presence and integration of these Indian elephant

specialists, as recruited by Alexander and later by the Diadochi, underscore the critical role of human expertise in harnessing the immense power of these animals. The vulnerability of the mahout in battle was a recognized tactical weakness—as the death or injury of a mahout could indeed cause an elephant to become uncontrollable—but it was a calculated risk managed through armor for the mahout and strategic deployment of the elephant [22].

Finally, the economic cost associated with acquiring, training, and maintaining war elephants was substantial. They represented a significant capital investment for any ancient state, comparable to maintaining a fleet or a large siege train. This high cost, coupled with the intricate logistical complexities, meant that only the wealthiest, most organized, and strategically forward-thinking empires and kingdoms could effectively deploy and sustain large elephant corps. The fact that the Hellenistic states, and later Carthage, continued to invest heavily in elephants despite these challenges, strongly argues for their perceived effectiveness as a decisive military asset that justified the expense and effort, rather than being a mere liability or an ostentatious display. Their continued use in the Sassanian armies centuries later, even when facing a Rome that had abandoned elephants, further attests to their enduring military value in certain contexts [21, 34].

Cultural Exchange and the "Follow the Elephant" Imperative

The narrative of Alexander and the elephants extends beyond military tactics and logistics; it is also a rich story of profound cultural exchange and mutual learning. Alexander's personal fascination with these animals, notably his efforts to capture and even send an elephant named Ajax back to Macedon for study and display, reflects a broader Hellenistic interest in exotic fauna and an emerging scientific curiosity [12, 14]. This interest aligns with the philosophical inquiries of figures like Aristotle, who had earlier discussed elephants in his zoological observations [14]. This engagement was not unilateral; the Greeks, through direct interaction, gained invaluable knowledge of elephant capture, training, and management techniques, sophisticated practices developed over millennia in India. Conversely, the Indian polities encountered Macedonian military tactics and organizational structures, which likely influenced their own military evolution, particularly in the nascent Mauryan Empire.

The "Follow the Elephant" imperative, a methodological approach highlighted by Trautmann (2025), suggests that by meticulously tracing the material reality of elephants in antiquity—their acquisition, care, deployment, and even their symbolic representation—we can gain a more accurate and nuanced understanding of the actual workings of ancient states and their intricate interconnections. This approach directly counters the tendency to view elephants merely as symbols or rhetorical devices in historical accounts, bringing to the forefront their tangible impact on ancient economies, technologies, and diplomatic relations. The presence of elephants in the armies of the Diadochi, their strategic importance in the Seleucid and Ptolemaic empires, and their continued presence in later Sassanian armies, reveals a tangible and significant flow of military technology and expertise from India to the West [21, 34].

This transfer of knowledge, deeply rooted in the Indian experience, directly contributed to the formation, stability, and character of the Hellenistic states. It shaped their internal military doctrines and their external interactions with each other and with emerging powers like Rome. The Mauryan Empire, under Chandragupta, which absorbed Alexander's former Indian territories and famously supplied Seleucus with 500 war elephants, stands as a testament to the sophisticated indigenous military capabilities that Alexander encountered and, perhaps inadvertently, helped to propagate across the ancient world [40, 41]. The history of the elephant thus becomes a vital, interconnected thread linking diverse ancient civilizations, challenging a purely Eurocentric view of military innovation and underscoring the profound significance of cross-cultural adaptation and the reciprocal nature of influence in the ancient world. Elephants were not just beasts of burden or instruments of destruction; they were living embodiments of power, cultural exchange, and military innovation that left an indelible mark on the historical landscape.

Conclusion

Alexander the Great's encounters with war elephants, particularly during his arduous and climactic Indian campaign, constitute a defining and transformative chapter in his illustrious military career and, indeed, in the broader annals of ancient warfare. These colossal animals, initially alien and terrifying to the Macedonian forces, presented an unprecedented challenge that demanded an extraordinary level of tactical innovation, strategic adaptation, and psychological resilience. Alexander's military genius was strikingly manifested not only in his ability to confront and decisively overcome these powerful beasts at the Battle of the Hydaspes but also, crucially, to pragmatically recognize their profound military utility and subsequently integrate them into his own burgeoning army. This pragmatic approach, often overlooked by later historical narratives, set a precedent that would fundamentally reshape the military landscape of the Hellenistic world.

The historical trajectory of elephant warfare, however, has often been distorted and obscured by later historiographical interpretations, most notably the pervasive "Roman meme" of inherent elephant unreliability. This study has critically examined how this deeply ingrained skepticism, born from Rome's later imperial experiences, its military victories over elephant-wielding powers, and its ultimate abandonment of war elephants, was anachronistically projected onto

Alexander's era by influential writers like Quintus Curtius Rufus. Furthermore, we have demonstrated how this flawed perspective was subsequently formalized into a "fact of military science" by Piero Damiano Armandi in the 19th century and, even more misleadingly, elevated to a "fact of elephant physiology" by Francis G. Benedict in the 20th century, despite mounting evidence, including Benedict's own observations, contradicting these assertions. This chain of historical interpretation, based on anachronism and confirmation bias, profoundly skewed the understanding of the elephant's true historical role.

A rigorous re-evaluation of the historical evidence, free from these later biases, reveals a dramatically different picture. Alexander's active acquisition of over 200 elephants from India, his meticulous efforts in transporting them back to Babylon, and his recruitment of skilled Indian elephant specialists clearly underscore his appreciation for their strategic value, dismantling any notion of his "contempt" for them. More significantly, the widespread and successful adoption of war elephants by his immediate successors, the Diadochi—particularly Seleucus I Nicator, whose 500 elephants were decisive at Ipsus, and Ptolemy I Soter, who established elaborate African elephant procurement systems—profoundly reshaped Hellenistic military doctrines and power dynamics for centuries. The critical role of elephants in major battles and their enduring presence in the armies of these successor kingdoms provide compelling and unequivocal evidence against the notion of their inherent unreliability. Instead, they were prized assets, capable of delivering decisive shock and tactical advantage when properly managed.

The immense logistical complexities and substantial economic investment required to capture, train, and maintain elephant corps further attest to their perceived effectiveness; only the most powerful, organized, and resource-rich ancient states could afford and sustain such a formidable military asset. This phenomenon facilitated a rich and dynamic cross-cultural exchange, transmitting sophisticated Indian elephant management techniques and military knowledge to the Hellenistic world, influencing everything from military strategy and engineering to the very terminology used to describe elephant handlers. This transfer was not merely military; it impacted zoological understanding, courtly display, and the symbolic representation of power across empires.

In essence, adopting the imperative to "follow the elephant"—by focusing on its material reality, logistical demands, tactical impact, and cultural significance—offers a more nuanced, accurate, and profoundly enriching understanding of ancient military history. It highlights the continuous evolution of military thought, the critical importance of adaptability in the face of new challenges, and the profound, often underappreciated, impact of cross-cultural military and technological exchange in shaping the ancient world. The legacy of Alexander's elephantine encounters is not one of mere fleeting terror but of a lasting transformation in the art of war, deeply rooted in the sophisticated military traditions of the Indian subcontinent and broadly disseminated throughout the Hellenistic sphere, forever changing the face of ancient combat.

REFERENCES

1. Assyrian Dictionary. 2005. Gelb, Ignace J., ed. Vol. 12, s.v. pīru A. Chicago: Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, 418–20.
2. Arrian. 1976. History of Alexander and Indica. Brunt, P. A., trans. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
3. Curtius. 1946. Quintus Curtius. History of Alexander. 2 vols. Rolfe, John C., trans. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, and William Heinemann.
4. Diodorus Siculus. 1961. Diodorus of Sicily. Oldfather, Charles Henry, trans. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, and William Heineman.
5. Megasthenes. Brill's New Jacoby 715. Megasthenes, Indian History. Duane W. Roller, trans. Leiden: Brill.
6. Jacoby, Felix. 1958. Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, dritter Teil, C. Leiden: Brill. Megasthenes = 715.
7. Plutarch. 1982. Plutarch's Lives. Life of Alexander. Loeb Classical Library, Perrin, Bernadotte, trans. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press and William Heinemann.
8. Anson, Edward M. 2020. Philip II, the Father of Alexander the Great: Themes and Issues. London: Bloomsbury.
9. Armandi, Piero Damiano. 1843. Histoire militaire des éléphants. Paris: D'Aymot.
10. Bar-Kochva, Bezelel. 1976. The Seleucid Army: Organization and Tactics in the Great Campaigns. New York: Cambridge University Press.
11. Baynham, Elizabeth. 1998. Alexander the Great: The Unique History of Quintus Curtius. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
12. Baynham, Elizabeth. 2021. Alexander's Pets: Animals and the Macedonian Court. In D'Agostini, Monica, Anson, Edward M., and Pownall, Francis, eds., Affective Relations and Personal Bonds in Hellenistic Antiquity. Studies in Honor of Elizabeth D. Carney. Philadelphia: Oxbow Books, 127–42.
13. Benedict, Francis G. 1936. The Physiology of the Elephant. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington.

14. Bigwood, J. M. 1993. Aristotle and the Elephant Again. American Journal of Philology 114, 4: 537–55.

15. Bosworth, A. B. 1996. The Historical Setting of Megasthenes' Indica. Classical Philology 91, 2: 113–27; https://doi.org/10.2307/270500.

16. Bosworth, A. B. 2004. Mountain and Molehill? Cornelius Tacitus and Quintus Curtius. Classical Quarterly N.S. 54: 551–67.

17. Briant, Pierre. 1997. Notes d'histoire militaire achéménide, à propos des éléphants de Darius III. In Brulé, Pierre and Oulhhen, Jacques, eds., Esclavage, guerre, économie en Grèce ancienne, hommage à Y. Garlan. Rennes: Presses universitaire de Rennes, 177–90.

18. Briant, Pierre. 2002. From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire. Daniels, Peter T., trans. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

19. Brunt, P. A. 1980. On Historical Fragments and Epitomes. Classical Quarterly 30, 2: 477–94.

20. Burstein, Stanley M. 2008. Elephants for Ptolemy II: Ptolemaic Policy in Nubia in the Third Century BC. In McKechnie, P. D. and Guillaume, P., eds., Ptolemy Philadelphus and His World. Leiden: Brill, 135–47.

21. Charles, Michael B. 2007. The Rise of the Sassanian Elephant Corps: Elephants and the Later Roman Empire. Iranica antiqua 42: 301–46.

22. Charles, Michael B. 2010. Elephants, Alexander and the Indian Campaign. Mouseion 10, 3: 327–53.

23. Clutton-Brock, Juliet. 1992. Horse Power: A History of the Horse and the Donkey in Human Societies. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

24. Clutton-Brock, Juliet. 1999. A Natural History of Domesticated Mammals. 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

25. Deloche, Jean. 1993–1994. Transport and Communications in India Prior to Steam Locomotion. French Studies in South Asian Culture and Society 7. Walker, James, trans. 2 vols. Delhi and New York: Oxford University Press.

26. Engels, Donald W. 1978. Alexander the Great and the Logistics of the Macedonian Army. Berkeley: University of California Press.

27. Engels, Donald W. 1980. Alexander's Intelligence System. Classical Quarterly 30, 2: 327–40.

28. Goossens, Roger. 1943. Gloses indiennes dans le lexique d'Hésychius. L'antiquité classique 12, 1: 47–55.

29. Paul, Goukowsky. 1972. Le roi Pôros, son éléphant et quelques autres (en marge de Diodore, XVII, 88, 6). Bulletin de correspondance hellénique 96, 1: 473–502; doi: 10.3406/bch.1972.2145.

30. Kosmin, Paul J. 2014. The Land of the Elephant Kings: Space, Territory, and Ideology in the Seleucid Empire. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

31. Mahé-Simon, Mathilde and Jean Trinquier. 2014. L'Histoire d'Alexandre selon Quinte-Curce. Paris: Armand Colin.

32. Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1986. Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen. Indogermanische Bibliothek. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

33. Parker, Grant. 2008. The Making of Roman India. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

34. Rance, Philip. 2003. Elephants in Warfare in Late Antiquity. Acta Ant. Hung 43: 355–84.

35. Reuss, Friedrich. 1876. Hieronymos von Kardia: Studien zur Geschichte der Diodochenzeit. Berlin: Weidmann.

36. Sabu [pseudonym]. 1979. Mustn't Forget. Niagara Falls: The author. Ringling Brothers Elephant History. Robert L. Parkinson Library and Research Center, Circus World Museum, Baraboo, Wisconsin.

37. Scullard, H. H. 1974. The Elephant in the Greek and Roman world. Cornell: Cornell University Press.

38. Sidebotham, Steven E. 2011. Berenike and the Ancient Maritime Spice Route. Berkeley: University of California Press.

39. Stoneman, Richard. 2019. The Greek Experience of India, from Alexander to the Indo-Greeks. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

40. Trautmann, Thomas R. 2015. Elephants and Kings: An Environmental History. New Delhi: Permanent Black; Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

41. Trautmann, Thomas R. 2021. Megasthenes on the Military Livestock of Chandragupta and the Making of the First Indian Empire. Comparative Studies in Society and History 61, 2: 339–65.

42. Tranquier, Jean. 2014. Alexandre au miroir des rois indiens: le développement du livre VIII des Histoires dAlexandre consacré aux souverains de lInde. In Mathilde Mahé-Simon and Jean Trinquier, eds., L'Histoire d'Alexandre selon Quinte-Curce. Paris: Armand Colin, 211–64.

43. Vecchi, Leone. 1893. Il generale Armandi: biographia, documenti, lettere. Imola: Galeati.

44. Wheatley, Pat and Charlotte Dunn. 2020. Demetrius the Besieger. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

45. Wulfram, Hartmut, ed. 2016. Der römische Alexanderhistoriker Curtius Rufus: Erzähltechnik, Rhetorik, Figurenpsychologie und Rezeption. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.