

(10.32) **Pursuit Die Roll:** To see if a cavalry unit pursues, the player rolls a die and adds two (+2) to the result. If the adjusted die roll is greater than the unit's TQ, that unit Pursues. Otherwise, it advances after combat normally. If the defending unit was eliminated—either from combat or during its Rout—there is *no* Pursuit.

PLAYNOTE: The presence of a leader has no effect on the Pursuit die roll, although the leader is free to tag along.

(10.33) **Pursuit Procedure:** Pursuing cavalry, essentially, chases the fleeing unit. After the routed unit is moved, the pursuing cavalry moves, following the same path as the fleeing unit. It stops only when it either moves into an enemy ZOC or places an enemy unit in *its* ZOC. It will *not* pursue a fleeing unit off the edge of the map; it will stop at the edge, ending pursuit.

(10.34) When the pursuing unit has stopped it will, if possible, attack any/all enemy units in its ZOC. The entire process is then repeated (10.32-10.34) until no attacks are possible. There are no Pre-Shock TQ checks in any Shock that occurs during Pursuit.

(10.35) Cavalry Pursuit is resolved immediately after the Rout result ... and before any other combat is resolved.

(10.36) Pursuing cavalry pays all terrain Hit costs; they do not pay any MP costs from their MA.

(10.4) ARMY WITHDRAWAL

DESIGN NOTE: The Army Withdrawal levels in the scenarios reflect the realities of each army's capabilities. They favor the Macedonians, as their army was professional and better trained. Play balance may be adjusted by changing those levels, although this is something that should not be done until you are familiar with both the game and your opponent.

(10.41) A player wins by causing his opponent's army to Withdraw. An army will Withdraw when it has exceeded its Withdrawal Level (listed in each scenario) at the end of the turn. To determine this, each player totals the number of Rout Points (from his eliminated units, or units that have Routed *off* the map) that army/player has garnered.

(10.42) In general, a unit is worth RPs equal to its TQ, with the following exceptions:

- All non-Shock Skirmisher unit (SK) are worth one (1) RP.
- Shock skirmishers (SK*), Elephants and Chariots are worth two (2) RPs.
- Double-sized units—the phalanxes—are worth twice (2x) their TQ rating. Thus a phalanx with a TQ of '7' is worth 14 RPs.
- Artillery units are worth '0'.
- Leaders are worth five times (5x) their Initiative Rating.

Exception #1: Alexander is worth 10x his Initiative, or 70 RPs. This does not apply in Chaeronea.

Exception #2: If Darius is killed, the Macedonians automatically win.

(10.43) If an Army's RP total is the same or higher than the Withdrawal Level for that army in that battle, it has routed and that player has lost the battle.

(10.44) If both sides reach Withdrawal Level at the end of the same turn, the player with the least number of RPs above that level wins (but just barely).

If both sides are exactly the same, it's a draw.

SOURCES:

Books on Alexander are rich in quantity and varied in opinion. The only point that any of these authors seem to agree on wholeheartedly is that Alexander was truly a genius.

Adcock, F. E.; The Greek and Macedonian Art of War (University of California Press; 1957) A good basic book on the development of hoplite-style warfare.

Arrian, Flavius Xenophon; translated by Edward Chinnock, The Anabasis of Alexander (Random House, New York, 1942) As close to an original source as we're likely to get. Although written several hundred years after the fact, Arrian's information appears to have been based on contemporary sources long lost, although some of his numbers sound like crowd estimates for a political rally. Arrian was part historian, part PR flak. Fun to read, though.

Bosworth, A.B.; Conquest and Empire (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1988) A very scholarly treatment of the reign of Alexander with good descriptions of the battles along with the various historical interpretations connected with each. Book contains an excellent discussion and dissection of Alexander's army in terms of command structure, numbers, weaponry and usage.

Connolly, Peter; The Greek Armies (Silver Burdett Co., Morristown NJ, 1985) Originally part of a larger work ("Greece and Rome at War"), this book is mostly valuable for the author's remarkable illustrations, although the information, while surface, is good.

Creasy, Sir Edward; The Fifteen Decisive Battles of History, (George Rutledge and Sons Ltd, 1850) This interesting book (we used the Arbela chapter), written in the Victorian era, is still a valuable source of answers to a variety of tactical questions.

Curtius, Quintus Rufus; trans. by John Yardley, The History of Alexander the Great, (Penguin Books; 1984) Another of our "original" sources, Curtius, while often providing some detail missing (one sometimes wonders why) from other sources, is prone to flights of fancy.

Delbrück, Hans, translated by Walter J. Renfroe, Jr., Warfare in Antiquity Volume 1; University of Nebraska Press; 1975. A groundbreaking, innovative work, which, although almost a century old, is still remarkable for its insight into why things were done. Delbrück was one of the first historians who tried to "recreate" ancient tactics to see if what was being said was actually viable, and to seriously—and scientifically—question some of the numerical flights of fancy the ancient (and not-so-ancient) historians engaged in.

Devine, A.M.; "Grand Tactics in the Battle of Issus," in The Ancient World, Vol. XII, nos 1 & 2, Ares Publishers, Illinois, 1985. Also included in this cite would be Devine's similar articles on The Granicus, Gaugamela, and The Hydaspes for AW magazine. Whether you agree with Prof. Devine's conclusions or not, these are the most succinct and lucid battle analyses extant. Most important is Devine's discussion of all available sources.

Diodorus, Siculus; Diodorus of Sicily (Universal History) (Loeb Classics Library; 1963) More "original" source work. Highly readable, but he does differ in many instances with his ancient brethren.

Dodge, Ayrault Theodore; Alexander; Greenhill Books, London, 1993 reprint of 1890 editions, Vols 1 and 2. Col. Dodge's account is a very readable narrative that follows Arrian as his main source. His major contribution was to take the often confusing descriptions of the various battles and, using his professional military judgement, creates maps of the actions which are consistent with the history, as

written, and are reasonable interpretations of what happened. He and Devine were critical sources to the smaller battles included in this game.

Engels, Donald W.; [Alexander the Great and the Logistics of the Macedonian Army](#) (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1978). Although pertaining mainly to operational considerations, Engels does list all of Alexander's losses and reinforcements in one table as well as providing a chapter on the Pinarus River's location.

Fox, Robin Lane; [Alexander the Great](#) (The Dial Press, New York, 1974) An overview of Alexander, nicely written, with an insightful description of how the "heavy" Companion cavalry operated tactically. Lane is one of the proponents of the Parmenion theory at Granicus.

Fuller, Maj. Gen. J. F. C.; [Military History of the Western World Volume 1](#), (Funk and Wagnalls, 1954) Good research, good OoB for Arbela in particular, quite opinionated. Interesting for what it leaves out more than what's in it.

Fuller, Maj. Gen. J. F. C.; [The Generalship of Alexander the Great](#) (Rutgers University Press; 1960) For 10-15 years this was the basic work on Alexander's military career. Very readable but, despite Fuller's usual opinions, not very thought-provoking. Still and all, a valuable source.

Hackett, Gen. Sir John (Editor); [Warfare in the Ancient World](#) (Facts on File, New York, 1989) This book, which contains several of Peter Connolly's vivid paintings, is a good, basic book on ancient warfare. The Alexander section, written by Alexandrian battle expert Dr. Albert Devine, is quite detailed and contains good deployment maps.

Hammond, N.G.L.; [Alexander the Great: King, Commander and Statesman](#) (Noyes Press, New Jersey, 1980). Another excellent military history, with good, detailed battle descriptions (he favors Arrian and pretty much dismisses everybody else). Even better are his analyses and maps of the battlefields, accompanied by photographs and extensive descriptions from on-the-spot visits. Where terrain conflicts arose, we tended to go with Hammond.

Hanson, Victor Davis; [The Western Way of War](#) (Alfred Knopf, New York, 1989) An unusual but highly interesting book on tactical warfare immediately preceding the Macedonian era; it's insights into hoplite/phalanx warfare are excellent.

Hurley, Vic; [Arrows Against Steel: The History of the Bow](#) (Mason/Charter;1975) An extremely valuable book, especially in the three-month dialogue the designers, developers and playtesters had over the GEnie system concerning the use and misuse of skirmisher units.

Jones, Archer; [The Art of War in the Western World](#) (University of Illinois Press, Urbana and Chicago, 1987) The first chapter presents an excellent analysis of the relative strengths of the various weapons systems of the period.

Olmstead, A. T.; [History of the Persian Empire](#) (University of Chicago Press; 1948) The basic work on those crazy old Achaemenids - certainly one of history's forgotten empires. Actually, they were quite a capable bunch, although the Persian word for "election" appears to be "assassination".

Plutarch, translated by John Dryden; [Plutarch's Lives Volume 4](#). (A.L. Burt Co.) The Robin Leach of Rome. This is great stuff, much of it R-rated.

Rossen, Robert; [Alexander the Great](#) (MGM Home Video, 1983) This was one of the first "serious" epic films of the 1950's. Despite good intentions, history is trashed as Arbela happens at Issus; the Macedonians all look like Homeric hoplites; most of the battle sequences, while having the terrain about right, are laughably hopeless; and Alexander often wears a helmet that makes him look like Rip Taylor with blinders. We also learn that it is against the law to kill a king unless you are one (priceless dialogue bit #2327), very few buildings had roofs, and that the Persians invented seat belts. On the plus side, Richard Burton (Alexander), Frederich March (Phillip) and Harry Andrews (Darius) really look the part, and the chariot charge at Arbela is right on the nose.

Tarn, W. W.; [Alexander the Great](#), (Cambridge University Press; 1948) Still considered by some to be the best overview volume ever written on Alexander.

Warry, John; [Alexander 334-323 BC: Conquest of the Persian Empire](#) (Osprey Publishing Ltd.; 1991) This book, one of the ubiquitous Osprey books on military doings, is mostly useful for visualizations of men, formations and weapons.

Warry, John; [Warfare in the Classical World](#) (St. Martin's Press, 1980) Probably the best single overview of ancient warfare available today. Excellent text, insight and graphics.

CREDITS:

Original system designed by:
Mark Herman

Deluxe edition designed by:
Mark Herman and Richard Berg

Cover art/counter art/Art Director:
Rodger B. MacGowan

Original game developed by:
Richard H. Berg

Rules and commentary by:
Richard H. Berg

4th edition project coordinator and editor: **Alan Ray**

4th edition map graphics and rules layout:
Mark Simonitch

Playtesters: **Stephen Chin-quee, Michael Lemick, Jim Lurvey, Rod Thayer, Keith Schlesinger, David Fox, Ralph Edwards, David Hall, Bill Thoet and Sal Vasta**

Proofing: **Kevin Duke and Peter Rich**

Producers: **Andy Lewis, Rodger MacGowan and Tony Curtis**