



Karanos

BULLETIN OF
ANCIENT MACEDONIAN STUDIES

01

Ancient Macedonian Studies
in Honor of A. B. Bosworth

2018

Karanos

**Bulletin of Ancient Macedonian
Studies**



Vol. 1 (2018)

**Ancient Macedonian Studies
in Honor of A. B. Bosworth**

President of Honor

F. J. Gómez Espelosín,
(Universidad de Alcalá)

Director

Borja Antela-Bernárdez,
(Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

Editorial Board

Borja Antela-Bernárdez
Antonio Ignacio Molina Marín (Universidad de Alcalá)
Mario Agudo Villanueva (Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

Advisory Board

F. Landucci (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore)
E. Carney (Clemson University)
D. Mirón (Universidad de Granada)
C. Rosillo (Universidad Pablo de Olavide)
W. L. Adams (University of Utah)
N. Akamatis (International Hellenic University)
V. Alonso-Troncoso (Universidad de A Coruña)
A. Domínguez Monedero (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid)
F. J. Gómez Espelosín (Universidad de Alcalá)
W. S. Greenwalt (Santa Clara University)
M. Hatzopoulos (National Hellenic Research Foundation)
S. Müller (Philipps-Universität Marburg)
M. Jan Olbrycht (University of Rzeszów)
O. Palagia (National & Kapodistrian University of Athens)
J. Roisman (Colby College)
G. Squillace (Università di Calabria)
T. Howe (St. Olaf College)

Secretary

Marc Mendoza Sanahuja (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

Edition

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
Departament de Ciències de l'Antiguitat i l'Edat Mitjana
08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona). Spain
Tel.: 93 581 47 87.
Fax: 93 581 31 14
karanos@uab.cat
<http://revistes.uab.cat/karanos>

Layout: Borja Antela-Bernárdez

Printing

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
Servei de Publicacions
08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona). Spain
sp@uab.cat
<http://publicacions.uab.cat/>

ISSN: 2604-6199 (paper)
eISSN 2604-3521 (online)
Dipòsit legal: B 26.673-2018

Printed in Spain
Printed in Ecologic paper

Karanos is an Academic Journal focused in the Historical, Socioeconomical and Cultural perspectives related with Ancient Macedonia, from the Argead Dynasty to the Hellenistic Macedonian Kingdoms (Seleucids, Ptolemies, Antigonids, among others) and the Roman province of Macedonia. *Karanos* publish double-blind peer-reviewed papers related with these topics, including Historical, Archaeological, Philological, Epigraphical, or Numismatical approaches, and any other kind of cultural analysis on the Ancient Macedonia and its historical appearances like the Hellenistic Kingdoms and the relation with other peoples and cultures, including Historiography and Classical Reception Studies. *Karanos* also accepts reviews of books, reports and interviews that can be considered of interest for the Ancient Macedonian Studies.

The opinions expressed in papers, notes, reviews or any other research published in *Karanos* is a responsibility in exclusive of their authors.

In order to support a Gender-friendly peer-review policy, avoiding preponderances, *Karanos* uses to keep equality concerning the referee's election of each paper.

Karanos is published under the Creative Commons within the following License:



Attribution (by): This license lets others distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon your work, even commercially, as long as they credit you for the original creation. This is the most accommodating of licenses offered. Recommended for maximum dissemination and use of licensed materials.

INDEX

EDITORIAL	5-6
Professor Brian Bosworth, a brief biography by E. BAYNHAM	7-8
<hr/> PAPERS <hr/>	
Alexander, Agathoi Daimones, Argives and Armenians by C. T. DJURSLEV – D. OGDEN	11-21
Alexander the Great, the royal throne and the funerary thrones of Macedonia by O. PALAGIA	23-34
Alexander and the Medicine by B. ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ – C. SIERRA MARTÍN	35-54
Battling without Beards: Synesius of Cyrene's <i>Calvitii encomium</i> , Arrian's <i>Anabasis Alexandri</i> and the Alexander discourse of the fourth century AD. by C. T. DJURSLEV	55-65
Icons, Images, Interpretations: Arrian, Lukian, their Relationship, and Alexander at the Kydnos by S. MÜLLER	67-86
Death on the Nile: The murder of Perdiccas and the river crossing in Ancient Macedonia by A. I. MOLINA MARÍN	87-106
<hr/> FLASHBACKS <hr/>	
The Coronation of the Diadochi by E. S. GRUEN	109-119
<hr/> MAIN VOICES IN ANCIENT MACEDONIAN STUDIES <hr/>	
W. S. Greenwalt by M. AGUDO VILLANUEVA – A. I. MOLINA MARÍN	123-127

REVIEWS

- Hugh Bowden, *Alexander the Great. A Very Short Introduction* **131-132**
by M. AGUDO VILLANUEVA
- Mario Agudo Villanueva, *Macedonia. La cuna de Alejandro Magno* **133-135**
by A. I. MOLINA MARÍN
- Claudia Antonetti – Biagi, Paolo (eds.), *With Alexander in India and Central Asia: moving East and back to West* **136-139**
by M. MENDOZA SANAHUJA
- Timothy Howe – E. Edward Gavrin – Graham Wrightson (eds.): *Greece, Macedon and Persia. Studies in Social, Political and Military History in Honor of Waldemar Heckel* **140-141**
by M. PACHÓN
- F. J. Gómez Espelosín, *En busca de Alejandro: historia de una obsesión* **142-143**
by A. I. MOLINA MARÍN

EDITORIAL

To launch a new journal is never an easy task. Given the wealth of digital journals on Antiquity available today, what is the point of creating another one? This question, along with many others, will have occurred to anyone who has ever entertained the notion of becoming a journal editor.

The case of *Karanos* is no different in this regard. For over a year now, the editorial board has been puzzling over such questions until, finally, we decided to start work on *Karanos*. The reason for putting our doubts aside is a simple one: to date, there is no journal in existence that focuses exclusively on the field of the *Ancient Macedonian Studies*. This is indeed a powerful argument for launching *Karanos*, as there is a gap that needs to be filled. It also explains the international flavour of *Karanos*: although based in Spain, as part of the catalogue of journals published by the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, the aim is for it to be international in scope, for which reason its main language is English, while accepting papers for publication that are written in French, Italian or Modern Greek, as well as in Spanish and, of course, English.

It is true that the historical notion of Macedonia could be regarded as too specific to make up a journal's whole area of study. The kingdom of Macedonia was a geographic and political entity with its own socio-cultural peculiarities that continued to function in an area of the Balkans (whose size varied over time) for several centuries in the first millennium B.C. However, the *Ancient Macedonian Studies* are assumed to transcend the limits of the historical entity known as Macedonia, encompassing each of the various historical, archaeological and cultural features of Ancient Macedonia, whether these pertain directly to the Argead Kingdom or to any of its subsequent manifestations in the context of the Hellenistic kingdoms, as the Roman province of Macedonia. Therefore, *Karanos* has a place for historical and cultural studies and epigraphic, numismatic, and archaeological analyses, when these are of a certain standard and could have a notable impact on historical research within the journal's area of focus. In fact, the journal starts out with the aim of proving that the *Ancient Macedonian Studies* involve rather more than just the figure of Alexander the Great and that, ultimately, he himself can only be understood within the Macedonian context. Besides its editors, *Karanos* is backed by a top-flight group of international researchers from various disciplines, whose guidance and support have helped to make its appearance possible.

Regarding the structure of *Karanos*, which will appear once a year, it has four clearly defined sections. The first of these is the "Papers" section, devoted to original studies or discussions on topics within the scope of the journal which make a contribution to our field of study. The second, called "Flashbacks", recovers studies that have already been published but are not readily accessible, or which continue to be of interest and considerable value to today's researchers. For its third section, *Karanos* opts for interviews, under the title "Main Voices in Ancient Macedonian Studies". It will provide the academic community with an opportunity to benefit from the experience of leading researchers in our field: as told in their own voices in a congenial, personal

tone. In this first issue, we have the honour of interviewing William Greenwalt, whose studies on the religious aspects of Macedonia, among others, have inspired several generations of researchers. Lastly, *Karanos* includes a brief section for reviewing relatively recent studies that are of interest or could have a notable impact on our field.

One main feature of *Karanos*, in a time of consciousness and the aim of change, is related to our policy about referees. In order to support a Gender-friendly peer-review policy, avoiding preponderances of male reviewers, *Karanos* uses to keep Gender equality concerning the referee's election of each paper. This is our little contribution to allow female researchers to be included in equality within the *Ancient Macedonian Studies*.

As births are always special moments – even in the case of journals – we have decided to turn this first inaugural issue of *Karanos* into a tribute to the great A. B. Bosworth. His influence and, to a certain extent, his guidance, have been crucial to the work of all historians specialising in *Ancient Macedonian Studies* over the last few decades. The editorial board would like to thank Elizabeth Baynham for her backing. From the very beginning she has supported our plans to pay tribute to Bosworth and she has contributed to this issue with a brief biographical sketch of him. Also taking part in the tribute are such authors as Ogden, Palagia, Müller, Djurselv and Sierra, who, in this way, are also lending their support to the launch of the journal *Karanos*, which embarks on its journey as from the following pages. Let me also remember the members of the staff at the Autonomous University of Barcelona Press, especially to Pep Sanso, who helps us with every doubt, and the people of the Department of Sciences of the Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Finally, we would like to thank you, as a reader, for your interest, and we hope your experience will be pleasant, fruitful and inspiring.

Turning back to the beginning, to launch a new journal can be a hard task to face up to, and in my opinion it can be an impossible challenge, but luckily we counted with an extra support, that of our families and friends. And every challenge seems easier with a little help from your family and friends. I have to thank here my own family, especially to my partner Mireia Bosch Mateu and our sons, for their generosity, love and care. I know the other members of the Editorial Board feel the same. Even more, any Editorial at every journal is, actually, a clue of the love and support of families along the world for researchers to be brave, to engage new journals and projects, to try to change a lot of thing. Thus, I cross my fingers, like any other Bogart at *Rick's* and say to myself: "Here is looking at you, kid!". *Aquesta va per tu*.

BORJA ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ

Director of *Karanos. Bulletin of Ancient Macedonian Studies*

borja.antela@uab.cat

Bellaterra (Barcelona), November 8th 2018

Professor Brian Bosworth

A brief biography

by Elizabeth Baynham
University of New Castle
elizabeth.baynham@newcastle.edu.au



It is a great honour to be asked to write about the life of Professor Bosworth for the Introduction of this special edition of *Karanos* in his honour. Brian always had a great admiration of European culture and scholarship, and he would have deeply appreciated this current compilation.

Albert Brian Bosworth was born in Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, on March 21st, 1942, during the height of World War II – he always liked to say that he “came in with the Siege of Leningrad” – which wasn’t quite accurate either in time or location - but nonetheless effective. He won a scholarship to the prestigious Nottingham High School (alma mater of D.H. Lawrence) and later to Oxford University, where he studied at Keble College. After completing his M. Phil, Brian (as he preferred to be known) was appointed as a lecturer in Classics at the University of Western Australia by Professor Mervyn Austin in 1967. He had already been accepted for a position in the public service at Whitehall, but Fate - and perhaps the appeal of a career in Classics and the lure of an exotic location like Australia - led him to leave England for the Southern Hemisphere. He was productive from the outset, and was appointed to a Personal Chair by the time he was 38.

Brian was to spend most of his life in Perth, apart from periods of study leave, University Fellowships and visits to the United States, the United Kingdom and Continental Europe. Interestingly, he never lost his Midlands accent. In his mid sixties and after he had retired from UWA, Brian was offered a Professorial appointment primarily as a researcher at Macquarie University, but sadly the onset of Parkinson’s Disease hindered his productivity there. He died in December 2014 after having been diagnosed with advanced oesophageal cancer.

Brian’s list of publications is considerable; seven books including the third volume of his Commentary on Arrian (which will be published posthumously), nearly ninety articles, book chapters and reviews, and around fifty five entries in the third edition of the Oxford Classical Dictionary (edited by S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth). He also supervised many Research Higher Degree candidates, several of whom have gone on to highly successful academic careers of their own.

Brian was a gentle and quiet man, although not without tenacity, if not a degree of stubbornness. He loved Classical music and could play the piano very well; he hated shopping and shopping malls, loved hiking, cooking and socializing with either a gin and tonic (he gave up whisky at Keble after too many sessions with J.P.V.D. Balsdon – or so he said), or a glass of wine in hand. He had a dry and sharp wit, but above all Brian was always known for his kindness and intellectual generosity – both to

colleagues and students. Right up until his last months he was corresponding with fellow scholars from all around the world (I was his ‘amanuensis’).

I believe it is both as a testament to Brian’s scholarship, as well as the high regard and affection from his colleagues that he should be celebrated again with such a distinguished collection nearly four years after his death.



Brian Bosworth (left) at the University of Canterbury (Photo by Tim Parkin, on the far right).



P A P E R S

Alexander, Agathoi Daimones, Argives and Armenians

by Christian Thue Djurslev
Aarhus University
c.djurslev@ed.ac.uk

and

Daniel Ogden
University of Exeter
d.ogden@ex.ac.uk

ABSTRACT Intriguing and complex traditions are preserved about Alexander and the *agathos daimon* house-snakes of Alexandria by Phylarchus, the *Alexander Romance*, ps.-Epiphanius and the *Chronicon Paschale*. These bear upon both a foundational myth and upon a related cultural practice. New light is shed on these traditions by some striking comparative folkloric evidence gathered in Armenia at the end of the nineteenth century. In primis, the Armenians' practice of addressing their friendly house snakes as 'Armenians' suggests that the Alexandrians' practice of addressing their own friendly house snakes as 'Argives' entailed a notion that they were themselves, somehow, 'Argive' in origin, a notion that can be evidenced in several further ways.

KEYWORDS Alexander; Ptolemy I; Alexandria; Argives; Argos; Argeads; Armenians; Agathos Daimon; house snakes; *Alexander Romance*; Phylarchus; ps.-Epiphanius; *Chronicon Paschale*; Abeghian; Inachus.

The present essay serves as a gloss to Ogden's recent discussion of the *agathoi daimones* house-snakes of Alexandria¹. The principal evidence for them is found in three texts. The first of these is the alpha recension of the *Alexander Romance*, probably produced in the third-century AD in the form in which we know it, although parts of it, including the one in question, are almost certainly early Ptolemaic in origin. This tells how Alexander's (remote) killing of a miraculous serpent that has been manifesting itself at the site of Alexandria as it is first being constructed results in the appearance of a host of *agathoi daimones* snakes. The recension is reconstructed from a single, poor Greek manuscript (A) and the Armenian translation of what was evidently a rather

¹ OGDEN 2013a, 286-309. For *Agathos Daimon* and *agathos daimones* in general see also NILSSON 1967-74, ii, 213-18; BERNAND 1970, i, 82-99; FRASER 1972, i, 209-11 (with notes); QUAEGBEUR 1975, 170-6 and *passim*; DUNAND 1981 and, most recently now, BARBANTANI 2014 esp. 224-8; further bibliography at OGDEN 2013a, 286. Barbantani's extensive article offers much of interest on the subject of *drakontes* in connection with North Africa, but its central hypothesis is precarious to say the least: it is entirely speculative to suppose that Apollonius' reference to Medusa's snake-children in the sole surviving fragment of his lost *Foundation of Alexandria* (Apollonius F4 Powell = schol. Nicander *Theriaca* 12a) had anything whatsoever to do with either Alexander or Ptolemy.

better account of the same Greek text. We offer a translation of the A text with important supplements from the Armenian translation indicated by arrow-brackets (the emboldened alphabetic tags will be explained below)²:

“When the foundations of the heroon [sc. for the slain Agathos Daimon serpent] had been laid down <he set it [i.e. the stele on which he had inscribed the letters] on a pillar>. There leaped out from it a large host <of snakes>, and, crawling off, they ran into the four [?] houses that were already there. Alexander, who was still present, founded the city and the heroon itself on the 25th Tybi. **[a]** From that point the doorkeepers admitted these snakes [*opheis*] to the houses as **[b]** *agathoi daimones* [‘good spirits’]. **[c]** These snakes are not venomous, **[d]** but they do ward off those snakes that do seem to be venomous, and sacrifices are given to the hero himself <, as snake-born>... **[e]** Alexander ordered that the guardians of the houses be given wheat. They took it and milled it and made porridge [?] and gave it to the snakes in the houses. The Alexandrians preserve this custom until today. On the 25th of Tybi they... **[f]** make sacrifice to the *agathoi daimones* that look after their houses and make them gifts of porridge”.
(*Alexander Romance* (A) 1.32.10-13 ≈ (Arm.) §§ 87 WOLOHOJIAN)³.

Secondly, we have a fragment of Phylarchus, whose history finished in 219 BC with the death of Cleomenes III of Sparta, preserved by Aelian:

“In his twelfth book Phylarchus says as follows about the asps [*aspides*] of Egypt. **[g]** He tells that they are strongly honoured, and as a result of this honour they become very gentle and tame. They are reared alongside children and do them no harm. When called they slither out of their holes and come. Calling them consists of clicking the fingers. **[h]** The Egyptians lay out gifts of guest-friendship for them. For whenever they have finished their meal they moisten barley in wine and honey and lay it out on the table on which they happen to have been dining. Then clicking their fingers they call their ‘guests’. And they present themselves as if by prior arrangement. Rampant around the table, they leave the rest of their coils on the floor, but lift up their heads and lick at the food. Slowly and bit by bit they take their fill of the barley, and eat it all up. **[i]** If some need presses upon the Egyptians in the course of the night they click their fingers again. This noise gives them the signal to retreat and withdraw. Accordingly, they understand the difference in the sound and why this is done, and immediately retreat and disappear, sliding back into their nests and holes. A man who has risen does not tread on any of them or even meet them”.
(Phylarchus *FGrH* 81 F27 = Aelian *Nature of Animals* 17.5)⁴.

The fragment begins in a slightly misleadingly fashion in the way it talks about the snakes, but by the end it becomes clear that the snakes are never actually seen by anyone. The family finishes their meal and as they withdraw to bed they click their fingers to tell the snakes that the coast is clear and that they may emerge. Should an individual have to rise unexpectedly in the night he clicks his fingers and the snakes tactfully withdraw. Nor, indeed, could they ever have been witnessed in the course of slurping their potage: no snake can eat barley, wine or honey. In this respect, these asps should be compared to the serpent of Egyptian Metelis described by Aelian elsewhere

² For the A text see KROLL 1926, with commentary at STONEMAN 2007. For an English translation of the Armenian text see WOLOHOJIAN 1969.

³ This translation is taken over from OGDEN 2013a, 286-7.

⁴ This translation is taken over from OGDEN 2013a, 306.

in the same work: a sacred serpent to which offerings are made, but which may never be looked upon⁵.

And, thirdly, we have a fifth-century (?) AD Christian narrative pseudonymously attributed to Epiphanius. Like the *Alexander Romance* account, this one offers an aetiology for Alexandrian house-snakes. The narrative survives in two recensions of its own, but it is reflected, in on the whole better, though not perfect, condition, in the seventh-century AD *Chronicon Paschale*. As Ogden has noted previously, the three texts differ from each other only by variation in omission, but none of them is independently intelligible. When all three congruent texts are overlapped, however, we do obtain an intelligible narrative:

“We heard from some old men, descendants of Antigonos and Ptolemy, that Alexander the Macedonian visited the tomb of the prophet [sc. that of the snake-averting prophet Jeremiah] and learned the mysteries pertaining to him. He transferred his remains to Alexandria, and arranged them, with all due honour, in a circle.⁶ [j] The race of asps was thus averted from that land, as similarly were the creatures from the river. And so he threw in [sc. inside the circle] the snakes called *argolaoi*, that is ‘snake-fighters’ [*ophiomachoi*], [k] which he had brought from Peloponnesian Argos, whence they are called *argolaoi*, that is, ‘right-hand-side men [*dexioi*] of Argos’. The sound they make is very sweet and of all good omen”.

([Epiphanius] *De prophetarum ortu et obitu* first recension p.9 Schermann.

~ second recension pp.62 Schermann; ~ *Chronicon Paschale* p.293 Dindorf⁷).

The role of the prophet Jeremiah here is presumably a relatively late addition to the tradition, and presumably too a Christian one rather than a Jewish one (though the latter possibility cannot be excluded); he perhaps supplanted another venerable figure. The key to the final baffling assertion lies in the *Suda*’s preservation of a folk etymology that construes the term *argolaoi* to mean ‘left-hand-side men of Argos’ as if it were built upon *laios*, ‘left’⁸. The original author or a subsequent editor of the Epiphanian text evidently had this same notion before him, but found it counter-intuitive that such good-omened snakes should be associated with the ill-omened left-hand side as opposed to the well-omened right-hand side, and so made the appropriate adjustment. A more natural etymology of the term *argolaoi* might be ‘Peoples of Argos’ (cf. *lāos*). However, it is important to note also that the *Suda* itself cites the term in the form *argolai*, which is simply construable as ‘Argives’, the form being used in this sense already by Euripides⁹.

It is clear that the three texts (or rather groups of texts) quoted are seeking to speak about the same phenomenon, despite their differences in the matters of origin-story, the species of the snakes concerned and the nature of the offerings made to them. Beyond the material supplied in these texts, we should note that, more generally, Agathos Daimon, in a more abstract, singular form, was conceived of and worshipped as bringer

⁵ Aelian *Nature of Animals* 11.17; for the Metelis serpent and the wider Greek phenomenon of the never-seen sacred snake, see OGDEN 2013a, 347-50.

⁶ An alternative tradition, preserved at John Moschus *Pratum Spirituale* 77 (ca. AD 600), has it that Alexander rather buried Jeremiah’s bones at Alexandria’s Tetrapylum (four-column colonnade).

⁷ For the two Epiphanian recensions see SCHERMANN 1907; SCHWEMER 1995. Discussion at OGDEN 2013a, 293-5; 2013c, from which the merged translation given here is taken over. The relevant portions of all three constituent texts are now reprinted, also with helpful further discussion, at BARBANTANI 2014, 228-32.

⁸ *Suda* s.v. ἀργόλαι.

⁹ Euripides FF41, 630 *TrGF*.

of wealth and good luck, a role in which he was often given a female consort, Agathe Tyche ('Good Luck'), as is richly attested in epigraphy and iconography ('Good Luck')¹⁰.

Further light is shed upon the phenomenon of the house-snakes by a summary of Armenian folk beliefs first published by the distinguished Armenian folklorist Manuk Abeghian in an 1899 German dissertation, the relevance of which for the *agathoi daimones* was first seen by Djurslev. Abeghian makes the following observations, which we correlate with the emboldened alphabetic tags inserted into the quotations above:

“Die Überreste einer Schlangenverehrung, die wir für die alten Armenier bezeugt finden, haben sich bis auf die Gegenwart in dem armenischen Volksglauben erhalten. **[f, g]** Eine Art von Vergötterung genossen aber nur die **[c]** unschädlichen Hausschlangen, *lortuk*, *lok* genannt; **[d, j]** diese, glaubt man, sind die Beschützer der Armenier gegen schädliche insbesondere gegen giftige Schlangen; letztere verfolgen sie sogar. Sie werden infolgedessen von den Armeniern für unverletzlich gehalten, **[a]** und man lässt sie als Beschützer des Hauses ruhig in den Wohnstätten sich einnisten. **[i]** Man glaubt, dass ein jedes Haus seine unsichtbare Schlange habe, die die bösen Geister vertreibt. **[b]** Sie ist das Glück des Heims und tritt zuweilen in Erscheinung. **[e, h]** Diesen Schlangen wird Milch vorgesetzt, **[b]** damit sie nach dem Trinken derselben Goldstücke in dem Gefässe zurücklassen. Man erzählt in einer Sage, wie eine solche Glücksschlange, weil sie schlecht behandelt wurde, sich von dem Hause entfernte und das ganze Hausglück mitnahm... **[k]** Die Schlangenart *lortuk* aber, sagt man sind “Armenier”, darum sind sie gegen die Armenier freundschaftlich gesinnt”¹¹.
(Abeghian 1899:74-6)¹².

The many and striking parallels between the two cultures described largely speak for themselves, but for convenience we summarize them here in tabular form:

	<i>Agathoi daimones</i>	Armenian <i>lortuk</i> (green-snakes, adders)
a	Doorkeepers admit the snakes to houses.	The snakes are regarded as protectors of the house and allowed to make their nests in the home.
b	They are <i>agathoi daimones</i> , ‘good spirits.’	They are the ‘luck of the house’ and can leave behind gifts of gold in them; if they leave, they take the house’s luck with them.
c	They are not venomous.	They are harmless.
d, j	They ward off venomous asps.	They chase away poisonous snakes.
e, h	They are fed in the houses with wine-based porridge.	They are fed in the houses with milk.
f, g	They receive sacrifices and are honoured.	They are revered.
i	They withdraw before clicking fingers, and so are never seen.	They are normally invisible, though they manifest themselves occasionally.
k	They are called ‘Argives.’	They are called ‘Armenians’ as being friendly to Armenians.

¹⁰ OGDEN 2013a, 297-302 and index s.v. “Agathe Tyche”.

¹¹ Abeghian supposes that a belief that the souls of ancestors were incorporated into the snakes lurks here. The question does not concern us at this point, but for what it is worth the Greeks and Romans too could imagine that the dead could return in the form of snakes: see OGDEN 2013a, 247-54.

¹² Abeghian’s dissertation has recently been translated into English by Robert Bedrosian (a sign of its continuing currency).

By what model are we to understand the relationship between the two cultures? We must not be misled by the Armenian connection. It is not, surely, credible that the Armenian folk customs should have been created by the Armenian translation of the *Alexander Romance*. That is simply not the way in which folk customs develop. And in any case the Armenian customs encompass beliefs that correspond tightly with those unmentioned in the *Romance*, but celebrated in the Phylarchan and Epiphanian texts. We must look, then, to one of two possibilities¹³. First, to that of a coherent set of ancient folk customs shared and preserved between places remote from each other in time and space. Or, secondly, to the independent but convergent development of folk customs in the two societies, perhaps under the pressure of partly similar faunal environments. House-snake cultures of some sort at any rate have been widespread across the world until relatively recently¹⁴. Whichever of these models is the right one, the *agathoi daimones* of Alexandria suddenly emerge from a fog of seemingly confused and fantastical literary projection to become rather more tangible.

Furthermore, the general cogency of the comparison prompts us to look again at the one pair of terms that seems to correspond a little less well than it might. There is indeed a correspondence between the Alexandrians calling their house-snakes ‘Argives’ and the Armenians calling theirs ‘Armenians’, but the correspondence would be stronger if the Alexandrians considered themselves, somehow or other, to be ‘Argives.’ Ogden has previously suggested that the significance of the Alexandrian snakes being tied to Argos lay in the claims of Alexander’s Argead dynasty to descent from Argos (via Temenus), and indeed in the Ptolemaic dynasty’s own claim to be itself Argead and ultimately from Argos¹⁵. This is not a view from which we entirely resile, and so we take the opportunity to offer the evidence for it in more detail.

The notion that the Argead dynasty derived from Argos is first found, famously, in Herodotus’ account of the Macedonian foundation myth: here its founder, Perdiccas I, is said to have travelled to Macedonia with his two brothers from Argos, before overthrowing the previous (unnamed) king of the place. He then gave the name Argaeus (*Argaios*) to his son and successor on the Macedonian throne¹⁶. The context indicates that the name was being read to signify ‘Argive’, as did *Argeios*, although in origin it may have signified ‘White’ or ‘Splendid’¹⁷. The name was to be a frequent one in the Argead onomasticon, being borne by, inter alios, Argaeus ‘II,’ who enjoyed a perhaps disputed period of rule between 393 and 391 BC and then challenged Philip II for the throne at the beginning of his reign in 359 BC. Herodotus further tells that Alexander I proved his Greekness to the satisfaction of the Hellenodicae on the basis that he drew his ancestry from Argos, and so gained entrance to the Olympic Games¹⁸. In the prologue to Euripides’ *Archelaus* Archelaus tells of his glorious series of Argive

¹³ A third model is theoretically possible, but surely not contingently so: that Abeghian was familiar with all three of the Greek texts we have quoted and extracted from them a model of his own to impose upon the Armenian customs of which he treated.

¹⁴ See OGDEN 2013a, 303 n.162.

¹⁵ OGDEN 2013a, 295.

¹⁶ Herodotus 8.137, 139. On this and the remainder of the material in this paragraph, see HAMMOND – GRIFFITH 1979, 3-115; BORZA 1990, 80-4. For Argaeus II see Demosthenes 23.121, Diodorus 14.92, 16.2-3.

¹⁷ See PAPE – BENSLEY 1911 s.v. Ἀργαῖος (‘Weisser’); cf. Ἀργός. On one occasion the text of Syncellus actually gives us a Macedonian king Ἀργεῖος instead of an Ἀργαῖος: *Chronicle* p.316 Mosshammer.

¹⁸ Herodotus 5.22.

ancestors going back beyond his father Temenus, and of how he came to Macedon¹⁹. Thucydides tells that the ancestors of Alexander I and Perdiccas II were Temenidae, descendants of Temenos, who had come to Macedon from Argos²⁰. In the *Philip* of 346 BC Isocrates told Philip II that Argos was his fatherland (*patris*), and that he should take as much care for it as he did for his ancestors²¹. A supposed Delphic oracle preserved by a scholium to Clement of Alexandria directs a third founder-figure, Caranus (for whom this wonderful new journal is named!), to quit Argos and Greece of the beautiful ladies for the waters of the Haliacmon²².

The Ptolemies could also boast Argive descent by virtue of the fact that they claimed descent in turn from the Argeads²³. The claim was made in two ways. First, they claimed it through Soter's obscure mother, Arsinoe, as we learn from an important fragment of the second-century BC Satyrus of Alexandria preserved by Theophilus:

“Now Satyrus too, in the course of supplying a history of the demes of the Alexandrians, making Philopator, also called Ptolemy, his starting point, indicates that Dionysus was the founder of his family. It was in accordance with this that Ptolemy established his first tribe [i.e., one named for Dionysus]. At any rate Satyrus says as follows: ‘Deianeira was born of Dionysus and Althaea the daughter of Thestius; Hyllus was born from Deianeira and Heracles, the son of Zeus; from Hyllus was born Cleodaeus; from Cleodaeus Aristomachus; from Aristomachus Temenus; from Temenus Cissus; from Cissus Maron; from Maron Thestius; from Thestius Acous; from Acous Aristodamidas; from Aristodamidas Caranus; from Caranus Coenus; from Coenus Tyrimmas; from Tyrimmas Perdiccas [sc. I]; from Perdiccas Philip [sc. I]; from Philip Aeropus; from Aeropus Alcetas; from Alcetas Amyntas [sc. I]; from Amyntas Bocer [sc. a brother to Alexander I]; from Bocer Meleager; from Meleager Arsinoe; from Arsinoe Ptolemy also called Soter, the son of Lagus; from Soter and Berenice Ptolemy Philadelphus; from Philadelphus and Arsinoe Ptolemy Euergetes; from Euergetes and Berenice the daughter of the Magas that was king in Cyrene Ptolemy Philopator. This then is the way in which those who were kings in Alexandria were related to Dionysus”.

(Satyrus of Alexandria *FGrH* 631 F1 *apud* Theophilus *To Autolytus* 2.7)²⁴.

¹⁹ Euripides *Archelaus* F228 *TrGF*; cf. Collard *et al.* 2004 *ad loc.* We need to supply the full details of Archelaus' arrival in Macedon from Hyginus *Fabulae* 219, a summary of the lost play; cf. HAMMOND – GRIFFITH 1979, 8.

²⁰ Thucydides 2.99; cf. 5.80, where Perdiccas II is said to develop his foreign policy on the basis of his kinship with Argos.

²¹ Isocrates 5.32.

²² Schol. Clement *Protrepticus* 2.11; cf. Justin 7.1.7; Eusebius *Chron. Arm.* 107 KARST; Syncellus *Chronicle* p.234 MOSSHAMMER.

²³ For discussion see BELOCH 1927, 176-7; TARN 1933, FRASER 1972, i, 44-5; BULLOCH 1995, 12-13; COLLINS 1997; LIANOU 2010, 128-30; OGDEN 2011, 80-8; 2013b.

²⁴ Cf. JACOBY *ad loc.* and GAMBETTI at *BNJ* *ad loc.* With the Satyrus book fragment should be compared the lacunary papyrus fragment *P.Oxy.* xxvii 2465, with a congruent but not identical text that, interestingly, names more of the mothers. The Oxyrhynchus text supplies Argaeus I between Perdiccas I and Philip I, as does Herodotus 8.139, and seemingly indicates, accordingly, that Theophilus has omitted this generation from his own version of the list by accident. For the Oxyrhynchus text see TURNER *et al.* 1962 *ad loc.* and FRASER 1972, ii, 120 n.48; Gambetti disputes that the Oxyrhynchus text is actually Satyran.

Secondly, they claimed it by the expedient of making Ptolemy himself the illegitimate son of Philip II:

“In particular Ptolemy... drew the king’s [Alexander’s] concerned attention. He was a blood-relative, and some believe he had been born of Philip. At any rate it was established that he was the son of a concubine of his”.
(Curtius 9.8.22)

“The Macedonians hold that Ptolemy is the son of Philip the son of Amyntas, although nominally the son of Lagus. For they say that his mother was given to Lagus by Philip with him already in her belly”.
(Pausanias 1.6.2)

“If this Ptolemy truly was the son of Philip, the son of Amyntas, he should know that he inherited his craziness about women from his father...”.
(Pausanias 1.6.8)

“Perdiccas suspected that Alexander had bequeathed the succession to Ptolemy, since he had often spoken to him about Ptolemy’s birth, and since Olympias had made it clear that Ptolemy was born of Philip. So he took Ptolemy aside and made him swear that if he was made Alexander’s successor, he would divide the succession with him and share it. Ptolemy took the oath without any inkling of Perdiccas’ suspicions, for he himself believed that Perdiccas would be the successor ...”.
(*Alexander Romance* (A) 3.32)²⁵.

“*Lagus*, proper name. He married Arsinoe the mother of Ptolemy Soter. Lagus exposed this Ptolemy in a bronze shield as having no relationship with him. A tradition comes down from Macedonia to the effect that an eagle visited him and stretched its wings over him and, hovering over him, shielded him from the direct rays of the sun, and from excessive rain, whenever it rained. It frightened off the flock-birds, tore up quails, and provided him with their blood as nourishment in place of milk”.
(*Suda* s.v. Λάγος = Aelian F283 Domingo-Forasté).

Several more generalized claims to Argead descent on the part of Ptolemies are compatible with either of these two notions. So it is, for instance, with an unpublished inscription that refers to the Ptolemies as ‘Heraclid Argeads’.²⁶ In an elaborate 20-line passage of his *Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus* Theocritus constructs an emphatic parallel between Alexander and Ptolemy Soter as descendants of Heracles, whilst yet leaving the actual mechanism of these descents unspecified; but, inevitably, these descents must have come through Argos and in the latter case through the Argeads²⁷. And as with the Argeads, Ptolemy Soter at any rate advertised his claim to Argive descent by incorporating ‘Argaeus’ into his family onomasticon, giving the name to one of his sons, probably by Eurydice; this was the son that was given the honour of escorting Alexander’s body from Memphis to its new permanent home in Alexandria²⁸.

²⁵ Cf. also *AR Arm.* §269 WOLOHOJIAN.

²⁶ Unpublished Ptolemaic inscription at ERRINGTON 1990, 265 n.6: Ἡρακλείδας Ἀργεάδας.

²⁷ Theocritus 17.13-33; cf. GOW 1950 and HUNTER 2003 *ad loc.* (esp. pp.107-8, 116-17, 120-1). Cf. *OGIS* 54.4-5, where Ptolemy Euergetes claims descent from Heracles, son of Zeus, on his father’s side, and from Dionysus on his mother’s.

²⁸ Pausanias 1.7.1; cf. OGDEN 1999, 68-73.

However, to move beyond Ogden's initial conjecture, the Armenian model strongly invites us to consider whether the snakes may have been designated Argive more particularly so as also to express and celebrate a deep and ancient relationship with Argos for people of Alexandria as a whole, not just for the presiding royal family. The circumstantial case for this is a good one.

Insofar as it was felt desirable to identify an ideal, unitary and unifying *polis* of origin for the diverse hodge-podge of Greek settlers in the new Alexandria, nowhere was better suited to the role than Argos²⁹. Already in Homer, as is well known, the massed Greek forces could all alike be badged as 'Argives' (*Argeioi*)³⁰.

But in Greek thought the city of Argos also boasted a hallowed and ancient relationship of its own with the land of Egypt, a relationship that enabled it to serve as an original homeland for Alexandria's ethnically Egyptian settlers as well as its Greek ones. For the founder of the Egyptian nation was none other than the eponymous Aegyptus. He drew his descent from Inachus via the latter's daughter (or remoter descendant) Io, whose wanderings, in the form of a cow, culminated in Egypt. The link was then reinforced when the Egyptian Danaus, brother to Aegyptus, returned to settle in Argos with his daughters, the Danaids, where they were joined by Aegyptus' sons. Henceforth the Argives had also been *Danaoi* ('Danaans'), a term which, from Homer onwards again, was deployed expansively, precisely like *Argeioi*, to refer to the Greek peoples as a whole³¹. It is noteworthy that this link between Egypt and Argos had seemed an important one to the Macedonians specifically from long before the age of Alexander. In Euripides' *Archelaus* again, when the founder Archelaus derives his descent from Argos for us, he in fact starts further back, with none other than the Egyptian Danaus, who, he tells, came from Egypt to found 'the city of Inachus', ordaining that those that had formerly been known as Pelasgians should henceforth be called 'Danaans' throughout Greece³².

Argos' mythical link with Egypt was a subject of recurrent interest for the Ptolemies' own Callimachus. A lost poem of his was actually devoted to the foundation of Argos³³. His fifth hymn, *On the Baths of Pallas*, takes Argos as its setting, and significantly so.

²⁹ The Greek and Greek-aspirant settlers in Alexandria will have laid claim to a vast array of ethnics derived from the cities of old Greece, as can be detected in the cases of the Greek settlers outside in the Egyptian *chora*, but it is likely that few of these ethnics, even amongst settlers of the first generation, bore witness to genuine citizenship rights in the cities denoted: see OGDEN 1996, 343-7. Cf. also FRASER 1972, i, 38.

³⁰ *Argeioi* for Greeks in general: Homer *Iliad* 2.159 etc.

³¹ Hesiod *Catalogue of Women* FF124-8 M.-W.; Aeschylus *Suppliques* 289-324, 538-89; *Prometheus Bound* 589-608, 790-815, 846-86; Herodotus 1.1, 2.153, 3.27; Ovid *Metamorphoses* 1.567-779; Apollodorus *Bibliotheca* 2.1.3-5; Plutarch *De malignitate Herodoti* 11; Zenobius *Proverbs* 2.6; Lucian *Dialogues of the Gods* 3; *Dialogues of the Sea Gods* 7; Pausanias 2.16.1, 2.19.3, 3.18.13, 7.1.7; Hyginus *Fabulae* 145, 168, 170; schol. Homer *Iliad* 1.42, 4.171; schol. Euripides *Hecuba* 886; schol. Euripides *Orestes* 872; Servius on Virgil *Aeneid* 10.497 etc. See HALL 1997, 77-89; VASUNIA 2001, 41-3; STEPHENS 2003, 8-9, 25-7; STEPHENS – ACOSTA-HUGHES 2012, 68-96; DEPEW 2013, 337-8; FOWLER 2013, 235-6. *Danaoi* for Greeks in general: Homer *Iliad* 1.42, etc.

³² Euripides *Archelaus* F228 TrGF; cf. COLLARD *et al.* 2004 *ad loc.*

³³ *Suda* s.v. Καλλιμάχος = Callimachus T1.11 Pf. It is not clear whether it was part of the *Aetia*.

The poem's final lines read:

“Hail goddess, and look after Inachian Argos! Hail as you drive out your horses, and may you drive them back again! Preserve the lot/estate (*klaros*) of the Danaans!”.

(Callimachus *Hymn* 5.140-2)³⁴.

The final phrase is surely evocative of Alexandria itself. Argive Io in particular was a highly significant figure for the poet. In the *Victory of Berenice* Callimachus applies to Argos the phrase, ‘the land of Danaus, born of the cow [i.e. Io]’³⁵. Another of his lost works was devoted to Io’s arrival in Egypt, *The Arrival of Io*³⁶. And one of his epigrams celebrates the dedication of a statue in the Alexandrian temple of ‘Inachian Isis’³⁷, Io, Inachus’ daughter, having been identified with the Egyptian goddess from at least the time of Herodotus³⁸.

This group of myths was celebrated in the names of some of the Alexandrian demes, as we learn from the Petrie papyri: *Autodikeios* saluted Autodice, daughter of Danaus; *Andromacheios* saluted Andromachus, son of Aegyptus; and, most importantly, *Inacheios* saluted Inachus himself³⁹. There can be no better indication than this that Argos was held to be a city of significance for the common people of Alexandria. Let us not forget, either, the ‘daughter of the Argive woman’ that is chosen to sing the all-important lament for Adonis on behalf of all the Alexandrians in Theocritus’ *Idyll* 15, *Adoniazusae*⁴⁰.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>BNJ</i>	Worthington 2012-
<i>FGrH</i>	Jacoby <i>et al.</i> 1923–
<i>LIMC</i>	Kahil <i>et al.</i> 1981-99
<i>OGIS</i>	Dittenberger 1903-5
<i>P.Petr.</i>	Mahaffy and Smyly 1891-1905
<i>PSI</i>	<i>Papiri greci e latini</i> 1912-
<i>TrGF</i>	Snell <i>et al.</i> 1971-2004

³⁴ For the particular significance of Argos in this poem, see BULLOCH 1995, 12-13, 247; DEPEW 2013, 337. Note also Callimachus *Aetia* FF65-6 Pf. and *PSI* xv.1500, on Danaus and the ‘Inachid’ springs of Argos; cf. Stephens and ACOSTA-HUGHES 2012, 185-8.

³⁵ Callimachus F383 Pf.

³⁶ *Suda* s.v. Καλλιμαχος = Callimachus T1.11 Pf. Again, it is not clear whether this poem either was part of the *Aetia*.

³⁷ Callimachus *Epigrams* 58.

³⁸ Herodotus 2.59, 156; cf. Diodorus 1.13.5, 1.25.1, 1.96.5.

³⁹ *P.Petr.* iii.1 col. 2 lines 19-20, iii.14 lines 1 and 8, iii.19 line 12, ii.21d line 6. See FRASER 1972, i, 45, ii, 121-2 n.54 and 122 n.56

⁴⁰ Theocritus 15.97; cf. Gow 1950 *ad loc.* The girl’s description as the ‘daughter of an Argive woman’ does not indicate that her father is not Argive; it is merely a function of the female-centred discourse of the gossiping interlocutors, Praxinoa and Gorgo. The notes of Gow 1950 and DOVER 1971 *ad loc.* do not seem to me to be to the point.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABEGHIAN, M. (1899): *Der Armenische Volksglaube*. Leipzig. English translation: M. Abeghyan [sic] (2012): *Armenian Folk Beliefs*, [R. Bedrosian transl.], New Jersey.
- AGER, S. L. – FABER, R. A. (eds.): *Belonging and Isolation in the Hellenistic World. Phoenix Suppl.* 51, Toronto.
- BARBANTANI, S. (2014): “Mother of snakes and kings: Apollonius Rhodius’ *Foundation of Alexandria*”, *Histos* 8: 209-45.
- BELOCH, K. J. (1927): *Griechische Geschichte*, iv.2 [2nd ed.], Berlin.
- BERNARD, A. (1970): *Le delta égyptien d’après les textes grecs*, 4 vols, Cairo.
- BORZA, E. N. (1990): *In the Shadow of Olympus*, Princeton.
- BULLOCH, A. W. (1985): *Callimachus. The Fifth Hymn: The Bath of Pallas*, Cambridge.
- COLLARD, C. – CROPP, M. J. – GILBERT, J. (2004): *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays II*, Oxford.
- COLLINS, N. L. (1997): “The Various Fathers of Ptolemy I”, *Mnemosyne* 50: 436-76.
- DEPEW, M. (2013): “Connections, origins and the construction of belonging in the poetry of Kallimachos”, in S. L. AGER – R. FABER (eds.): *Belonging and Isolation in the Hellenistic World. Phoenix Suppl.* 51, Toronto: 325-40.
- DITTENBERGER, W. (1903-5): *Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae*, 2 vols., Leipzig.
- DUNAND, F. (1981): “Agathodaimon”, *LIMC* I.1: 277-82.
- ERRINGTON, R. M. (1990): *A History of Macedonia*, Berkeley.
- FOWLER, R. L. (2013): *Early Greek Mythography*, II, Oxford.
- FRASER, P. M. (1972): *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols, Oxford.
- GOW, A. S. F. (1950): *Theocritus*, 2 vols., Cambridge.
- HALL, J. M. (1997): *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L. – GRIFFITH, G.T. (1979): *A History of Macedonia*, II, Oxford.
- HUNTER, R. L. (2003): *Theocritus. Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*. Berkeley.
- JACOBY, F. *et al.* (eds.) (1923): *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin–Leiden.
- KAHIL, L. *et al.* (eds.) (1981-99): *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*. Zurich–Munich.
- KROLL, W. (ed.) (1926): *Historia Alexandri Magni (Pseudo-Callisthenes). I. Recensio vetusta*, Berlin.
- LIANOU, M. (2010): “The Role of the Argeadai in the Legitimation of the Ptolemaic Dynasty: Rhetoric and Practice”, in E. CARNEY – D. OGDEN (eds.): *Philip II and Alexander the Great: Father and Son, Lives and Afterlives*, New York: 123-33.
- MAHAFFY, J. P. – SMYLY, J. G. (eds.) (1891-1905): *The Flinders Petrie Papyri*, 3 vols., Dublin.
- OGDEN, D. (1996): *Greek Bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods*, Oxford.
- (1999): *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death: the Hellenistic Dynasties*, London.
- (2011): *Alexander the Great: Myth, Genesis and Sexuality*, Exeter.
- (2013a): *Drakōn. Dragon Myth and Serpent Cult in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, Oxford.
- (2013b): “The birth myths of Ptolemy Soter”, in S. L. AGER – R. FABER (eds.): *Belonging and Isolation in the Hellenistic World. Phoenix Suppl.* 51, Toronto: 184-98.

-
- (2013c): “The Alexandrian foundation myth: Alexander, Ptolemy, the *agathoi daimones* and the *argolaoi*”, in V. ALONSO TRONCOSO – E. ANSON (eds.): *After Alexander: The Time of the Diadochoi*, Oxford: 241-52.
- PAPE, W. – BENSELER, G. E. (1911): *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, 3rd ed., Brunswick.
- QUAEGEBEUR, J. (1975): *Le dieu égyptien Shai dans la religion et l’onomastique*, Leuven.
- NILSSON, M. P. (1967-74): *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, 2 vols. [3rd ed.], Munich.
- Papiri greci e latini* (1912–), Florence.
- SCHERMANN, T. (1907): *Prophetarum vitae fabulosae*, Leipzig.
- SCHWEMER, A. M. (1995): *Studien zu den frühjüdischen Prophetenlegenden. Vitae Prophetarum Bd. I: Die Viten der großen Propheten Jesaja, Jeremia, Ezechiel und Daniel. Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Tübingen.
- SNELL, B. – KANNICHT, G.E. – RADT, S. (eds.) (1971-2004): *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, 5 vols., Göttingen.
- STEPHENS, S. (2003): *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Berkeley.
- STEPHENS, S. – ACOSTA-HUGHES, B. (2012): *Callimachus in Context. From Plato to the Augustan Poets*, Cambridge.
- STONEMAN, R. (2007): *Il Romanzo de Alessandro*, 3 vols, Milan.
- TARN, W. W. (1933): “Two notes on Ptolemaic history”, *JHS* 53: 57-68.
- TURNER, E. G. – REA, J. – KOENEN, L. – FERNANDEZ POMAR, J. M. (eds.) (1962): *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, xxvii, London.
- VASUNIA, P. (2001): *The Gift of the Nile: Hellenising Egypt from Aeschylus to Alexander*, Berkeley.
- WOLOHOJIAN, A. M. (transl.) (1969): *The Romance of Alexander the Great by Pseudo-Callisthenes. Translated from the Armenian Version*, New York.
- WORTHINGTON, I. (ed.) (2012–): *Brill’s New Jacoby*, [Online resource], Leiden.

Alexander the Great, the royal throne and the funerary thrones of Macedonia*

by Olga Palagia

National & Kapodistrian University of Athens

palagia@enternet.gr

ABSTRACT There is no evidence in either Greece or Macedon in the archaic and classical periods that the throne functioned as a symbol of royalty. Thrones were for the gods and their priests. Only the king of Persia used a royal throne and even had portable thrones for his campaigns. This paper argues that after his conquest of the Persian Empire, Alexander the Great adopted the throne as a royal symbol; after his death, his throne became a token of his invisible presence. Philip III Arrhidaeus is known to have used a royal throne after his return to Macedonia. By implication, the marble thrones found in three tombs at Vergina–Aegae are here understood as symbols of royalty and the tombs are interpreted as royal.

KEYWORDS Throne; priest; Persian king; tomb; marble; gold and ivory.

Among the symbols of royalty in the kingdom of Macedon, the throne requires special investigation. We will try to show that its introduction as the seat of power may be traced to the new world order created by Alexander the Great's conquest of Asia; we will subsequently investigate the impact of the royal throne on the funerary furniture of Macedonia.

In archaic and classical Greece thrones were reserved for the gods and by extension, their priests and priestesses. Zeus, father of the gods, was often depicted enthroned. There are two obvious sculptural examples from the fifth century, the east frieze of the Parthenon¹ and the cult statue created by Phidias for the temple of Zeus at Olympia. Zeus' statue at Olympia is now known only from coins and literary sources². Herodotus' (5.72) account of the priestess of Athena rising from her throne when Cleomenes I of Sparta entered the adyton of Athena's temple on the Athenian Acropolis, indicates that thrones could also be used by priests and priestesses. The

* This is a small tribute to Brian Bosworth, friend and mentor, who introduced me to the study of ancient Macedonia and taught me the merit of illuminating the archaeological evidence through the histories of Alexander. His guidance and wisdom often saved me from error and are sorely missed.

I am grateful to Hans R. Goette for his photo of the throne from the temple of Apollo Zoster, to Robin Lane Fox for sharing his article "Alexander and Babylon: a substitute king" in advance of publication, to Panagiotis Faklaris for sharing his unpublished article "Προβλήματα του λεγομένου 'τάφου της Ευρυδίκης' στη Βεργίνα" and to Angeliki Kottaridi for discussions of the three Vergina tombs containing marble thrones. I alone am responsible for the conclusions reached in this article.

¹ London, British Museum. NEILS 2001, 106 fig. 76.

² LAPATIN 2011. Coins: LAPATIN 2011, 80-84. Source: Paus. 5.11.1-11.

hierophant of the Eleusinian mysteries also had the use of a throne³. In the fourth century we have several examples of priestly thrones in marble set up in sanctuaries, mainly in Athens and Attica. A pair of thrones was dedicated by Sostratos to Nemesis and Themis in their sanctuary of Rhamnous⁴. The cult had only one priestess but each throne was dedicated under a different priesthood (Phidostrate and Callisto). A priest's throne is preserved inside the temple of Apollo Zoster in Vouliagmeni (Fig. 1)⁵. A throne dedicated to Dione, who had a cult near the Erechtheion, was set up on the Athenian Acropolis⁶. Thrones for the priests of Hephaistos and Boutes also came to light on the Acropolis and must be related to the cults in the Erechtheion⁷. Dead women on Attic grave reliefs of the fourth century are sometimes depicted sitting on thrones like Pamphile on the stele of Demetria and Pamphile from the Kerameikos⁸. The significance of these thrones has never been adequately explained; one wonders if they suggest that the women died while serving as priestesses. Marble thrones were also dedicated by members of the Spartan Gerousia in the sanctuaries of Laconia in the fourth and third centuries B.C., e.g., the sanctuaries of Apollo Amyclaeus, Athena Alea and of Cassandra/Alexandra⁹.

Royal thrones in classical Greece are only mentioned in drama, attributed to heroes of the remote past¹⁰. Pausanias (2.19.5) saw a throne in the temple of Apollo in Argos, which was attributed to King Danaus, mythological founder of the sanctuary. As for the historical kings of Sparta and Macedon, there is no evidence that the kings of Sparta ever used thrones. The concept of the throne among the Greeks was reserved for the Great King of Persia¹¹. We have very little information about the daily life and rituals of the kings of Macedon before Alexander the Great. No royal throne is attested in Macedonia, and the first possible instance of enthronement of a Macedonian king involves Philip II. Diodorus (16.92.5 and 95.1) describes a procession in the theatre of Aegae on the occasion of the wedding of Philip's daughter, Cleopatra, in 336. The procession included statues of the twelve gods, and alongside them Philip added his image as *synthronos* of the gods¹². The wording is ambiguous. It could mean either that Philip was shown enthroned or that he was equal to the gods. But Philip's throne, even if it existed, was not intended as a symbol of royalty but rather as a manifestation of godlike status (*isotheos*).

The concept of the throne as a seat of royalty was at home in Persia. The Great King's throne was moreover invested with divinity and nobody but the king was allowed to sit in it¹³. Two audience reliefs from the Apadana staircase in Persepolis show the enthroned king at court towering above the standing courtiers.¹⁴ His throne is placed on a platform under a canopy, surrounded by armed guards. Two incense burners are placed before him.

³ CLINTON 1974, 20; CLINTON 2008, 374-375, no. 500.

⁴ Athens National Museum 2672 and Rhamnous 618 N. PETRAKOS 1999, 100-102, nos. 121-122.

⁵ KOUROUNIOTIS 1927/28, 28, figs. 20-21.

⁶ Athens, Acropolis Museum 4047. PALAGIA 2002a, 176, 178, figs. 10-11.

⁷ Athens, Acropolis. PALAGIA 2002a, 178, fig. 14.

⁸ Athens, Kerameikos Museum I 257-P 687. STROSZECK 2014, 177-178, fig. 33.2.

⁹ Sparta Museum. LANÉRÈS 2012; ZAVOU 2013.

¹⁰ E.g., Soph. *OT* 399.

¹¹ Pl. *Rep.* 553c.

¹² BADIAN 1996, 13; PASPALAS 2005, 86-87.

¹³ FREDRICKSMEYER 2000, 159-160 with n. 72.

¹⁴ GABELMANN 1984, 7-16, pl. 1, 1-2; PASPALAS 2005, 73-74, fig. 1. For an extensive discussion of images of the enthroned Great King of Persia and their significance, see PASPALAS 2005, 72-76.

The Greeks familiarized themselves with enthroned Persian kings in battlefields, e.g., when Darius I surveyed the bridge of boats built at Abydus by Mandrocles of Samos ca. 513 B.C.¹⁵. In 480 Xerxes watched the battles of Thermopylae and Salamis from a safe distance sitting on a throne¹⁶. His throne on Mt. Aigaleos overlooking Salamis was set up under a golden parasol¹⁷. Xenophon (*HG.* 1.5.4) informs us that during the Peloponnesian War, Cyrus the Younger granted an audience to Lysander at Sardis sitting on a gold and silver throne (no doubt in a ritual recalling the audience reliefs of Persepolis). In Greek art, the Great King of Persia was represented enthroned: two examples are offered in the fourth century by the statue base of Pulydamas by Lysippus in Olympia, showing Darius II Ochus at court¹⁸, and an Apulian volute krater by the Darius Painter, dating from the period of Alexander's Asian campaign, showing Darius III at Persepolis¹⁹.

The two worlds finally came together after the battle of Gaugamela in 331, when Alexander sat on the throne of Darius III at Susa²⁰. The throne was set under a golden canopy; its footstool was apparently too low for Alexander's feet to reach and it had to be replaced by a table. Plutarch's anecdote (*Alex.* 37.7) of the emotional response of old Demaratus of Corinth, who burst into tears upon seeing Alexander on the throne implies the novelty of seeing a Macedonian king on a throne. Alexander had his enthronement immortalized by the painter Apelles, who painted him holding the thunderbolt of Zeus²¹. Alexander dedicated his portrait in the temple of Artemis at Ephesus because East Greek cities were less likely to have been offended by the king's divine attributes. A wall-painting in the House of the Vettii in Pompeii showing Alexander in a purple cloak in the guise of Zeus is thought to reflect the portrait by Apelles²². Alexander's throne is Greek not Achaemenid, modeled on that of Zeus, therefore not a royal but a divine throne.

Whereas the Great King of Persia sat on his throne surrounded by standing courtiers, Alexander introduced couches for his Companions. Ehippus records how Alexander sat on a gold and ivory throne in the gardens of Babylon, with his Companions sitting on couches with silver feet²³. Alexander's throne was sacrosanct, as shown by the episode of a condemned criminal who seized his royal garments and diadem, sat on the throne, and was consequently put to death²⁴.

As Fredricksmeyer has aptly remarked, there is no evidence that Alexander's use of the royal throne in Persia and Babylon entailed ritual enthronement according to Achaemenid customs²⁵; he seems rather to have invested it with his own personal charisma. That Alexander's throne eventually came to symbolize his power as well as his invisible presence is shown by the potency of his empty throne after his death²⁶.

¹⁵ MANDROCLES dedicated a painting of this episode in the Heraion of Samos: Hdt. 4.88 and 7.44.

¹⁶ Hdt. 7.212 and 8.90.

¹⁷ Plut. *Them.* 16.

¹⁸ Olympia Museum A 45. GABELMANN 1984, 80-82, pl. 10; MORENO 1995, 92-93, no. 4.12.1.

¹⁹ Naples, Museo Nazionale 3253/819471. BOARDMAN 2001, 122, fig. 159.

²⁰ Diod. 17.66.3; Curt. 5.2.13 and 7.11; Plut. *Mor.* 329d. Plutarch (*Alex.* 37.7) places the incident in Persepolis.

²¹ Plin. *NH* 35.92; Plut. *Mor.* 335a. PALAGIA 2015, 2-3.

²² STIRPE 2006, 171-173, no. 24; PALAGIA 2015, 2-3, fig. 1.

²³ Ehippus *ap.* Athen. 12.537d. See also Arr. *An.* 7.24.1-3.

²⁴ Diod. 17.116.2-4; Arr. *An.* 7.24.1-3; Plut. *Alex.* 73.7-9 – 74.1. This incident, which took place in Babylon in 323, is often explained as part of the Oriental "substitute king" ritual which aimed to avert evil from the king's person though ABRAMENKO (2000) interpreted it as a plot against Alexander. LANE FOX (2016) argues against the ritual of the substitute king and considers it a random episode.

²⁵ FREDRICKSMEYER 2000, 160.

²⁶ See SCHÄFER 2002, 33-37; PASPALAS 2005, 87-88.

Curtius (10.6.4-9 and 15) records how a day after Alexander passed away in Babylon, Perdiccas called a marshals' assembly before the conqueror's empty throne in order to discuss the succession. Perdiccas placed on the throne Alexander's diadem, royal garments and weapons, along with the signet ring that the king had given him on his deathbed, and invited the assembly to reach a settlement about the fate of Alexander's empire. When Alexander's half-brother Arrhidaeus was chosen as his successor assuming his father's name Philip, he is said to have been placed on Alexander's throne²⁷. It is likely that the royal throne as symbol of kingship eventually made it to Macedonia with Philip III Arrhidaeus. Plutarch (*Phoc.*33.8) describes how Arrhidaeus met two rival embassies of the Athenians at Pharygae in Phocis in 318 sitting under a golden canopy and flanked by his Friends²⁸. Considering that the golden canopy belonged to the paraphernalia of the Great King's throne, this sounds like an imitation of the audience ritual adopted by Alexander in Persia.

The ploy of the empty throne as a token of the king's invisible presence was used in 318/17 by Eumenes, during his campaign against Antigonus the One-eyed in Cilicia and later in Susiana²⁹. His aim was to solidify the loyalty of the Silver-Shields, veterans of Alexander's army, and other elements of the Macedonian military to his person, in light of the fact that he was not a Macedonian. After the royal treasury was brought in from Susa, he announced to the army that Alexander appeared to him in a dream sitting on his throne and giving orders to his commanders. Eumenes had a golden throne from the treasury set up under a tent, placed on it the royal diadem, scepter and armour, added a fire altar and an incense burner in front and had the commanders sacrifice to the throne daily before they assembled to receive their orders, which were issued in Alexander's name. It has been suggested that this ritual was aimed at the Persian elements in the army on account of the employment of the fire altar³⁰, but Diodorus (18.61.3) explicitly says that Eumenes' goal was to placate the Silver-Shields.

We now come to a question that has remained unanswered in the archaeology of Macedonia for some years. In light of what we have discussed so far, what are we to make of the three marble thrones found in Macedonian tombs at the old Macedonian capital of Vergina–Aegae (Figs. 2-4)? No evidence of gold and ivory thrones like those used by Alexander in Babylon, for example³¹, has come to light in Macedonia so far. We have a painted example of such a throne in a wall-painting of the mid-first century B.C. from Boscoreale, presumably copying a Macedonian prototype³². The naked man sitting on the throne is generally interpreted as a king, either a historical king of Macedon or King Minos, judge of the Underworld³³.

Macedonian tombs usually housed couches made of various materials, e.g., stone or gold and ivory, that served as depositories of the mortal remains of their owners³⁴. These couches often supported vessels or caskets containing cremations. The beautifully decorated pair of marble couches of Potidaea (Cassandra) is a fine

²⁷ Plut. *Mor.* 337d. PASPALAS 2005, 88.

²⁸ This incident is extensively discussed by PASPALAS 2005.

²⁹ Polyae. 4.8.2; Diod. 18.61.1; 19.15.3-4; Plut. *Eum.* 13.5-8; Nep. *Eum.* 7.2-3. SCHÄFER 2002, 21-37; Anson 2004, 150-152.

³⁰ SCHÄFER 2002, 26-32.

³¹ See n. 23 above.

³² New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 1903 (03.14.6). ANDERSON 1987/88, fig. 35; PALAGIA 2014, 217-219, fig. 4 (with earlier references).

³³ See PALAGIA 2014, 218-219.

³⁴ SISMANIDES 1997; ANDRIANOU 2009, 39-50.

funerary example from the time of Cassander³⁵. It is remarkable that despite the wide geographical distribution of Macedonian tombs, only a handful of tombs at Vergina contained marble thrones. Even though elements of Persian-type furniture have been found in Macedonia,³⁶ the thrones of Vergina are of purely Greek form. Vergina-Aegae served as the burial ground of the Argead dynasty of Philip and Alexander³⁷. Of the other kings of Macedonia, Demetrios Poliorcetes was buried in Demetrias³⁸ and Lysimachos in or near Lysimacheia³⁹, both cities having been founded by the respective rulers. We do not know whether the other dynasties had designated burial grounds.

Two out of the three tombs with thrones at Vergina are situated very close to the royal palace. All three were found plundered and only one was fully published. The so-called Tomb of Rhomaios, named after the archaeologist who excavated it in 1938, had against the back wall of the main chamber a painted marble throne (Fig. 2) about 2 m high on the right and a stone bench on the left⁴⁰. The bench probably served as a base for a wooden or gold and ivory couch⁴¹. Both pieces of furniture, throne and couch, can be understood to have supported vessels or caskets with cremated remains. The throne rests on a pedestal and is accompanied by a footstool. The back of the throne is divided into nine rectangular panels which were decorated with painted stars. The design is obviously imitating a wooden prototype. The armrests are in the form of sphinxes. The right side of the throne preserves a painted scene of two griffins devouring a stag. This tomb is generally dated to the first half of the third century.

A similar throne came to light in the so-called Bella Tomb II at some distance from the palace (Fig. 3)⁴². The back of the throne is painted on the wall of the tomb and the footstool carries the impression of two feet. This tomb housed a single cremation burial contained in a limestone casket that was probably originally placed on the throne. Judging from the wall-painting on the façade showing the coronation of a warrior by a female personification, the owner must have been male. This tomb is also dated to the first half of the third century. It was excavated by Manolis Andronikos in 1981 but never fully published.

The so-called Tomb of Eurydice, partly excavated by Andronikos in 1987⁴³ and never properly published, has not been fully uncovered to this day. It was found at a distance of 4 m. from the Tomb of Rhomaios in close proximity to the palace. It is a Macedonian tomb encased in an outer shell of ashlar blocks giving the impression of a cist tomb from the outside, to discourage robbers⁴⁴. This in itself is an extreme measure and may indicate troubled times.

³⁵ Thessaloniki Museum. SISMANIDES 1997, 30-78, pls. 1-29.

³⁶ PASPALAS 2000. On the typology and material (wood, gold, silver and bronze) of Achaemenid thrones, see KYRIELEIS 1969, 36-41.

³⁷ Philip III Arrhidaeus was buried at Aegae (Diod. 19.52.5; Athen. 4.155a). Alexander the Great's body was originally going to be conveyed to Aegae for burial (Paus. 1.6.3). It is assumed that Philip II was buried at Aegae because he was assassinated there (Diod. 16.92-94) but no ancient source explicitly names the location of his burial. Cf. HATZOPOULOS 2018.

³⁸ Plut. *Demetr.* 53.3.

³⁹ App. *Syr.* 64; Paus. 1.10.4.

⁴⁰ ANDRIANOU 2009, 30, no. 11; MANGOLDT 2012, 270-273, pls. 107 and 108, 1-2; KOTTARIDI 2013, fig. on p. 338.

⁴¹ KOTTARIDI 2013, fig. on p. 339.

⁴² ANDRONIKOS 1984, 35-37, fig. 15; ANDRIANOU 2009, 30, no. 10; MANGOLDT 2012, 288-289, pl. 112,4; KOTTARIDI 2013, fig. on p. 353.

⁴³ ANDRONIKOS 1987; GINOUVÈS 1994, 154-161; KOTTARIDI 2007, 38-44; MANGOLDT 2012, 291-294, pl. 112, 5-6; FAKLARIS forthcoming.

⁴⁴ See MANGOLDT 2012, pl. 112, 5.

An iron helmet, probably part of the grave goods, and two skeletons attributed to tomb robbers were found in the ante-chamber. The main chamber housed a painted and gilded marble throne with a footstool, carrying a panel painting of Hades and Persephone on its back (Fig. 4),⁴⁵ a marble casket containing a cremation burial and the remnants of a gold and ivory couch suggesting a second burial.⁴⁶ The remains of the cremation are said to belong to a woman but no forensic study has ever been published. The back wall of the main chamber is decorated with engaged Ionic columns and a false marble door and windows giving the impression of a façade. The elaborate decoration of the marble throne imitates gold and ivory prototypes. A purple canopy may have stood over it⁴⁷.

The date of this tomb and its attribution to Eurydice, Philip II's mother, are controversial⁴⁸. The sherds of three Panathenaic amphorae of the Athenian archon Lykiskos dating from 344/3 were recovered from the pyre above the tomb, while an Attic red-figure lekythos by the Eleusis Painter dating from about 330 came to light inside the tomb⁴⁹. The date of the tomb, however, cannot depend on imported Attic pottery, and specifically not on Panathenaic amphorae that tended to be kept as heirlooms for generations. A case in point is the House of Mosaics at Eretria where Panathenaics of the 360s were on display in the peristyle for about a hundred years until the destruction of the house around 270⁵⁰. In any case, the date of the so-called Eurydice Tomb must remain open until further evidence comes to light.

The attribution of the tomb to Eurydice, whose date of death is unknown⁵¹, was based mainly on the assumption that thrones belonged to female burials⁵². This was in turn based on two backless marble thrones bearing female names in the Macedonian Tomb of the Erotes at Eretria which dates from the second century B.C.⁵³. This tomb also housed two marble couches bearing male names and a marble chest inscribed with a woman's name. Quite apart from the fact that the Tomb of Eretria is not in Macedonia and is moreover rather late, its so-called thrones can be more properly described as luxury stools since they have neither backs nor armrests.

It is therefore safer to assume that the funerary thrones of Vergina belonged to men following the evidence we have discussed concerning the Bella Tomb and the so-called Eurydice Tomb. Considering the significance of the throne in Macedonia and its association with royal authority from Alexander the Great onwards, one may well ask if the three tombs with thrones at Vergina are royal⁵⁴. The question was raised by Paspalas and Huguenot, who reached opposing conclusion⁵⁵. Paspalas' premise that thrones could also be used by non-royals is based on Arrian's (*Anab.* 7.4.7) description of the mass marriage at Susa arranged by Alexander for himself and his Companions in 324, in the course of which the brides and bridegrooms sat on thrones; but Arrian explicitly says that the nuptials followed the Persian custom. Huguenot, on the other hand, suggested that thrones denote royalty but was at pains to explain the thrones in

⁴⁵ ANDRIANOU 2009, 30, no. 9; KOTTARIDI 2007, 38-44; 2013, fig. on p. 140.

⁴⁶ Gold and ivory couch: KOTTARIDI 2007, 39.

⁴⁷ On the canopy, see GUIMIER – SORBETS 2001, 218.

⁴⁸ PALAGIA (2002b) advocates a date after Alexander's conquest of the East.

⁴⁹ For illustrations of this pottery, see KOTTARIDI 2011, figs. 83 and 168.

⁵⁰ BENTZ 2001.

⁵¹ In a speech given before Philip II in 346, Aeschines (2.26-29) spoke about her as if she were dead, so we assume she had died before then. See CARNEY 2000, 44-45.

⁵² Cf. SISMANIDES 1997, 198-199.

⁵³ HUGUENOT 2008, 115-119, 121, pls. 6, 3; 7; 8; 12-15; 25,1.

⁵⁴ We have no evidence anywhere in Greece or Macedonia of funerary use of priests' thrones.

⁵⁵ PASPALAS 2008, 88; HUGUENOT 2008, 115-119.

the Tomb of the Erotes at Eretria. As we have seen above, however, the Eretria “thrones” are more likely stools.

If the marble thrones of Vergina are evidence of royal burials, we have no shortage of Macedonian kings who died in the first quarter of the third century though of course we do not know where they were buried. The civil war between the younger sons of Cassander in 294 and the Gaulish invasion of 279 proved fatal for a number of Macedonian kings. Cassander and his sons, Philip IV, Antipater II and Alexander V, as well as Ptolemy Ceraunus, all died between 297 and 279⁵⁶. Meleager and Antipater Etesias were proclaimed kings and deposed in quick succession in 279 but may have eventually received a royal burial⁵⁷. But all this is speculation. We must await further evidence to fully explain the presence of thrones in Macedonian tombs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABRAMENKO, A. (2000): “Der Fremde auf dem Thron. Die letzte Verschwörung gegen Alexander d. Gr.”, *Klio* 82: 362-378.
- ANDERSON, M. L. (1987/88): “The Villa of Fannius Synistor at Boscoreale”, *BMA Winter 1987/88*: 17-36.
- ANDRIANOU, D. (2009): *The Furniture and Furnishings of Ancient Greek Houses and Tombs*, Cambridge.
- ANDRONICOS, M. (1984): *Vergina. The Royal Tombs*, Athens.
- (1987): “Βεργίνα. Ανασκαφή 1987”, *Το Αρχαιολογικό Έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 1: 81-88.
- ANSON, E. M. (2004): *Eumenes of Cardia*, Boston – Leiden.
- BADIAN, E. (1996): “Alexander the Great between two thrones and heaven: variations on an old theme”, in A. Small (ed.): *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity*, *JRA Supp.* 17: 11-26.
- BENTZ, M. (2001): “Die Preisamphoren aus dem Mosaikenhaus in Eretria”, *AntK* 44: 3-12.
- BOARDMAN, J. (2001): *The History of Greek Vases*, London.
- CARNEY, E. D. (2000): *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia*, Norman, Oklahoma.
- CLINTON, K. (1974): *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Philadelphia.
- (2008): *Eleusis. The Inscriptions on Stone. II. Commentary*, Athens.
- FAKLARIS, P. (forthcoming): “Προβλήματα του λεγομένου ‘τάφου της Ευρυδίκης’ στη Βεργίνα”, *ArchDelt.*
- FREDRICKSMEYER, E. (2000): “Alexander the Great and the kingship of Asia”, in A. B. BOSWORTH – E. BAYNHAM (eds.): *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*, Oxford: 136-166.
- GABELMANN, H. (1984): *Antike Audienz- und Tribunalszenen*, Darmstadt.
- GINOUVÈS, R. (1994): *Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest*, Princeton.
- GUIMIER-SORBETS, A. M. (2001): “Mobilier et décor des tombes macédoniennes”, in R. FREI STOLBA – K. GEX (eds.): *Recherches récentes sur le monde hellénistique*, Bern: 217-227.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L. – WALBANK, F. W. (1988): *A History of Macedonia*, vol. III, Oxford.

⁵⁶ Cassander and Philip IV both died in 297: HAMMOND – WALBANK 1988, 208, 210. Antipater II died in 294: Hammond and Walbank 1988, 218. Alexander V died in 294: HAMMOND – WALBANK 1988, 215-217. Ptolemy Ceraunus died in 279: HAMMOND – WALBANK 1988, 252-253.

⁵⁷ HAMMOND – WALBANK 1988, 253-254.

- HATZOPOULOS, M. B. (2018): *La mort de Philippe II. Une étude des sources*, Athens.
- HUGUENOT, C. (2008): *La tombe aux Érotes et la tombe d'Amarynthos, Eretria XIX*.
- KOTTARIDI, A. (2007): "L'épiphanie des dieux des Enfers dans la nécropole royale d'Aigai", in S. DESCHAMPS-LEQUIME (ed.): *Peinture et couleur dans le monde grec antique*, Milano: 26-45.
- (ed.) (2011): *Heracles to Alexander the Great, exhibition catalogue*, Oxford.
- (2013): *Aigai, the Royal Metropolis of the Macedonians*, Athens.
- KOUROUNIOTIS, K. (1927-28): "Το ιερόν του Απόλλωνος του Ζωστήρος", *ArchDelt* 11: 9-53.
- KYRIELEIS, H. (1969): *Throne und Klinen*, Berlin.
- LANE FOX, R. (2016): "Alexander and Babylon: a substitute king?", in K. NAWOTKA – A. WOJCIECHOWSKA (eds.): *Alexander the Great and the East: History, Art, Tradition*, Wiesbaden: 103-115.
- LANÉRÈS, N. (2012): "La dédicace du 'throne' d'Aléa", *SEG* 46,400, nouvelle lecture", *REG* 125: 715-725.
- LAPATIN, K. (2011): "Representing Zeus", in J. MCWILLIAM – S. PUTTOCK – T. STEVENSON – R. TARAPOREWALLA (eds.): *The Statue of Zeus at Olympia*, Newcastle upon Tyne: 79-109.
- MANGOLDT, H. (2012): *Makedonische Grabarchitektur*, Tübingen – Berlin.
- MORENO, P. (1997): *Lisippo. L'arte e la fortuna*, Monza.
- NEILS, J. (2001): *The Parthenon Frieze*, Cambridge.
- PALAGIA, O. (2002a): "Ζεὺς Νάιος καὶ Διώνη στὴν Ἀκρόπολη τῶν Ἀθηνῶν", in *Αρχαία ελληνική γλυπτική. Αφιέρωμα στη μνήμη του γλύπτη Στέλιου Τριάντη. Μουσείο Μπενάκη* Παράρτημα 1, Athens: 171-180.
- (2002b): "The 'Tomb of Eurydice', Vergina, plundered", *Minerva* Jan./Febr. 4.
- (2014): "The frescoes from the Villa of P. Fannius Synistor in Boscoreale as reflections of Macedonian funerary paintings of the early Hellenistic period", in H. HAUBEN – A. MEEUS (eds.): *The Age of the Successors and the Creation of the Hellenistic Kingdoms (323-276 B.C.)*, Leuven: 207-231.
- (2015): *The Impact of Alexander the Great on the Arts of Greece*, Ghent.
- PASPALAS, S. A. (2000): "On Persian-type furniture in Macedonia: the recognition and transmission of forms," *AJA* 104: 531-560.
- (2005): "Philip Arrhidaios at court – an ill-advised persianism? Macedonian royal display in the wake of Alexander", *Klio* 87/1: 72-101.
- PETRAKOS, B. (1999): *Ο δήμος του Ραμνούντος II. Οι επιγραφές*, Athens.
- SCHÄFER, C. (2002): *Eumenes von Kardia*, Frankfurt.
- SISMANIDES, K. (1997): *Κλίνες και κλινοειδείς κατασκευές των Μακεδονικών τάφων*, Athens.
- STIRPE, P. (ed.) (2006): *Immagine del mito. Iconografia di Alessandro Magno in Italia*, Thessaloniki–Rome.
- STROSZECK, J. (2014): *Der Kerameikos in Athen. Geschichte, Bauten und Denkmäler im archäologischen Park*, Athens.
- ZAVOU, E. (2013): "Αναθηματικοί θρόνοι γερόντων", *Grammateion* 2: 93-104.

CAPTIONS



Fig. 1: Marble throne in the temple of Apollo Zoster, Vouliagmeni (Photo: Hans R. Goette).



Fig. 2: Marble throne in the Tomb of Rhomaios, Vergina (Photo from KOTTARIDI 2013, 338).



Fig. 3: Marble throne in Bella Tomb II, Vergina (Photo from KOTTARIDI 2013, 353).



Fig. 4: Marble throne in the so-called Tomb of Eurydice, Vergina.
(Photo from GINOUVÈS 1994, fig. 137).

Alexander and the Medicine*

by Borja Antela-Bernárdez
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
borja.antela@uab.cat

and

by César Sierra Martín
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
odiseo7@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT During the expedition and campaign across Asia, Alexander and his army had been involved in a lot of circumstances that deserved the attention of some professionals of the medicine. The relationship between Alexander's army and the Physicians is complex, and it is also a question to observe if there were in the army something like a medical unit. Nevertheless, the links between the Argeads and the practice of healing and medical arts and the professionals of medicine seems to have been usual in the Macedonian court. So, Alexander's episodes concerning his illness, and especially his abilities to heal or to help someone to be healed can be considered as a clue of the king's connections with Asclepius, and even more, of Alexander's use of this links to portrait himself as a healer, and in some way even as an incarnation of Asclepius, in his own way to divinization.

KEYWORDS Medicine; Asclepius; physicians; Medical unit; Asian campaign; Alexander the Great; King as healer; Argeads.

In Antiquity, nothing was left to chance in a military campaign, where soldiers shared space with a long list of members of the entourage of the generals, such as philosophers, artists, seers, physicians... But along with these, there were other figures like assistants, bartenders, prostitutes, wheelwrights, squires, sons/daughters and women of soldiers, and so on, *ad infinitum*. We can guess that the non-combatant collective in a military expedition would be equal or superior in number to that of the soldiers¹. The organization of these groups of people, nevertheless, was not included among the usual information offered by the Ancient sources², which were more interested in explaining

* This paper, developed within the Research Group 2017SGR234, wants to be a tribute in honor of Prof. Brian Bosworth.

¹ The question is difficult to quantify: ENGELS 1978, 11ff.

² Despite SALAZAR 2013, 297 who defends that, concerning Alexander's wounds and the military Medical treatment in Greece, "the historians writing about Alexander the Great (in particular Plutarch, Arrian and Quintus Curtius), who often present his life in Homeric terms, form another group of important authors. Alexander was wounded several times, and some of the descriptions go into great detail about his wounds and their treatment". In our opinion, this is a judgement lacked of rigour, that does not agree with the difficulties of analyzing this subject in detail, as is our aim in this paper. Likewise, the

aspects like tactics before battle, ethnic composition of the armies, the generals' skills, etc. In fact, our sources tend to focus their attention on everything related with the combat, and just silence from what we can consider the normal details of the daily life³.

Alexander's campaign cannot be compared with any other driven by the Greeks in Asia. In a business of such a magnitude like that, with so many troops, the non-combatant group gains major importance, although the sources left them in the shadow in their accounts⁴. So, the list of non-combatants involved in the campaign also allows us to identify, in the account by our sources, a long list of groups: sappers⁵, fortune-tellers⁶, philosophers, sophists and poets⁷, historians (like Callisthenes himself)⁸, and many other intellectuals and flatterers, who made Alexander's banquets and evenings more pleasant, and also worked on tasks of research and documentation in the lands of Asia⁹.

Of the less attractive duties, we can also detect the presence of a group of assistants as bartenders (in the army of Alexander: Curt. 8.4; in the army of Darius III: Curt. 5.8.5), merchants, ensuring the supplies of the army (i.e. Arr. An. 6.22.4)¹⁰, athletes¹¹, spies, or explorers (i.e. Arr. An. 4.1), interpreters (i.e. Arr. An. 4.6; Curt. 5.13.7), cooks and pastry chefs (Plu. Alex. 22), massage therapists, room helpers and maids (Plu. Alex. 40), courtesans¹², foragers (Arr. An. 4.5.5), mercenaries and their families (Diod. 17.84.3), or even the families the Macedonian soldiers produced with their concubines during the expedition¹³. This huge collective of non-combatants was also increasing its number while the expedition crossed Asia, probably undermining the army's mobility.

short bibliography of SALAZAR 2013, 310-311 shows the complexity and the lack of information about this topic.

³ Xen. HG. 4.8.1. cf. PRITCHETT 1999, 153.

⁴ About the military approaches to Alexander's campaign, FULLER 1958 is still helpful. Nevertheless, there are good recent works like MILES 1976; MARKLE 1982; STRAUSS 2003 and the great work of SEKUNDA 2010. On the other hand, MORENO 2012, despite focused in Philip II, is also useful due to the bibliography and the full treatment of the study cases and the problematic of the Macedonian army. Also, see LONSDALE 2007.

⁵ For example, during the siege of Tyre: Diod. 17.41.4; Curt. 4.2.12; Arr. An. 2.19.6. On Alexander's sieges, see ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ 2012, 77-134, with bibliography. Likewise, BOSWORTH 2003a, 241.

⁶ The best known was Aristander of Telmessos. On his relationship with Alexander, see HAMILTON 1969, 4; HECKEL 2006, 45-46 and FLOWER 2008, 179-181.

⁷ A great number of artists, philosophers and scientists followed Alexander: Faure 1982, 65-66. On the other hand, this kind of company, intellectuals who accompanied the king during the banquets and dinners, where an usual feature in the Argead court: TOMLISON 1970; FAURE 1982, 207-208; BORZA 1983; MURRAY 1996; KOTARIDI 2004; CARNEY 2007; ZARAGOZA – ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ 2018. The presence of intellectuals also became a key element in the Hellenistic courts: SMITH 1993, 202-212.

⁸ BOSWORTH 1970; PRANDI 1985; BOSWORTH 2003b, 72-74.

⁹ There is an academic tradition considering the expedition as a scientific exploration of Asia: ROMM 1989; BODSON 1991; ALVAR 2000, with bibliography.

¹⁰ To these we must add those in charge of the management and purchase of the salves and captives (PRITCHETT 1971, 89-92), and so the Royal agents who dealt with markets supplies for the troop: Arist. Oec. 2,34a.38, and the comments by LE RIDER 2003, 305-309.

¹¹ There is a lot of examples (i.e. Curt. 9.7.16), being Dioxippus the most famous: Curt. 9.7.1.6-26; Diod. 17.100.1-101.6, Ael. VH 10.22. Cf. FAURE 1982, 67-68.

¹² For example, Diod. 17.72; Curt. 5. 7.2-3. We know well the great number of courtesans and prostitutes in Alexander's campaign, like the Atheian Thais (Plu. Alex. 38; Diod. 17.72; Curt. 5.7.3-7), the Theassalian Campaspe or Pancaste (Plin. NH 35.86-87; Ael. VH 12.34), Pythionice and Glycera (Ath. 13.594d-595d), or the Thessalian Callixena (Ath. 10.435a), to quote the main examples. On the matter of sexuality and the Macedonian campaign, FAURE 1982, 211. On the presence of prostitutes in Alexander's army, see ZARAGOZA 2018.

¹³ This kind of practices would probably be widely accepted: Diod. 17.110.3; ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ 2008, 319; ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ 2015.

In consequence, the role of the medicine in this context would surely have been of major importance. Within Alexander's expedition, a physician had to attend not only the usual wounds resulting from battles and fights, but also the effects of insalubrity due to the mass of people; epidemics, maladies resulting from physical efforts and temporary shortages, etc. In some way, the health care needs in an expedition like that of Alexander may have been as urgent as in any *polis*. Of course, we must also add to this a relevant factor for the health of the people involved in the campaign, as was the arrival in unknown landscapes, which meant new diseases and the ignorance by the physicians of the plants and medicines that could help in their treatment¹⁴.

The first aim of this paper is to analyse how the expedition of Alexander across Asia until the heart of India expanded the limits of the Greek medical knowledge, becoming a real challenge for the military physicians¹⁵.

PHYSICIANS WITH ALEXANDER

As a starting point, we must place the mass of non-combatants in the Macedonian army. The military logistics and impedimenta meant that the usual places of the non-combatants were usually located in the rear-guard¹⁶. Does this mean that the Medical staff were also within the impedimenta? This is, actually, what Aeneas Tacticus says (16.15), who recommended putting the wounded and sick, as an inoperative section of the army, at a cautious distance from their comrades or even in a camp. A confirmation of this practice can be found in the preface of the battle of Issus, when the sources indicate that the army of Darius, after developing a wrapping manoeuvre, surprised a group of Macedonian soldiers left behind due to suffering some sickness (Curt. 3.8.14; Arr. *An.* 2.7). Thus, the continuity of battles, skirmishes, sieges or the hard rigour of the marches provoked a rise in the number of soldiers who needed medical attention, which also meant a problem in the logistics of Alexander's army¹⁷. We also know about a soldier named Eurylochus who decided to enrol himself among the sick (Arr. *An.* 7.8.12; Plu. *Alex.* 41.5).

For our research, the case of Eurylochus provides us with information about the logistics of the wounded and sick in the army of Alexander. First, those sick or seriously wounded soldiers were moved away definitively from the military activity, with lists that regulate who had to be moved in any case. This meant at least some officers or administrators were in charge of these lists and these wounded/sick soldiers. Secondly, it seems that these lists were reviewed afterwards in order to avoid fakes or attempts of desertion. So, the military administration of the Macedonian army of Alexander marked differences between the soldiers with chances of recovery to combat, who were moved to the rear-guard, or were treated and healed in the camp, or even within some concrete spaces in the conquered cities¹⁸, and the soldiers who became unable for service in the

¹⁴ For India before Alexander, see BOSWORTH 1995, 27-44, with bibliography.

¹⁵ Our aim is to offer a different approach that SALAZAR 2000, 184-208.

¹⁶ Curt. 3.22; 4.12.3-4; Arr. 3.23.7; Plu. *Alex.* 43.

¹⁷ The wounded were in the hundreds. A good example is provided by the siege of Halicarnasus, where the Macedonians suffered 300 casualties during a night exit of the besieged: Arr. *An.* 1.20.10.

¹⁸ For example, as in the case of Issus, in Zariaspa (Sogdiana) or in Taxila: Arr. *An.* 4.16.6; 5.8.3. Bosworth 2003b, pp. 115-116 assures that "Alexander seems to have made it a practice to leave his sick troops in the satrapal capitals, to join the main army after their convalescence (cf. 3.19.8 (Cleitus)). Only officers of standing are mentioned by name, but troops of all ranks were included in the convalescence arrangements (5.8.3)". Another example is the case of Alexandria of Media, where the king founded a

army, who were repatriated or, in some cases, used in garrisons or as cleruchs for the conquered lands (as in the case of Sogdiana: Arr. *An.* 4.22.5). In some extreme cases, the wounded would even be abandoned to their own fate if they disturbed the movement of the army, such as in the Gedrosia desert¹⁹.

If we now look at the basic health care of the wounded, we are again faced with the problems of the nature of our sources. We cannot find specific information about who attend the sick or wounded, or even about the possible existence of a ‘physician’s tent’²⁰. Despite this lack of sources, we maintain that some kind of medical organisation would have existed, dealing with the serious cases and matters of the troops, leaving the superficial questions to the experience and care of each soldier to himself²¹. There may also have been some soldiers with knowledge of medical practice, close to the surgeons, capable of offering some kind of first aid, although our sources cannot confirm it.

However, in the expedition, there were physicians, whose work is recorded and valued when they treated some personality within the army, as in the case of Alexander himself and his generals. Among these physicians, we know some of them by their name, as there are references in our sources. This is the case, for example, of Alexippus (Plu. *Alex.* 41.6), Andocides (Thphr. *HP* 4.16.6; Plin. *NH* 14.58; 17.240; Ath. 6.258b), Critobulus²² (Curt. 9.5.25; Arr. *Ind.* 18.7), Dracon, the physician of Roxana, and his son Hippocrates (Suda s.v. ‘Hippocrates’), the famous Philip of Acarnania (vid. *infra*), Glaucias/Glaukon (Plu. *Alex.* 72.2; Arr. *An.* 7.14.4), Pausanias (Plu. *Alex.* 41.7), or Polydorus of Theos (Ath. 12.548e). The problem, nevertheless, begins when we try to distinguish which of these names make reference to physicians and which of them were simple surgeons, as in the case of Critodemus (Plin. *NH.* 7.37), about whom our unique source describes him removing an arrow from the eye of Philip II during the siege of Metone.

Likewise, the Macedonian court seems to have given more attention to the physicians. This is, actually, what we can observe in cases like the patronage by Perdiccas II to the most famous physician of Antiquity, Hippocrates of Cos (Suda s.v. ‘Hippocrates’). On the other hand, it seems probable that the Argeads had some kind of court physician (or physicians), as for example shown by the case of Nicomachus, the father of Aristotle²³, who had enjoyed a close friendship with the King Amintas III, father of Perdiccas II and Philip II (Diod. 5.1), although it is difficult to assess the existence of a unique physician in the court, as far as we hear about other names, like Menecrates (Ael. *VH.* 12.51), who may have shared the task of taking care of the health of the Macedonian royal family with Nicomachus.

city with 3000 barbarians and the mercenaries who wished to live there : Diod. 17.83.2. See BOSWORTH 2003b, 142-143.

¹⁹ Curt. 9.10.13. At the light of the account of Xen. *Agas.* 1.21, this practice was normal. See PRITCHETT 1971, 81-82.

²⁰ A military *ιατρείον/iatreïon*. On this *iatreïon* see NISSEN 2010. The physician’s tent in a military context of Antiquity is studied for the Roman period by SCARBOROUGH 1969, 71 and BAKER 2009, 31ff.

²¹ We just know a case in Curtius (7.1.22-23) about the self Medical assistance by soldiers. Nevertheless, we do not agree with GABRIEL 2007, 141 and LEE 2008, 244, who defended the inexistence of sanitary assistance in the Greek armies.

²² HECKEL 1981, 396-398, who defends a probable mistake in the transmission of the name of Critobulus for Critodemus.

²³ Many authors have linked Aristotle with Alexander’s Medical interests: Plu. *Alex.* 41.7 and HAMILTON 1969, 108; Curt. 9.8.27.

Audacity and boldness in combat were Alexander's well-known abilities, causing, as a result, multiple injuries and other diseases²⁴. In these cases of Alexander's wounds that our sources mention the medical staff. We can consider here one of the most famous episodes of Alexander's life, the illness suffered in Cilicia²⁵. Our sources explain how, on his way to Tyre, Alexander decided to take a bath in the icy waters of the Cidnus River²⁶. Soon afterwards, the bath provoked a fever, insomnia and convulsions²⁷. The physicians came to treat the King, fearing the possible consequences of a mistake in their treatment²⁸. Among them, Philip of Acarnania, a person with close ties to the King, took the initiative, and resolved to prepare a medicine (φάρμακον/*pharmakón*) which restored Alexander's health. However, the most interesting of this episode are the accusations of treason against Philip. The sources explain that, while Philip managed to prepare the medicine, Parmenio gave a letter to Alexander accusing Philip of being part of a plot against the Macedonian King. The letter assures that Philip was bribed by Darius III²⁹. The supposed conspiracy was finally shown to be a fake, and Philip gained great fame among the troop due to his intervention, receiving numerous signs of gratitude³⁰, and to Alexander's fast recovery (Curt. 3.6.17).

Nevertheless, the sources do not explain the kind of malady suffered by Alexander³¹, nor even the medicine used by Philip. According to Arrian, who follows Aristobulus here, the causes of this sickness are hard to say (with the fatigue³², or the bath in cold waters, prevailing). On Philip's medicine, Arrian and Plutarch consider it as a purgative (Arr. *An.* 2.4.9; Plu. *Alex.* 19.4), and Curtius just says that Philip made a kind of healing beverage for the King (Curt. 3.6.3), an answer so close to that of Diodorus (Diod. 17.31.4-6). So, with this kind of poor information, we are not able to tell what kind of sickness Alexander suffered from, or what solution was offered to him by Philip³³, although what we can observe is that Philip seems a physician of Hippocratic profile, as none of our sources describes him trying to observe a divine origin for the illness, or dealing with any kind of religious treatment of purification³⁴. Likewise, the relationship between Philip and the King after the Cidnus episode is confusing, since some sources describe him as a prestigious (Arr. *An.* 2.4.9; Plu. *Alex.* 19.4), or daring physician (Diod. 17.31.5), and others seem to date the close ties between them to a common past in Macedon (Curt. 3.6). So, despite the difficulties from our sources, we can guess that

²⁴ The wounds of Alexander were just a part of the building of an heroic image by Alexander: SALAZAR 2000, 184ff..

²⁵ VERGES 1951, 73 corrects that it was not actually in Cilicia, but in the Troad, in a region which had been inhabited by the Cilicians: Str. 13.7.

²⁶ Xen. *An.* 1.2.23; Str. 14.5.12 C673; Val. Max. 3.8 ext 6. Cf. HECKEL – YARDLEY 1997, 128.

²⁷ This bath is maybe linked with an information in Polyaeus about the Macedonian prohibition of using hot water for bathing. *Strat.* 4.2.1. BOSWORTH 2003a, 190-191 does not mention Polyaeus. The bath appears also in Diod. 17.31.4; Curt. 3.4.8-10; Arr. *An.* 2.4.7; Plu. *Alex.* 19. About the therapeutic uses of baths in Hippocratic Medicine, see Str. 14.5.12, Plin. *NH* 31.11, Vitruv. 8.3.6 (cf. BOSWORTH 2003a, 191), JOUANNA 1999, 168-169.

²⁸ A good example of this could be the case of Glaucón: see *infra*.

²⁹ *An.* 2.4.9; Curt. 3.6.4; Plu. *Alex.* 19.5. Diodorus (17.31.4) does not mention the letter. Justin. 11.8.5 is the unique who puts Parmenio outside the scene: HECKEL – YARDLEY 1997, 129.

³⁰ VERGES 1951, 84.

³¹ ENGELS 1978 assures it was malaria, while SCHACHERMEYER 1973, 202 and GREEN 1974, 220 argued it was a pneumonia. The sources does not allow us, in our opinion, to argue what illness exactly was.

³² Aristobulus seems to be the unique source about this: BOSWORTH 2003a, 190.

³³ We agree here with SALAZAR 2000, 190-191.

³⁴ A usual feature of the *iatrómanteis*: GIL 2004, 119.

Philip was one of Alexander's court physicians, or at least one who was close to the royal house³⁵.

The truth is, actually, that we do not know very much about Philip, and after the Cidnus episode, the sources set him aside. We just hear about him clearly on another occasion, as in the siege of Gaza³⁶. The account of this siege is marked in the sources by Aristander's prediction that the King would be wounded if he took part in the assault (Curt. 4.6.12; *An.* 2.26.4; *Plu. Alex.* 25.5). Alexander finally decided to attack himself, and then he was wounded by an arrow, and only Curtius (4.6.12) says that Alexander was treated by Philip, who removed the arrow and made an incision to allow the blood to flow. This kind of tasks by a physician is really close to the traditional uses of the military physicians in the Ancient world, that is to say, extraction of arrows, bandage of wounds, treatment of fractures and dislocations, etc. However, the rest of the accounts about the wound of Alexander in Gaza does not specify the treatment or any other kind of medical care. In any case, Philip vanishes from our sources definitively and the medical assistance is mentioned by our sources just in isolated cases where a main character needed the help of a physician. A good example of it is recorded by Plutarch, on Alexander's worries about the health of some of his generals and friends:

“After Peucestas had safely recovered from an illness, Alexander wrote to the physician, Alexippus, expressing his thanks. While Craterus was sick, Alexander had a vision in his sleep, whereupon he himself offered certain sacrifices for the recovery of his friend, and bade him also a sacrifice. He also wrote to Pausanias, the physician, who wished to administer hellebore to Craterus, partly expressing distress, and partly advising him how to use the medicine”.
(*Plu. Alex.* 41.3-4. Translation by PERRIN 1919).

This passage shows the existence of an active health care within the highest officers of the Macedonian army. As we can see, the physician appears to palliate the effects of some accident or sickness difficult to cure, and disappears in the cases when their patients are a lot and of low rank³⁷. Indeed, this does not mean that the health service was just limited to the members of the Macedonian high command, but the task of the physician is noted by our sources when the health of the personalities is in danger. Again, a singular situation happened to Alexander in India, in the battles against the Malians, where the King suffered a serious wound by an arrow³⁸. The sources show a series of multiple information about the episode, but almost in every one of them the account noted the task of a physician. In Arrian, we read different versions: in one

³⁵ Also BOSWORTH 2003a, 191 and HECKEL 2006, 213-214. Some discussion exists about the duties of these physicians and their role within the army, or if they were expected to fought in battles and so. HECKEL – YARDLEY 1997, 129 are not quite convinced of these physicians' military duties. *Contra*, BOSWORTH 2003a, 191. In our opinion, these physicians were not probably in the battlefield, as the case of Perdicas in the siege of Thebes and received treatment in the rearguard: *Arr. An.* 1.8.1-3. But it seems actually possible that the physicians should also develop their duties within the ranks of the phalanx, if we consider the case of Critodemus and the eye of Philip II or the wounds of Alexander against the Malians: *Arr. An.* 6.11.

³⁶ Although somebody named Philip was present in Babylon during the party organized by Medias, (*Ps.Call.* 3.31), it is doubtful to identify him with Philip the physician: HECKEL – YARDLEY 1997, 129. On the other hand, Hamilton 1969, loc. cit quotes the suggestion by Berve, who argued that maybe we know nothing more about Philip because he decided to stay and lived in the Middle East, as a part of a contingent leaved in a city or in the rearguard of Alexander's advance. HECKEL – YARDLEY says Berve's suggestion is unlikely.

³⁷ On this, but for the Roman period, see SCARBOROUGH 1969, 68.

³⁸ BOSWORTH 2003c.

version, we find Critodemus of Cos extracting the weapon, and in another one it was Perdikkas who treated Alexander, due to the difficulty to find a surgeon near where the incidents occurred (Arr. *An.* 6.11)³⁹. Other accounts of the episode do not mention any physician (Diod. 17.99.5), while Plutarch says that someone, indefinite, extracted the arrow (a physician? Maybe even Perdikkas, as in Arrian?), and the King during some days had to follow a special diet for recovering from his wounds (Plu. *Alex.* 63.6), a fact that suggests some kind of prescriptions from a professional, i.e., a physician. In light of these details, we can understand that we are dealing here with Alexander and his health, and this is what attracts the attention of our sources to the medical staff in charge of the king's treatment. Likewise, the death of Hephaestion provides us with the story of his personal physician, Glaukon⁴⁰, who was at the theatre when Hephaestion was recovering from an illness. This recovery began to become complicated and finally Hephaestion died, provoking the wrath of Alexander, who ordered the physician to be crucified⁴¹.

Despite this kind of eventualities, medical assistance was also of major importance during the many epidemics suffered during Alexander's expedition. The mass, the shortage, and the overcrowding of the huge amount of human beings produced the elements to enable epidemics to extend among the army and the non-combatant population enrolled in Alexander's campaign⁴².

For example, after Gaugamela, Alexander decided to speed up the march of his army due to the worsening of the general healthiness caused by the decomposition of the corpses in the battlefield (Curt. 5.1.10)⁴³. On another occasion, during the prosecution of a group of Scythians, the army contracted an outbreak of diarrhoea caused by drinking polluted waters, and even Alexander himself was affected⁴⁴ (*An.* 4.4.8-9).

Also grievous, was the outbreak of mange suffered by the expedition in the lower course of the Indus River. Some soldiers had a bath in a salt lagoon, and the epidemic spread around, as such that the epidemic had to be treated with oil washes (Curt. 9.10). Likewise, in Gedrosia the ravages of shortage and famine, the fatigue of the march, and the insalubrity, promote the spreading of illness (Curt. 9.10.13; Arr. *An.* 6.25.4). Surely, the skills and expertise of the physicians of the expedition had been of major importance, although our sources say nothing about them, or their intervention.

However, the arrival of the expedition in India meant contact with a region known only indirectly by the Greeks and Macedonians⁴⁵. The members of the expedition had to face natural phenomenon, named as supernatural: tides (Curt. 9.9.9), and the monsoon (Plu. *Alex.* 60.3); the sighting of unknown fauna, like elephants (Arr. *An.* 8.13), whales (Curt. 9.1.11), beasts of every kind (Diod. 17.92; Curt. 9.8). These elements fostered the discouragement of the army, driving them to decide not to continue with the march beyond the Indus (Arr. *An.* 5.27). In a similar situation, the arrival to these unknown landscapes meant, for the physicians, an exponential rise in the health problems, and a chance to document new phenomena and medicinal plants.

³⁹ Surgery's knowledge was probably common among the soldiers. Curt. 9.5.25 says Critodemus and not Critobulus: HECKEL 2006, 100. On this, see also HECKEL 1981.

⁴⁰ Glaucias, according to Arr. *An.* 7.14.4.

⁴¹ Plu. *Alex.* 72 against Diod. 17.110.8.

⁴² In Greek culture, the term that designed the shortage (λιμός/limós) is closely linked with the one used for epidemic (λοιμός/loimós). See DEMONT 1983, 343 and JOUANNA 2006, 197.

⁴³ Hp. *Flat.* 6; Hp. *Nat.Hom.* 9. See JOUANNA 1999, 151-152; DEMONT 1983; JOUANNA 2006; SIERRA 2012a, with bibliography.

⁴⁴ The epidemic, according to Arrian, also affected Alexander: BOSWORTH 2003b, 31.

⁴⁵ DUECK 2012, 38-39.

Again, our sources are not really interested about the medical questions, with the just one exception: the high menace of the snakes. The sources are unanimous about the fact that the main mortality factor in India was the snakes. Diodorus is probably the most explicit, when he writes about the troop's worries concerning the lethal danger of the snakes (Diod. 17.90.6). The frightened soldiers were driven to the need of sleeping in hammocks to save themselves from this danger, and how the snakes lay in wait to bite them even in the more usual daily tasks, like looking for firewood, when they saw horrible great-sized snakes⁴⁶ (Diod. 17.90; Curt. 9.1.4). The fear of this menace shocked the whole army, and the perplexity and ignorance of the physicians faced with this fact was, actually, very significant, as we can observe in Arrian:

“No Greek physicians have discovered a remedy against Indian snake-bite; but the Indians themselves used to cure those who were struck. And Nearchus adds that Alexander had gathered about him Indians very skilled in physic, and orders were sent round the camp that anyone bitten by a snake was to report to the royal pavilion. But there are not many illnesses in India, since the seasons are more temperate than ours. If anyone is seriously ill, they would inform their wise men, and they were thought to use the divine help to cure what could be cured”.
(Arr. *An.* 8.15.11. Translation by ROBSON 1933).

This passage has two questions that deserve more comment. Firstly, the medical research concerning the poison of the snakes, and secondly the response from the leader facing a health problem like this. The assessment by Arrina is surprising as regards the unsuccessful research to find a medicine against the poison, especially if we have in mind what Arrian wrote five centuries later⁴⁷. Secondly, we are probably facing an example of an *iatreîon* created *ad hoc* to solve a specific health problem. So, this question reinforces our impression about the existence of an administrative way to solve primary health care in the army of Alexander. Thus, the health problems of the expedition in India were grievous, if we consider the huge amount of medicines coming from Greece (Diod. 17.95.4-5).

But the native population not only know well the way to avoid the venom, but also they used it in the battlefield, coating their arms (arrows and swords) with it and provoking several casualties among the Macedonians⁴⁸. In one of these skirmishes, Ptolemy was wounded, and this fact is used by Curtius to explain his legend of the Alexander's dream (Curt. 9.8.22). Curtius says that Alexander obtained the medicine for Ptolemy due to the apparition, while Alexander was dreaming of a dragon (snake) that has a herb in its mouth (Curt. 9.8.27)⁴⁹. However, Arrian indicates that the Indian physicians knew the medicine, and Diodorus confirms it, adding that it was in fact a root (Diod. 17.90.6). Legends apart, it seems obvious that in an ecosystem completely unknown to the Greek physicians, pragmatism drove Alexander to count on Indian physicians to help the troops with primary assistance and health care.

To sum up, it seems that the introduction of the physicians within the ancient armies was a main turning point in the campaign of Alexander. Nevertheless, we are unable to describe here any kind of integrated health care, due in part to what our sources want to explain, but we can document the presence of physicians and medical knowledge. In consequence, we can assure the existence of a minimum, double-sided, health care: one

⁴⁶ Diod. 17.90.1; Arr. *An.* 8.15.10.

⁴⁷ Roman medicine was familiar to Snake poisons: NUTTON 2004, 159; LASKARIS 2005, 176.

⁴⁸ MAYOR 2009, 89.

⁴⁹ GIL 2004, 352ff.; NUTTON 2004, 42.

group of physicians, surgeons or soldiers with knowledge and experience in the care of wounds, and another different group of professionals who were in charge of the health care of the King and his generals and relatives. If the latter also dealt with the most grievous diseases of the soldiers, we cannot tell, but it is possible that it actually happened if the operational skills of the army were at risk⁵⁰. This is what we can actually deduce from the episode of the Indian snakes and the incorporation of Indian physicians into the army.

Finally, Alexander's campaigns were a real challenge for the strong Greek medical tradition. During the 'Anabasis', Greek physicians were forced to deal with a lot of situations they probably knew well, but they also had to face, in India and other places, circumstances that meant a hard test to their knowledge. We can be sure that the Macedonian expedition had a deep impact on Greek medicine, and especially, in military medicine. Actually, the newest works from the Hippocratic Corpus we can find recommendations for the physicians to take part in military expeditions to far lands to gain experience in military medicine and surgery (*Med.* 14)⁵¹.

THE PHYSICIAN ALEXANDER

There is no need to read much in Plutarch's *Life of Alexander* to find the first information about Alexander's relationship with the medicine:

"In my opinion Alexander's love of the art of healing was inculcated in him by Aristotle pre-eminently. For he was not only fond of the theory of medicine, but actually came to the aid of his friends when they were sick, and prescribed for them certain treatments and regimens, as one can gather from his letters".
(Plu. *Alex.* 8. 1. Translation by PERRIN 1919).

Aristotle's influence in Alexander's intellectual interests are, actually, very plausible. Also, Aristotle's interest in medicine is well-known, mainly due to his father Nicomachus, the court physician of Amintas III of Macedon (D. L. 5. 1)⁵². Plutarch's aim here is to emphasize the fact that Alexander was above the standards for an educated man of his age in his love and interest for the medical knowledge (τὸ φιλατρειν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ)⁵³. Furthermore, Plutarch stress the fact that Alexander did not only learn theoretical rudiments, but he also practised the art of medicine and, in our opinion, this distinction is made to show the difference between the King and the rest of Greek cultivated men whose general education (*paideía*) included medical knowledge⁵⁴.

"Physician' means both the ordinary practitioner, and the master of the craft, and thirdly, the man who has studied medicine as part of his general education (for in almost all the arts there are some such students, and we assign the right of judgement just as much to cultivated amateurs as to experts)".
(Arist. *Pol.* 1282a. Translation by RACKHAM 1944).

⁵⁰ SALAZAR 2004, 72.

⁵¹ JOUANNA 1988, 10-17; LOPEZ FÉREZ 1988, 27.

⁵² LONGRIGG 1993: 149ff.; LLOYD 2003: 176-201; NUTTON 2004: 118ff.; BOUDON-MILLOT 2005; VAN DER EIJK 2005, 234ff.

⁵³ LUCHNER 2004: 190.

⁵⁴ JAEGER 1933, 783-829; HORSTMASHOFF 2010.

So, the man with medical knowledge (ὁ πεπαιδευμένος περὶ τὴν τέχνην) was not really a physician⁵⁵. We also know that some works within the Hippocratic Corpus were addressed to a wider public, not actually with a great level of medical expertise, and even some researchers argued that there are works in the Corpus which were probably not written by the physicians themselves, but by sophists⁵⁶. All these lead us to the well-known relationship between Rhetoric and Medicine⁵⁷.

In consequence, and having in mind that Alexander had, according to Plutarch, real medical knowledge, we cannot be surprised by the fact that our sources placed Alexander in the leading role of some therapeutic actions or suggesting medical/hygienic measures. For example, in Diodorus we find an interesting detail concerning the foundation of Alexandria in Egypt. According to Diodorus, Alexander took an active part in the foundation of the city. Among the measures, Alexander is worried about the orientation of the streets (Diod. 17, 64). The planimetry was conceived to allow the Etesian winds, refreshing the city in order to achieve a healthy environment for the citizens. This fact must be linked with the information we can find in *On Airs, Waters and Places*, from the Hippocratic Corpus, which shows the interest of Hippocratic medicine on the influence of the environment and the orientation in the space that cities can have on the human beings (*Aër.* 1). According to this work, the physician should have knowledge of the influence over the health of humans (*Aër.* 2)⁵⁸. This kind of knowledge of the living conditions developed by the Hippocratic medicine was incorporated into the Greek military culture with notable interest, as we can observe in a passage from the *Cyropedia*:

If you are going to stay for some time in the same neighbourhood, you must not neglect to find a healthy location for your camp; and with proper attention you cannot fail in this. For people are continually talking about unhealthy localities and localities that are healthy; and you may find clear witnesses to either in the physique and complexion of the inhabitants;
(X. Cvr. I. 6. 16. Translation by MILLER 1914).

This passage and its links with *Aër.* 2, shed some light on Alexander's works for Alexandria's orientation. Actually, this is not an isolated case, since as far as we can see after Gaugamela, when Alexander ordered to leave the place in order to avoid the decomposition of the corpses in the battlefield, which resulted in a pollution in the environment and helped in propagating an epidemic outbreak (D.S. XVII. 64. 3; Curt. V. 1. 10). The decision is a clear evidence of the application in the field of hygienic measures fundamental in the Hippocratic Corpus. Indeed, pollution (*miasma*), a well-known topic in the studies of the Greek religious medicine, was adopted by the Hippocratic thought to mean 'air contamination', as an agent that helps in the transmission of disease. We can find the basis of this in *Flat.* 5, where the author assures that air is the source of every sickness, especially when it is circulated full of pollution, and was harmful for the health (*Flat.* 6)⁵⁹. So, questions like the orientation of the cities

⁵⁵ Even Galenus, who was not from a family of physicians, began as amateur (πεπαιδευμένος): IERACI BIO 1991, 134.

⁵⁶ JOUANNA 1984, 28-32; JOUANNA 1988, 10-17; LOPEZ FÉREZ 1988; NUTTON 2004, 50; more cases in SIERRA 2012b, 13-16.

⁵⁷ VM 20. See LONGRIGG 1993, 93; RODRÍGUEZ-ALFAGEME 1997, 155; JOUANNA 1999, 82-83; BARTON 2005, 41 ff.; AGARWALLA 2010, 74 ff.; JAEGER 1933, 792-793 and SIERRA 2012c: 94-96.

⁵⁸ A similar assesment can be found in Arist. *Pol.* 1327b 23-33. See JOUANNA 1999, 14 ff.; SIERRA 2012d, 52ff.

⁵⁹ A similar idea in Th. II. 48. See JOUANNA 2012; DEMONT 2013.

and military encampments, and concerns about the health standards of air and the prevention of epidemic outbreaks are clues of Alexander's medical knowledge, and how he made practical use of them.

On other occasions, the medical knowledge of the Macedonians were shown as a result of particular cases. In general, the sources of Alexander stress, the worries of the King when he noticed some sickness in his close friends, generals and relatives. In these cases, Alexander used to write to the physician with practical recommendations and comments, even detailing drugs and other medicines. Plutarch, for example, says that in the course of a hunt, Peucestas suffered an attack by a bear, and was convalescent for some days (Plu. *Alex.* 41.4). After his recovery, Alexander himself wrote a letter to Peucestas' physician, Alexippus, congratulating him for his work. During another hunting incident, Craterus was injured in his thigh, and his physician Pausanias wanted to provide him with hellebores, when he received a letter from Alexander recommending how to do so. On other occasion, Arrian says that Alexander himself showed his criticism with the physicians who had to treat him. This was what actually happened during the episode of Alexander's sickness after his bath in the icy waters of the Cidnus River, in Cilicia. What Arrian suggests here, is that Alexander accepted to drink the medicine Philip from Acarnania offered to him not just because he trusted the physician, but also because he agreed with the treatment and the suitability of the medicine in this case (Arr. *An.* II. 4. 8), once again stressing the high level of Alexander's medical knowledge⁶⁰.

All these episodes showed us the expertise of Alexander about Hippocratic medicine, as we saw in Plutarch (*Alex.* 8). Sometimes, this knowledge was general, allowing Alexander to decide about healthy places for windows and cities or the warnings due to an epidemic danger after the battle, and sometimes it was a more technical and precise knowledge, like when he recommended a treatment or a drug, like the Hellebores. Nevertheless, gradually the sources seem to confer Alexander with new medical skills, as we can see as far as the expedition gets close to unknown landscapes to the Greeks, like Bactria or India. This process is parallel to the transformation of Alexander himself, who progressively gains divine issues due to the magnification of his deeds and achievements⁶¹. In this process of assimilation with the divine, and even divinisation, of Alexander we are interested here in how it affected his medical knowledge. Indeed, a little detail into Craterus' recovery, under the eye of Pausanias the physician, claims our attention. Beyond the recommendations to the physician, it seems that Alexander took part in the recovery of Craterus by other means:

“While Craterus was sick, Alexander had a vision in his sleep, whereupon he offered certain sacrifices himself for the recovery of his friend, and bade him also sacrifice”.

(Plu. *Alex.* 41. 3. Translation by PERRIN 1919).

This passage drives us to the religious aspect of the Greek medicine. The case reminds us of the other oneiric examples we have already discussed, like in the case of the treatment of Ptolemy's poisoning by Indian snakes, although the episode is not clearly an example of the archaic nosology. Thus, we have no details here linking Craterus' sickness with the divine, but we can observe other typical issues of the archaic nosology: the cathartic actions and a sort of *incubatio* by Alexander worked as nexus

⁶⁰ Other perspectives in Diod. 17.31.6; Plu. *Alex.* 19; Curt 3. 6.

⁶¹ ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ 2007, *passim*; ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ 2016, with bibliography.

between the human and the divine. In this passage, when Alexander says to his friend what kind of sacrifices he has to make in order to get a better recovery, we can consider that our sources are talking about the existence of a pollution (*miasma*), contracted by Craterus, that needs to be expiated (*kátharsis*). The plain description does not allow us to know what kind of fault Craterus was responsible for, or the name of the divinity he offended. We just know that Alexander had a vision (*ὄψις/ópsis*) telling him what sacrifices were needed to restore his friend's health. This role of the King as nexus between the human sphere and the divine can be understood as a symptom of Alexander's progressive divinization.

We can also observe how this tendency is emphasised during a medical emergency in India. The Indian snakes' poison was, as we already saw, a serious danger. Our sources stress the high mortality resulted from this, as well as the Greek physician's inability to find a solution (Arr. *An.* VIII. 15. 11; Curt. IX. 1. 12; Diod. XVII. 90. 6)⁶². There were also the problem of the poisoned weapons by the Indians⁶³. Although Arrian talks about the inclusion of Indian physicians as an answer (Arr. *An.* VIII. 15. 11), Diodorus and Curtius points out that it was Alexander himself who took the responsibility of solving the situation, identifying the medicine to neutralise the poison. The version provided by Curtius is, actually, more extensive. He explicitly says that Ptolemy was wounded by a poisoned arrow, so Alexander, worried about his friend, assisted him beside Ptolemy's bed when he became sleepy:

“For when Alexander, wearied by fighting and by anxiety, had taken his place beside Ptolemy, he ordered a bed for himself to sleep on to be brought in. As soon as he lay down upon it, he immediately fell into a profound sleep. When he awoke, he said that in a dream a serpent had appeared to him, carrying an herb in its mouth, which it had indicated to be a cure for the poison; and the king declared too that he would recognize the colour of the herb if anyone could find it. Then, when it was found -for it was sought by many at the same time- he placed it upon the wound; and immediately the pain ceased and within a short time the wound was scabbed over”.

(Curt. IX. 8. 27. Translation by ROLFE 1946).

This is a clear description of an *incubatio*, and suggests a mythical animal, a dragon (snake?), who revealed a plant to Alexander as the cure⁶⁴. Alexander remembered so vividly that he could even recognize the medicine without the help of an adviser, so he supplanted the character of the archaic *iatrómantis*. So, this case shows an obvious connection between the human sphere and the divine in Alexander, who adopts a sacred position in front of his army. Actually, it is interesting to note that Alexander decided this way to show his troops the cure for the snakes' poison, maybe with a propagandistic aim, and avoid other ways of explaining how he knew the medicine, like his medical knowledge or such.

On the other hand, Diodorus also records this episode, with a snake instead of a dragon, and a more detailed description of the pathology of those affected by the poison (Diod. 17.103.5), but again, like in Curtius, the answer to this situation came from Alexander's dream, although he is also more explicit in explaining the use of the medicine:

⁶² ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ – SIERRA 2016.

⁶³ MAYOR 2009: 89.

⁶⁴ Recently, BARBARA 2014: 63 also defends this therapeutic action as an *incubatio*.

“The king saw a vision in his sleep. It seemed to him that a snake appeared carrying a plant in its mouth, and showed him its nature and efficacy and the place where it grew. When Alexander awoke, he sought out the plant, and grinding it up, plastered it on Ptolemy's body. He also prepared an infusion of the plant and gave Ptolemy a drink of it. This restored him to health”.
(Diod. XVII. 103. 8. Translation by OLDFATHER 1963).

Thus, the account by Curtius and Diodorus are not the same, but very similar, stressing, in both cases, that Alexander gathered in his own person the features of the *iatrómantis* and the *iatrós*, a rare fact in Greek literature⁶⁵.

To sum up, we can perceive an evolution in the medical skills and knowledge of Alexander as long as the expedition went on. Indeed, it seems like the medical thinking during the expedition suffered a kind of archaizing process, mixing up pragmatic situations with elements that belonged to the religious medicine, like the *incubatio*.

The climax of this can be found in the well-known episode of the death of Hephaestion⁶⁶. Again, the sources offer an unequal treatment of the details. Diodorus says that Hephaestion died near Ecbatana due to heavy drinking (Diod. XVII. 110. 8), while Plutarch (*Alex.* 72) writes that the real cause of death was that Hephaestion ignored his physician's advice, and after a copious meal, he died. Glaukon the physician was crucified as a result of Alexander's wrath⁶⁷. Arrian is more critical with the different versions about it (*An.* 7.14.3), but he also writes about Glaukon's death and Alexander's argued outrage:

“Others tell us that he bade the temple of Asclepius at Ecbatana be razed to the ground -a barbaric order, and not in Alexander's way at all; but more suitable to Xerxes' insolence towards things divine and harmonizing with those fetters which they say Xerxes let down into the Hellespont, with the notion of punishing the Hellespont”.
(Arr. *An.* VII. 14. 5. Translation by ROBSON 1933).

Although Arrian had doubts about some versions, he also approved another one where Alexander met a group of Greek ambassadors from Epidaurus and he asked them to bring his offerings to the god, and a note where he condemned Asclepius' behaviour concerning Hephaestion's death (*An.* 7.14.6). Likewise, in both cases we find a furious Alexander who does not hesitate in denouncing or even in considering making some reprisals against Asclepius for not helping his friend or saving his life. Thus, Alexander shows here that he feels an equal to the god, at the same level of him, and allowed to demand explanations from him. This is not a behaviour a Greek would accept, and he probably wants to criticise Alexander as the new Great King, also probably assimilating him with other impious Persian monarchs like Xerxes, to quote the best example. But we are probably also witnessing a process of evolution by Alexander, from a military leader with a high level of medical knowledge to a visionary in close connection with the gods, receiving advice and dreams with miraculous medicines and even received reprisal from the gods.

⁶⁵ Empedocles is probably the best example for mixing a *iatrómantis* and a physician: D. L. VIII. 60-66. More examples can be found in JOUANNA 1999: 262-265.

⁶⁶ HAMMOND 1993, 295.

⁶⁷ On this fact, see the views of LUCHNER 2004, 192.

ASCLEPIUS AND ALEXANDER'S DIVINISATION

In the light of the information we have collected, our aim is to suggest the existence of a process of assimilation between Alexander and the god Asclepius. This assimilation, framed within the usual method of Alexander in relation to many other mythical characters of the Greek culture, seems to follow the same system used in the case of the main characters of the heroic-divine assimilation by Alexander⁶⁸, which usually began with a specific episode where the aim of Alexander to be linked with a god or a hero is revealed, although this process always keeps a close link with the tradition and the mythical origins of the Argead's genealogy. This is also the case in the assimilation with Asclepius, where the starting point can be located in the famous bath of Alexander in the Cidnus River. The episode can also be viewed as a type of imitation and heroic assimilation. Thus, the place where these occurred cannot be accidental, as the Cidnus River is strongly linked to the cult of Asclepius, and an important medical school existed in the city⁶⁹. It is surprising, in some way, that the cure of Alexander came from a physician from Acarnania, Philip, and not a physician from Cidnus, and we can have an interesting conclusion about it. In fact, we cannot forget the main role that the sons of Amphiaraus had in Acarnania in the diffusion of the cult of Asclepius, at least in Athens. On the other hand, the presence of Philip, the Acarnanian, brings us directly to Philip II of Macedon's authority over Acarnania during the period before Alexander, and also, to Olympias of Epirus, whose probable links with Asclepius deserve more attention, as we shall see later. The bath of Alexander also does not seem an accidental fact, and although the episode occurred in the icy waters of the Cidnus (Plu. *Alex.* 19. 1; Arr. *An.* II. 4. 7.)⁷⁰. We must consider it as very similar to the bath of Zeus in the Lusius River, traditionally remembered as the coldest river of the world, which provoked an illness in Zeus, and the need of Zeus to be treated by Asclepius himself (Paus. VIII. 28. 2).

The healing of Alexander was, therefore, linked with a probable, calculated purpose. To the scientific resemblance of the whole episode of Philip of Acarnania's treatment, in the episode we can also contrast it with the transition between the human and the divine, usual in Alexander's procedures for self-representation and heroisation. Thus, by means of the sickness, but especially by the healing, Alexander becomes ostensibly closer to Asclepius. In fact, in Greek religious medicine, during the treatment, there was the belief that the sick received the god himself in their body, even developing some physical likeness to the god⁷¹. As a recovered patient, Alexander himself had been also transformed in some way into Asclepius.

However, the links between the kings of Macedonia and the cult of Asclepius were probably older. In fact, we know about the treatment and healing of Perdiccas II by Hippocrates, in a clear and intense figuration of Asclepius⁷². Also, Philip II had showed a strong interest in the Macedonian cult of Asclepius when he conceded eponymity to the priests of Asclepius in some cities of the realm⁷³. Likewise, epigraphy also shows

⁶⁸ ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ 2007, 90-102.

⁶⁹ THIVEL 1981.

⁷⁰ Alexander was not unique in history to suffer the cold waters of the Cidnus. In 833, Califa Al-Ma'mun died due to a bath like that of Alexander.

⁷¹ FRICHER 1982, 270.

⁷² Text available in *Vita Hippocratis secundum*, in *Soranum Sorani Gynaeciorum Libri IV*, CMG IV, 175-178. It is also recorded in PINAULT 1992: 127-128. Also, PINAULT 1992, 74-75; JOUANNA 2000, 512.

⁷³ HATZOPOULOS 1996, I, 193-194, 384.

how popular the cult of Asclepius was in Macedonia, if we consider the dedications from many Macedonian cities in Epidaurus around 360/59 BC⁷⁴, or the evidence of parties and dedications to Asclepius in Macedonia itself⁷⁵. Nevertheless, the cult of Asclepius was probably mixed at some time, probably due to the always dangerous *interpretatio graeca* of our sources, with that of Darron, a god of Macedonian origin with presence in Pella⁷⁶.

Back to Alexander, the truth is that his relationship with Asclepius would probably have a lot of facets. First, we cannot dismiss that the snake usually related with Olympias from Epirus was, in fact, not just related with Dionysus, as Plutarch says, but also with Asclepius and his snake relative, Glykon (Plu. *Alex.* 2.6)⁷⁷. Actually, Dionysus and Asclepius were strongly linked⁷⁸. One of the genealogies of Asclepius, which consider him a son of Arsinoe, connects Asclepius with the Heraclids, and as a result, he can also be viewed as an ancestor of the Argeads, i.e. of Alexander himself. Not in vain, this reasoning had been used by Alexander in the assimilation of Achilles, Heracles or Dionysus. Worthy of mention is also the fact that, like Heracles and Achilles, Asclepius was a human in the beginning. Thus, his presence in the *Iliad* (Il. II. 729; IV. 194) as a military physician of the Achaeans, would probably have granted him a wide fame among the members of the Macedonian court, due to the strong traces of the Mycenaean culture in the Macedonian society⁷⁹.

We have also noted that Heracles, to whom Alexander planned a well-known assimilation, had some, traditionally omitted curative facets in the Greek world⁸⁰. Due to this curative aspect of his cult, Heracles also received a cult in Epidaurus, the main sanctuary of Asclepius. As a matter of fact, it was in the Peloponnese where we can document better a kind of representation of Asclepius as beardless (Paus II. 10. 3; II. 13. 5; II. 32. 4; VIII. 28. 1), an issue that again brings us back to Alexander and his iconography⁸¹, strongly linked also with Dionysus. In this context, we must mention here the dedication by Alexander of his spear and his cuirass to the sanctuary of Asclepius in Gortin (Arcadia)⁸², recorded by Pausanias (8.28.1)⁸³. Pausanias also clearly stresses the specific beardless aspect of the statue of the god in this sanctuary⁸⁴.

Born man like Alexander, Asclepius gained his divine status due to his deeds and excellence (Arist. *Pol.* 1284a13). No doubt, this feature of the god was present in the aim of Alexander's assimilation with him, as happened in the case of Heracles. Like in the other cases, Alexander's transition to becoming Asclepius himself drove him from a medical praxis of treatment to even the mystical skills for healing.

⁷⁴ IG IV 1², 94b. Also, MARI 2011, 462. We know too some tribes in different Macedonian cities with the name of Asclepius: IG X² 1, 183; 1, 265; 2, 112.

⁷⁵ LEMERLE 1935, 140, #41; SEG 39: 619.

⁷⁶ SEG 44: 546.

⁷⁷ HAMILTON 1999, 4-5. Olympias was not the unique Queen of Epirus linked with the cult of Asclepius in the sphere of fertility: Andromaca, aunt of Olympias and wife of Arybbas of Epirus, visited Epidaurus in an attempt to become pregnant. Cf. CARNEY 2006, 14. About the relationship between Philip and Arybbas, see HAMILTON 1999, 2-3.

⁷⁸ Por ejemplo, NOVILLO-CORBALAN 2014, esp. 134.

⁷⁹ On the influence of the Homeric and Mycenaean world in Macedonia, see COHEN 1995; CARLIER 2000; ETIENNE 2002: 258-260; WARDLE – WARDLE – WARDLE 2003, *passim*.

⁸⁰ Philostr. VA 8.7.9; Paus. 2.32.4; IG V, 1119.

⁸¹ ALONSO TRONCOSO 2010; ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ 2005, 168-215.

⁸² Vid. ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ 2018.

⁸³ Cf. GABALDON 2004, 65-66, with bibliography about the sanctuary.

⁸⁴ On the dedication of Alexander in Gortina, see ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ 2018.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AGARWALLA, P. (2010): "Training Showmanship. Rhetoric in Greek medical education of the fifth and fourth centuries BC", in M. HORSTMANSHOFF (ed.): *Hippocrates on medical education. Selected papers read at the XIIth international Hippocrates Colloquium, Universiteit Leiden 24-26 August 2005*, Leiden: 73-85.
- ALONSO TRONCOSO, V. (2010): "The Bearded King and the Beardless Hero. From Philip II to Alexander the Great", in E. CARNEY – D. OGDEN (eds.): *Philip II and Alexander, Lives and Afterlives*, Oxford: 13-24.
- ALVAR, J. (2000): "Alejandro: explorador y hombre de ciencia", in J. ALVAR – J. M. BLÁZQUEZ (eds.): *Alejandro Magno. Hombre y Mito*, Madrid: 83-98.
- ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ, B. (2005): *Alexandre Magno e Atenas. Historia de Grecia 338-323 a.C.*, Santiago de Compostela.
- (2007): "Alejandro Magno o la demostración de la divinidad", *Faventia* 29, 89-103.
- (2008): "Vencidas, Violadas, Vendidas: Mujeres griegas y violencia sexual en asedios romanos", *Klio* 90/2: 307-322.
- (2012): "Alejandro Magno, poliorcetes", in J. VIDAL – B. ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ (eds.): *Fortificaciones y guerra de asedio en el mundo antiguo*, Zaragoza: 77-134.
- (2015): "La campaña de Alejandro: Esclavismo y dependencia en el espacio de conquista", in I. SASTRE – M. VALDÉS (eds.): *Los espacios de la esclavitud y la dependencia en la Antigüedad*, Besançon: 281-296.
- (2016): "Like Gods among Men: The Use of Religious and Mythical Issues during Alexander's Campaign", in K. ULANOWSKI (eds.): *Religious Aspects of War in Ancient and Medieval Times*, Leiden, 235-256.
- (2018): "La lanza de Alejandro en Gortina", *Gladius* 38, 7-13.
- ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ, B. – SIERRA MARTÍN, C. (2016a): "Alejandro Magno y la Anábasis de la medicina griega", *Athenaeum*: 397-417.
- (2016b): "La divinización de Alejandro a través de la medicina", *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 113: 115-138.
- BAKER, P. A. (2009): *Medicine, Death, and Military Virtues*, in F. M. SIMÓN – F. PINNA POLO – J. REMESAL (eds.): *Formae mortis. El tránsito de la vida a la muerte en las sociedades antiguas*, Barcelona: 25-37.
- BARBARA, S. (2014): "Forme et genèse d'une péripétie Romanesque: le rêve d'Alexandre (Curt., IX, 8, 22-27)", in M. MAHÉ-SIMON – J. TRINQUIER (eds.): *L'Histoire d'Alexandre selon Quinte-Curce*, Paris: 61-90.
- BARTON, J. (2005): "Hippocratic explanations", in P. VAN DER EIJK (ed): *Hippocrates in Context. Papers read at the XIth International Hippocrates Colloquium. University of Newcastle Upon Tyne. 27-31 August 2002*, Leiden–Boston: 29-47.
- BODSON, L. (1991): "Alexander the Great and the Scientific Exploration of the Oriental Part of his Empire. An Overview of the Background, Trends and Results", *AncSoc.* 22: 127-138.
- BORZA, E. (1983): "The Symposium at Alexander's Court", in *Ancient Macedonia* 3, Thessaloniki: 44-55.
- BOSWORTH, A. B. (1970): "Alexander and Callisthenes", *Historia* 19: 407-413.
- (1995): "Aristotle, India and Alexander", in M. F. BOUSSAC – J. F. SALLES (eds.): *Athens, Aden, Arikamedu. Essays on the interrelations between India, Arabia and the Eastern Mediterranean*, Delhi: 27-44.
- (2003a [1980]): *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*, v.1, Oxford.

-
- (2003b): *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*, v.2, Oxford.
- (2003c): "The Indian Campaigns, 327-325 BC", in J. ROISMAN (ed.): *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great*, Leiden: 159-168.
- BOUDON-MILLOT, V. (2005): "Art, Science and Conjecture, from Hippocrates to Plato and Aristotle", in P. VAN DER EIJK (ed.): *Hippocrates in Context. Papers read at the XIth International Hippocrates Colloquium. University of Newcastle Upon Tyne 27-31 August 2002*, Leiden: 87-99.
- CARLIER, P. (2000): "Homeric and Macedonian Kingship", in R. BROCK – S. HODKINSON (eds): *Alternatives to Athens*, Oxford: 259-268.
- CARNEY, E. (2006): *Olympia, the mother of Alexander*, London
- (2007): "Symposia and the Macedonian Elite: The Unmixed Life", *Syllecta Classica* 18: 129-180.
- COHEN, A. (1995): "Alexander and Achilles – Macedonians and Mycenaeans", in J. B. CARTER – S. P. MORRIS (ed.): *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule*, Austin: 483-505.
- DEMONT, P. (1983), "Notes sur le récit de la peste athénienne chez Thucydide et sur ses rapports avec la médecine grecque de l'époque classique", in F. LASSERRE (ed.): *Formes de pensée dans la Collection hippocratique. Actes du IVe colloque international hippocratique, Lausanne, 21-26 septembre 1981*, Genève, 341-353.
- (2013): "The Causes of the Athenian Plague and Thucydides", in A. TSAKMAKIS – A. AMIOLAKI (eds.): *Thucydides between History and Literature*, Berlin: 73-90.
- DUECK, D. (2012): *Geography in Classical Antiquity*, Cambridge.
- ENGELS, D. W. (1978): *Alexander the Great and the Logistics of the Macedonian Army*, Berkeley-Los Angeles.
- ETIENNE, R. (2002): "La macédoine entre Orient et Occident: essai sur l'identité macédonienne au IVe siècle av. J. C.", in C. MÜLLER – F. PROST (coord.): *Identités et cultures dans le monde méditerranéen antique*, Paris: 253-275.
- FAURE, P. (1982): *La vie quotidienne des armées d'Alexandre*, Paris.
- FLOWER, M. A. (2008): *The Seer in Ancient Greece*, Berkeley-Los Angeles.
- FRICHER, B. (1982): *The Sculpted World: Epicureanism and Philosophical Recruitment in Ancient Greece*, Berkeley.
- FULLER, J. F. C. (1958): *The Generalship of Alexander the Great*, London.
- GABALDÓN, M. M. (2004): *Ritos de armas en la Edad del hierro: armamento y lugares de culto en el Mediterráneo y el mundo celta*, Madrid.
- GABRIEL, R. A. (2007): *Soldiers' Lives Through History: The Ancient World*, Westport.
- GIL, L. (2004 [1969]): *Therapeia: la medicina popular en el mundo clásico*, Madrid.
- GREEN, P. (1974): *Alexander of Macedon*, London.
- HAMILTON, J. R. (1969): *Plutarch. Alexander. A Commentary*, Oxford.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L. (1993): *Sources for Alexander the Great. An analysis of Plutarch's Life and Arrian's Anabasis Alexandron*, Cambridge.
- HATZOPOULOS, M. B. (1996): *Macedonian Institutions under the kings*, Thessaloniki, II vols.
- HECKEL, W. (1981): "Two Doctors from Kos", *Mnemosyne* 34: 396-398.
- (2006): *Who's who in the Age of Alexander the Great. Prosopography of Alexander's Empire*, Oxford.
- HECKEL, W. – YARDLEY, J. C. (1997): *Justin. Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus, vol. I: Books 11-12, Alexander the Great*, Oxford.
- IERACIO, A. M. (1991): "Sulla concezione del medico pepaideuménos in Galeno en el tardoantico", in J. A. LÓPEZ FÉREZ (ed.), *Galeno: obra, pensamiento e*

- influencia (coloquio internacional celebrado en Madrid, 22-25 de Marzo de 1988)*, Madrid: 133-151.
- JAEGER, W. (2012 [1933]): *Paideia: los ideales de la cultura griega*, México.
- JOUANNA, J. (1984): “Rhétorique et Médecine dans la Collection Hippocratique. Contribution à l’Histoire de la Rhétorique au Ve Siècle”, *REG* 97: 26-44.
- (1988): “Notice”, in *Hippocrate. Des Vents-De l’Art*, Paris.
- (1999): *Hippocrates*, Baltimore.
- (2000 [1996]): “Hipócrates”, in J. BRUNSCHWIG – G. E. R. LLOYD (eds.): *El saber griego. Diccionario crítico*, Madrid: 510-517.
- (2006): “Famine et Pestilence dans l’Antiquité Grecque: un Jeu de Mots sur Limos/Loimos”, in J. JOUANNA – J. LECLANT – M. ZINK (eds.): *L’Homme Face aux Calamités Naturelles dans l’Antiquité et au Moyen Âge*, Paris: 197-219.
- (2012): “Air, Miasma and Contagion in the Time of Hippocrates and the Survival of Miasmas in Post-Hippocratic Medicine (Rufus of Ephesus, Galen and Palladius)”, in P. VAN DER EIJK (ed.): *Greek Medicine from Hippocrates to Galen. Selected Papers*, Leiden: 121-136.
- KOTARIDI, A. (2004): “The Symposium”, in D. PANDERMALIS (ed.): *Alexander the Great: Treasures from an Epic Era of Hellenism*, New York: 65-87.
- LASKARIS, J. (2005): “Error, loss, and change in the generation of therapies”, in P. VAN DER EIJK (ed.): *Hippocrates in Context. Papers read at the XIth International Hippocrates Colloquium. University of Newcastle Upon Tyne. 27-31 August 2002*, Leiden: 173-189.
- LE RIDER, G. (2003): *Alexandre le Grand. Monnaie, finances et politique*, Paris.
- LEE, J. W. I. (2008): *A Greek Army on the March. Soldiers and Survival in Xenophon’s Anabasis*, New York.
- LEMERLE, P. (1935): “Inscriptiones latines et grecques de Philippes (suite)”, *BCH* 59: 126-164.
- LLOYD, G. E. R. (2003): *In the Grip of Disease. Studies in the Greek Imagination*, New York.
- LONGRIGG, J. (1993): *Greek Rational Medicine. Philosophy and Medicine from Alcmaeon to the Alexandrians*, London.
- LONSDALE, D. J. (2007): *Alexander the Great. Lessons in Strategy*, Oxon.
- LÓPEZ FÉREZ, J. A. (1988): “Sobre los flatos como reflejo de la sofística en el *Corpus hippocraticum*”, *CFC* 21: 25-43.
- LUCHNER, K. (2004): *Philiatroi. Studien zum Thema der Krankheit in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit*, Göttingen.
- MARI, M. (2011): “Archaic and Early Classic Macedonia”, in R. LANE FOX (ed.): *Brill’s Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Leiden: 79-92.
- MARKLE, M. M. (1982): “Macedonian Arms and Tactics under Alexander the Great”, in B. BARR-SHARRAR – E. N. BORZA (eds.): *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*, Washington: 87-111.
- MAYOR, A. (2009): *Greek fire, poison arrows, and scorpion bombs: biological and chemical warfare in the ancient world*, London.
- MILES, R. D. (1976): “The Army of Alexander the Great”, in *Alexandre le Grand. Image et Réalité*, Genève: 87-137.
- MILLER, W. (transl.) (1914): *Xenophon: Cyropaedia*, London.
- MORENO, J. J. (2012): *Los orígenes del ejército de Filipo II y la falange macedonia*, Madrid, UNAM [PhD diss.].
- MURRAY, O. (1996): “Hellenistic Royal Symposia”, in P. BILDE *et al.* (eds.): *Aspects of Hellenistic Kingships*, Aarhus: 15-27.

- NISSEN, C. (2010): “Ἱατρεῖον et ἐργαστήριον, les noms des lieux d’exercice des médecins dans le monde grec”, *AC* 79: 117-135.
- NOVILLO-CORVALÁN, P. (2014): “Reinterpreting the wound of Philoctetes: A Case Study in Literature and Medicine”, in V. BATES – A. BLEALKELY – S. GOODMAN (eds.): *Medicine, Health and the Arts: Approaches to the Medical Humanities*, New York: 128-144.
- NUTTON, V. (2000): “Medical Thoughts on Urban Pollution”, in M. HOPE – E. MARSHALL (eds.): *Death and Disease in the Ancient City*, London: 65-73.
- (2004): *Ancient Medicine*, London.
- OLDFATHER, C. H. *et al.* (transl.) (1963): *Diodorus Siculus’ Library*, London.
- PERRIN, B. (transl.) (1919): *Plutarch: Lives, vol. VII: Demosthenes and Cicero, Alexander and Cesar*, London.
- PINAULT, J. R. (1992): *Hippocratic Lives and Legends*, Leiden.
- PRANDI, L. (1985): *Callistene. Uno storico tra Aristotele e i re macedoni*, Milano.
- PRITCHETT, W. K. (1971): *The Greek State at War. Part I*, Berkeley.
- (1999): *The Greek State at War. Part V*, Berkeley.
- RACKHAM, H. (transl.) (1944): *Aristotle: Politics*, London.
- ROBSON, E. I. (transl.) (1933): *Arrian: Anabasis of Alexander*, London.
- RODRÍGUEZ ALFAGEME, I. (1997): “Retórica, comedia y medicina: sobre Ar. Ran. 940-947”, in A. LÓPEZ EIRE (ed.): *Sociedad, política y literatura: comedia griega antigua. Actas del I Congreso Internacional (Salamanca 1996)*, Salamanca: 151-172.
- ROLFE, J. C. (transl.) (1946): *Quintus Curtius: History of Alexander*, London.
- ROMM, J. S. (1989): “Aristotle’s Elephants and the Myth of Alexander’s Scientific Patronage”, *AJPh* 110: 566-575.
- SALAZAR, C. F. (2000): *The Treatment of War Wounds in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*, Leiden.
- (2013): “Treating the sick and wounded”, in B. CAMPBELL – L. A. TRITLE (eds): *The Oxford Handbook of Warfare in the Classical World*, Oxford: 294-311.
- SCARBOROUGH, J. (1969): *Roman Medicine*, London.
- SCHACHERMEYR, F. (1973): *Alexander der Große. Das Problem seiner Persönlichkeit und seines Wirkens*, Vienna.
- SEKUNDA, N. (2010): “The Macedonian Army”, in J. ROISMAN – I. WORTHINGTON (eds.): *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Oxford: 446-471.
- SIERRA, C. (2012a): “Reflexiones sobre Atenas, la Peste y Tucídides”, *Euphrosyne* 40: 283-295.
- (2012b): “Lecciones de mecánica de fluidos en el tratado hipocrático *Sobre los flatos*”, *Epos* 28: 13-24.
- (2012c): “Notas sobre medicina y difusión de ideas en la Grecia clásica”, *CFC(g)* 22: 91-101.
- (2012d): “Diferentes pueblos, diferentes cuerpos: algunos ejemplos en las fuentes históricas”, *Habis* 43: 47-62.
- SMITH, R. R. (1993): “Kings and Philosophers”, in A. BULLOCH *et al.* (eds): *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley: 202-212.
- STRAUSS, B. S. (2003): *Alexander: The Military Campaign*, in J. ROISMAN (ed.): *Brill’s Companion to Alexander the Great*, Leiden: 133-157.
- THIVEL, A. (1981): *Cnide et Cos? Essai sur les doctrines médicales dans la collection hippocratique*, Paris.
- TOMLISON, R. A. (1970): “Ancient Macedonian Symposia”, in *Ancient Macedonia* 1, Thessaloniki: 308-315.

- VAN DER EIJK, P. (1991): “*Airs, Waters, Places and On the Sacred Disease: Two Different Religiosities?*”, *Hermes* 119.2: 168-176.
- VERGÉS, J. (1951): *Q. Curcio Rufo. Historia de Alejandro Magno, libros III y IV. Edición y Comentario*, Barcelona.
- WARDLE, K. A. – WARDLE, D. – WARDLE, N. M. H. (2003): “The Symposium in Macedonia: A Prehistoric Perspective”, *AEMTH* 15: 631-643.
- ZARAGOZÀ, C. – ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ, B. (2018): “El *symposio* de Alejandro”, *L’AC* [in print].

**Battling without Beards:
Synesius of Cyrene's *Calvitii encomium*,
Arrian's *Anabasis Alexandri* and the
Alexander discourse of the fourth century AD.***

by Christian Thue Djurslev
Aarhus University
c.djurslev@ed.ac.uk

ABSTRACT This paper explores the literary tradition of the curious *chreia* that Alexander ordered his men to shave off their beards before battle. The story is represented by various sources from the imperial period but most prominently in the *Encomium of Baldness* by Synesius of Cyrene. The latter source posits that the story comes from the *History of Alexander* by Ptolemy, son of Lagus, but this claim cannot be true when Synesius' version is compared to other extant uses of the *chreia*. This paper exemplifies some of Synesius' methods of working, arguing that we need to invest more energy in appreciating the wider tradition of Alexander in late antiquity to understand our earlier texts.

KEYWORDS Alexander; Ptolemy I; Arrian; Synesius of Cyrene; Dio Chrysostom; Julius Africanus; *chreia*; literary tradition; Late Antiquity; early Christian literature.

“It seems unavoidable that the reputation
of Arrian and his Alexander history was
undiminished in the fourth century.”
BOSWORTH (1980, i, 38)

When reflecting upon the grand career of Brian Bosworth, his historical commentary on Arrian's *Anabasis Alexandri* is inescapable. Though still incomplete, he began the projected three-volume work more than a generation ago, and it will stand as an authoritative tool for all future scholars of Alexander. In the first volume, from which the epigraph is taken, he offers an extensive introduction to Arrian's authorship. It is an intellectual biography, stressing how Arrian represented himself as an authoritative writer of the history of Alexander and how he was read in antiquity and beyond. One of Photius's favourites, Bosworth notes, the Hadrianic Arrian is praised for his literary style and placed higher than most of the Classical historians he was trying to imitate¹.

* I am honoured to be celebrating Brian Bosworth in this first journal issue of *Karanos*. Though with regret I have never had the pleasure of meeting the man himself, I have benefitted immensely from his scholarship. I hope that this paper might have amused him.

¹ Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 92. Cf. BOSWORTH 1980, i, 34.

In the commentary Bosworth is, however, concerned with the actual fragments of Arrian in other texts, as well as the medieval manuscript tradition of the *Anabasis*, and not so much the *Nachleben* of Arrian in Late Antiquity more broadly. For instance, the line quoted above refers primarily to the use of Arrian in the anonymous *Itinerary of Alexander* (*Itinerarium Alexandri*), a Latin work dedicated to the Roman emperor Constantius II (c. AD 340). But Bosworth does not discuss many other texts of the fourth century that interact more subtly with Arrian. To explore this area of his literary fame in this century more fully, I will discuss an intriguing Alexander vignette in Synesius of Cyrene's *Encomium of Baldness* (*Calvitii encomium*)².

For thinking about literary reputation, the two prefaces in Arrian's *Anabasis* are particularly pertinent, especially the so-called "Second Preface" (1.12)³. Making an allusion to the famous remark Alexander made at Troy—namely, that Achilles should consider himself happy that he had had Homer as a herald—Arrian claims that he is going to be for Alexander what Homer had been for Achilles. The Trojan *chreia* was used in a variety of ways by previous authors but, of the extant testimonies, Arrian is the first to deploy it to proclaim his own fame⁴. Bosworth devotes less attention to the "first" preface—in which Arrian establishes his principal sources, Aristobulus and Ptolemy—because he has addressed this complex relationship in the introduction.

He notes in passing that Arrian's famous assertion of Ptolemy's trustworthiness, that he was a king and could not, therefore, lie, is also made by Synesius. The latter was a well-travelled sophist based in the Pentapolis area of Libya and a student of the famous female Neo-Platonic philosopher, Hypatia of Alexandria⁵. Both Arrian and Synesius insist on the royal authority of King Ptolemy. But what follows in Synesius' account could not be further from the historical work of Arrian. It is a fascinating tale with the premise that Alexander only won his battles against Persia because his soldiers were beardless. Before delving into the implications of this strange story, we turn first to the context of the speech and its author; then we move on to the tale itself and its subtle interaction with Arrian and other Alexander discourse; and, finally, we make some general observations on Arrian's repute that refine Bosworth's remark.

I. SYNESIUS' CAREER AND THE CALVITII ENCOMIUM

Born of an aristocratic Christian family in Cyrene in the early 370s, Synesius received a thorough education beyond the stage of a grammarian at Alexandria. He briefly travelled to Greece around the late 390s and to Constantinople as an emissary to the emperor Arcadius in 399. Here he proved his worth as an orator and political thinker by arguing a case of tax remission and being invited to deliver a speech on kingship. Returning to North Africa after some years, he came into ever closer contact with leading members of the church, Theophilus the Patriarch of Alexandria in particular, and he became more involved with the political affairs of the principal North African

² For the complex scholarly debate regarding the date of this speech, c. 396/7, see the introduction to the text in LACOMBRADÉ 1978-2008, iv, 1-10.

³ ANDERSON 1980; STADTER 1981; MOLES 1985; TONNET 1988, 69-84; MARINCOLA 1989; GARY 1990; SISTI 2002; HIDBER 2004; BOSWORTH 2007, 447; TÓTH 2009; BORGEAUD 2010; RODRÍGUEZ HORRILLO 2011.

⁴ See e.g. Cic. *Arch.* 10.24; Arr. *An.* 1.12.1-5; Plu. *Alex.* 15.9; Ps.-Callisth. 1.42.9-12 KROLL; SHA Probus 1.1-2; Jul. *Or.* 8.250d; Them. *Or.* 19.339 SCHENKL *et al.*; Jerome *Life of Hilarion* prologue. For the innumerable medieval versions of this popular saying, see CARY 1956, 108 n. 31.

⁵ Ptolemy BNJ 136 F 11 HOWE from Synesius of Cyrene *Enc. Calv.* §§ 15-6.

cities. Although he hesitated to take up the episcopal seat of busy Ptolemais because of his philosophical convictions, his family and his preference for the quiet life of the countryside, he eventually accepted the position and spent the rest of his life presiding over the See until he died sometime after 413⁶.

He was a prolific author, and his writings range between “pagan” classicising orations, such as the *De Regno* given before emperor Arcadius, and Christian productions, such as the beautiful hymn, ‘Lord Jesus, think on me’, which is in the English hymnal and sung during the season of Lent. But it is difficult to say anything with great confidence about the nature and chronology of these texts, except the speech delivered before the emperor, because of a general lack of actual context for the pieces delivered. Many orations were epideictic pieces, rhetorical show-orations that displayed the artistic skills of Synesius, and could have been performed anywhere in the cities he visited. They were presumably delivered on the spur of the moment, an unprepared speech on a particular topic, embellished with sophisticated allusions to the standardised literary *topoi* of the Greek and Roman worlds. For a familiar example, one may think of Plutarch’s two-part oration *De Alexandri Magni fortuna aut virtute* (326d-345b), timed orations that were improvised in front of audience and performed to display Plutarch’s rhetorical talents⁷. In such a performance, Synesius would not pause to think or reconsider what he said, but there was probably an opportunity to edit his piece before he published it, which he himself suggests towards the end of the *Encomium* (§ 24).

One of Synesius’ favourite founts of inspiration was Dio Chrysostom of Prusa, the celebrated Greek orator, who flourished under Nerva and Trajan. Arrian was very young when Dio was in his prime as a highly distinguished sophist. Synesius represents Dio as a cynic philosopher in a short treatise with the terse title *Dio*. In this work, Synesius defends Dio against the accusations of the third-century sophist Philostratus, who contrasts Dio’s sophistry unfavourably with the “true” philosophy of Apollonius of Tyana. In Synesius’ text, by contrast, Dio’s ascetic and contemplative life is projected as an ideal model for imitation in terms of artful oratory and philosophical devotion. This outspoken respect for Dio is maintained elsewhere in Synesius’ *oeuvre*, but especially in the *Encomium of Baldness*, in which the underpinning argument is constantly engaging with Dio’s lost *Praise of Hair* (*Encomium comae*). Indeed, we can piece together some of the contents of Dio’s speech from Synesius’ engaging response to it.

A short summary of Synesius’ tongue-in-cheek argument against Dio until the point of the Alexander anecdote will give an impression of the contents in both orations. Adorned with allusions to the Homeric epics, Greek history and Platonic philosophy, Synesius’ preface describes how miserable he once was that his hair was falling out since everyone considered long hair beautiful (§ 1). Slowly growing accustomed to baldness, he began to believe that Dio was deliberately misrepresenting hairy heads in too elaborate terms (§ 2) and composed a more rustic response, taunted by the rhetorical flair of Dio’s essay, part of which Synesius professes to reproduce (§ 3). He proceeds to give “factual evidence” that being bald is better than being shaggy: in the animal kingdom, hairless creatures are more noble than hairy ones, sheep being the dumbest

⁶ The following biography is based on Calvacanti in the *EAC* 3, 680-2. Cf. *BNP* s.v. Synesius (J. RIST); CAMERON – LONG 1993, 13-70. LANE FOX 2015, 574 reviews some of the central contributions to the scholarship on Synesius and provides essential bibliographical references for what he calls the ‘uninitiated’.

⁷ For these special declamations, see CAMMAROTA 1998; PRANDI 2000; ASIRVATHAM 2005 (fundamental); DJURSLEV 2010, 1-2.

of all (§ 5); the heads of the sharpest philosophers were without hair, since hair could prevent the divine above from reaching the head, like a shell covering a nut (§§ 6-7); the spherical shape of the head when it is bald is a divine form (§ 8); the descriptions of hairy gods are not in accordance with the truth (§ 9); the Egyptians say that hair-like stars are evil omens (§ 10); the shining skin of a bare head lights up in darkness (§ 11); the physical health of bald people is better because the god of health, Asclepius, has no hair (§ 12); the skulls of bald men are stronger, a contention illustrated with historical examples from Herodotus and a digression on the Scythians (§ 13); the idea that hair is more beautiful than baldness, as Dio insists, is not the opinion of everyone (§ 14); and Dio's praise for the well-combed long-haired Spartans in the battle of Thermopylae is an empty eulogy because they suffered a devastating defeat (§ 15).

The ironic tone should be fairly evident from this outline. Helmut Seng has recently shed light on this neglected aspect of an underrated text in the corpus, focussing on the brilliant ways in which Synesius exposes Dio's sophistic arguments by making equally convoluted arguments to counter them⁸. It is in the train of such comic arguments, which are all parodies of vignettes of Greek literature, that Synesius mentions that Dio has intentionally omitted the most glorious Greek battles against the Persians, namely those of Alexander (§§ 15-6), because the Macedonians fought them clean-shaven. Indeed, Synesius makes a further claim that the Macedonians only won the war because of a strategic shave during the final battle against Darius III, which he locates in Arbela (a small hamlet in northern Iraq). He states that he has learned this fact from the *History of Alexander* by Ptolemy, son of Lagus, who had been an eye-witness and was later a king, which is why it would have been shameful for Ptolemy to lie. On this royal authority, Synesius proceeds to give a vivid account of the battle⁹. He relates how a Persian soldier threw away his light weapons, seized a Macedonian by the beard, slid under his opponent, made him fall down and finished the fallen Macedonian with his dagger. Other Persians noticed this impressive feat and began chasing their bearded enemies all across the plain. Because of this, the Macedonian army suffered heavy losses since they did not possess the right armour. Synesius explains that the soldiers were outfitted in heavy armour and styled with their beards, making them ineffective against the lighter, unencumbered Persians. Then he notes that it was in this critical moment that Alexander sounded the retreat to avoid defeat in what he refers to as the 'Battle of Hair', *trichomachia*. The king went on to unleash the barbers on the army; once the soldiers were beardless, they resumed the fighting. Since it was no longer possible for the Persians to hold on, so to speak, the Macedonians secured the already divinely devised victory—it had been prophesied that the Heraclids would defeat the Achaemenids—because of their arms, armour and shaved chins.

This entertaining tale falls into two distinct parts: (1) the historicising details of Ptolemy the author and the geographical location, which we are told just after Synesius has spoken of the Spartan defeat; (2) the narrative of the action, which is printed as a separate paragraph in the Budé edition. The former is traditionally viewed as a fragment of Ptolemy or a subtle echo of Arrian, as already said, whereas the latter is taken to be an elaboration of an anecdote also attested in Plutarch and Polyaeus. In the following two sections, I will treat both of these ideas as the result of asking the wrong questions of Synesius' Alexander digression. I believe that we should consider this extraordinary story within its sophistic performance context, namely as an impromptu speech. Understood in this alternative context, the features of the story become much more

⁸ SENG 2012. Cf. LANE FOX 2015, 81.

⁹ The following summary salutes that of PEARSON 1960, 189.

apparent: through speaking from memory, Synesius weaves together multiple established Alexander traditions to bestow authority upon the most powerful narrative that will support his case against Dio's *Encomium of Hair*. He is not concerned with historical precision or quoting specific authors, but uses the tools from the rhetorical toolbox of Graeco-Roman historical writing to create a compelling argument and, above all, to engage his listeners/readers.

II. PTOLEMY OR ARRIAN?

Bosworth observed in passing that Arrian's famous verdict on Ptolemy's reliability is echoed in this passage, which was also noticed by Lionel Pearson and subsequent scholarship¹⁰. Even though neither scholar believed that Synesius consulted Ptolemy first hand, they were unable to prove it. Indeed, on the same page, Pearson suggests that 'Synesius may have found the story attributed to Ptolemy by some writer who preferred to give an "authority" for his stories, to satisfy his readers' pedantic tastes', although the origin of the source is in Pearson's view, 'hardly a matter of great importance'. In other traditions of modern scholarship, Synesius' reference to Ptolemy is accepted as a genuine fragment of Ptolemy's *History* (BNJ 138 F 11 Howe), despite some reservations¹¹.

Besides the above objection that Synesius did not consult sources while he was speaking, the geographical detail also indicates that he was not following Ptolemy or Arrian word for word. Arrian gives a longer discussion of the geography of the area of the battle of Arbela, saying that it was actually fought at Gaugamela, a plain some distance from the hamlet of Arbela. He records this piece of information on the authority of his primary sources, Aristobulus of Cassandreia and Ptolemy¹². This point about Gaugamela is also made briefly in Plutarch's famous Alexander biography¹³. These four sources insist that Gaugamela was the location for the battle, an opinion which is different from the majority of the evidence from other ancient testimonies¹⁴, as Plutarch states in the same passage. Given Synesius' claim to follow Ptolemy, it is extremely problematic that he actually posits that the location of the battle is Arbela rather than Gaugamela, even if Arrian does briefly revert back to the familiar form of Arbela. But he does so only to disapprove of it, and *his* reversal does not of course mean that Ptolemy would necessarily have done the same. Indeed, Plutarch's passing remark to Gaugamela suggests otherwise.

To dismiss the tale as non-Ptolemaic or Arrianic not solely on this basis would be imprudent, as there are other features of the story that need to be investigated: the

¹⁰ BOSWORTH 1980, 43. Cf. PEARSON 1960, 189.

¹¹ See JACOBY *Commentary* on Ptolemy *FGH* 138 F 11 (p. 504) with DEMANDT 2009, 18. The arguments go back to ROHDE 1883. Cf. the short commentary on Synesius and Ptolemy by LAMOUREUX – AUJOLAT in the French Budé edition of the text: LACOMBRADÉ 1978-2008, iii, 75-7. Howe's new *BNJ* commentary *ad loc.* accepts the fragment as genuine after some discussion.

¹² Arr. *An.* 6.11.4-6 incorporating Aristobulus *BNJ* 139 F 16 POWNALL and Ptolemy *BNJ* 138 F 10 HOWE. Cf. Arr. *An.* 3.8.7.

¹³ Plu. *Alex.* 31.6.

¹⁴ For the battle fought at Arbela, see e.g. Callisthenes *FGH* 124 F 14a from Str. 17.1.43; Str. 16.1.3-4; D.S. 17.53.4, 17.61.3-63.1; Plin. *HN* 2.180; Fron. *Str.* 2.3.19; Curt. 5.1.2-3, 6.1.2, 9.2.23; Polyæn. 4.3.6, 4.3.17; Ael. *VH* 3.23; *Chronicon Oxyrhynchi* *FGH* 255 F 2b; D.C. 68.26.4; Amp. § 16.2 ARNAUD – LINDET; Lib. *Or.* 18.260; Zos. 1.4.3. The Arbela location is also the standard one in the rhetorical handbooks, see Alexander Numentius *De Figuris* p. 35 SPENGEL.

shaved beards and the tradition of this particular saying, *chreia*, that other scholars have drawn attention to, and to which we turn next.

III. THE *CHREIA* TRADITION

Despite the fact that Pearson considered the sources for Synesius generally unimportant, he still drew attention to two possible sources for the sophist's use of the *chreia*¹⁵. Plutarch relates this story twice: once in the *Life of Theseus* where he relates how Theseus made the Athenians cut their hair for religious and martial reasons; and another reference is made again in his collection of sayings attributed to Alexander, which is a part of the, perhaps spurious, essay *The Sayings of Kings and Commanders* (172b-208a). The second-century AD Macedonian Polyaeus places the *chreia* at the important second position in his handbook on military strategy. In other words, shaving strategically *before* battle is the *second* lesson to be learned about Alexander's general success in warfare. Pearson is right in thinking that these attestations could have inspired Synesius in his wide reading, but there is, I believe, a more likely candidate, which Pearson and those after him, including Bosworth, have not noticed.

The Christian apologist, librarian and intellectual Sextus Julius Africanus compiled a miscellany entitled *Embroideries (kestoi)*, in the early third century. This eclectic genre of alternative histories and strange minutiae arranged together in no apparent order was hugely popular with Christians and pagans alike. For instance, we possess similar works by Aelian, Ptolemy Chennos and Clement of Alexandria. In this age of compilation, Africanus' work is not unusual, nor is it the most distinguished. It survives only in some lengthy fragments. Although they have been collected and published before, there is now a very accessible and erudite volume available in the new series of *die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte (GCS NF)*¹⁶.

In the pertinent fragment, no. 12, the longest surviving fragment of the text, the author attempts to explain why the Romans could conquer the Macedonians (148 BC at Pydna) and Greeks (146 BC at Corinth), but *not* the contemporary Sassanid 'Persian' power in the Severan age (AD 230s), even though the Persians had been previously defeated by the Greeks and Macedonians under Alexander. Ignoring the fact that Alexander fought more than 500 years previously, his argument thus links Greeks, Romans, Macedonians and Persians in a historical sequence that makes the past relevant for the Roman present. He argues that the armament of Greeks and Macedonians enabled them to be very effective against light-armoured Persians, but not against the heavy-armoured Romans. Conversely, Roman military gear was not effective against the agile Persians. He concludes by suggesting that the Romans could wear a combination of Greek and Roman gear to defeat the contemporary 'Persians'.¹⁷ In this optimised military context, Africanus says of Alexander:

“They assign this use and practise to the soldier king. For Alexander himself was the one who ordered his soldiers to shave off their beards. When someone protested that he was cutting off his facial adornment, he replied, ‘do you not

¹⁵ Plu. *Moralia* 180b (no. 10), *Thes.* 5.4; Polyaeus. 4.3.2.

¹⁶ The older, but very worthy standard edition of VIEILLEFOND 1970, must have been available to Bosworth.

¹⁷ Similar advice on how to defeat Persia was sought by Trajan and supplied by Aelian Tacticus' *Tactica*. His focus is more on tactics than armour, but the Macedonian strategies are the prime example in every category.

know, ignorant civilian, that in battle there is nothing easier to grab hold off than a beard?' Therefore, face to face with such equipment, no barbarian would be able to stand firm, however he should have been fitted out'.
(Julius Africanus, *Miscellany* F 12.1. *GCS NF* 18.39)¹⁸.

This version distinguishes itself from previous versions in the following ways:

— In Plutarch, the protester is not an unknown soldier but the general Parmenio, whose tenure in the Macedonian army began during the reign of Alexander's father, Philip II. The setting is the eve of an unspecified but major battle at which Alexander calls for a war-council with his generals. Victor Alonso Troncoso has recently situated Plutarch's version of the *chreia* in the context of the disputes between Alexander's men (Ptolemy, Seleucus, Hephaistion, Craterus) who imitated the king's beardless chin and those of Philip's old guard (Parmenio, Antipater) who did not¹⁹. Polyaeus also refers to Alexander's address to the generals, but this context has fallen out of Julius Africanus and Synesius.

— Whereas Plutarch and Polyaeus place no emphasis on armour at all, Julius Africanus and Synesius share the strong interest in the heavy equipment of the Macedonians and the light-armoured Persians. In fact, both authors make a very similar assessment of the weight of the Macedonian armour and the fact that the Persians could easily pull the Macedonian men down if they grabbed the beard. Synesius also echoes the idea of Julius Africanus that the Persians could no longer stand firm against the Macedonians once the facial hair had been sheared. But the aims of the Alexander digressions in both texts are different: Julius Africanus was interested in the technicalities of Macedonian armour prompted by the problematic situation in contemporary politics; Synesius used these technical details to confer authority upon his story, aiming to repudiate Dio. He elaborates on what is to his own advantage.

Given the striking similarity between Julius Africanus and Synesius, I cannot accept the scholarly view that Plutarch or Polyaeus were the only influences. There is an obvious link between Julius Africanus and Synesius in that they were both North African Christians, who spent much time Alexandria for different purposes. In that city, both writers would have had access to a wealth of Alexander-related material of which we have little to no knowledge. One can only wonder if Ptolemy could be proven to be the actual source for Julius Africanus' argument about the armament. A digression on armour and a stratagem to reflect Alexander's intelligence would perhaps suit the context of Ptolemy's *History of Alexander* very well, if we are still right in thinking that Ptolemy generally emphasised military activities and Alexander's virtuous behaviour²⁰. Presumably, the great library of Alexandria, or associated North African libraries, would have retained a copy of the work of its founder (or its founder's father), for as long as it survived in some form. If Ptolemy could be proved to be a genuine source of Julius Africanus, Pearson's explicit lack of interest in the sources for the *chreia* would be somewhat ironic, given the fact that his principal interest was Ptolemy himself as an author and a primary source of Alexander history.

¹⁸ For the whole digression, see Julius Africanus *Miscellany* F 12.1 (*GCS NF* 18.35-41).

¹⁹ ALONSO TRONCOSO 2010, 21.

²⁰ PEARSON 1960; ROISMAN 1984.

I am, however, sceptical of such a position. Julius Africanus does not commit to a source and could have altered or elaborated on the existing *chreia* tradition that we know from Polyaeus and Plutarch who do not have them on any explicit authority. Because a text is available at a library does not mean someone would consult it or that it was the only option for that particular piece of information. Julius Africanus may also have wanted to make some alterations. He had an argument to make. As for Synesius, I believe the same thing applies: making a passing non-committal reference to a Ptolemaic author is not the same as following Ptolemy's *History of Alexander* as a principal source in the way Arrian does. Arrian is committed to Ptolemy throughout the whole of the *Anabasis*, whereas Synesius does the name-dropping before he tells a story that Arrian (who used Ptolemy) did not know. For comparison, when Ennodius, the fifth-century bishop of Pavia in North Italy, says that Alexander wished only for the poetaster Choerilus to write his praise²¹, he is surely not engaging with the original Greek poem of Choerilus himself, but playing on a verdict passed on the poet by Horace, whose works were widely read in the urban schools²².

Another point against seeing Synesius' tale as following tradition mindlessly is the setting of the battle. We have noted the geographic location, but there is also the obvious fact that Alexander did not know about shaving strategically *until* he had fought the Persians. He did not order his men to do it *before* the battle, as he does in every other attested *chreia*. This detail is a new twist.

On the basis of this discussion, I would not consider the story, as it is told in Synesius' text, a fragment of Ptolemy's *History of Alexander*. Given the performance context of Synesius' speech, my contention is that he was not engaging with one single specific source in any direct way. He uses material selectively from several sources, as he composes the story on the fly. Indeed, in all the previous chapters of the *Encomium of Baldness*, he deploys multiple authors or literary *topoi* at the same time. Memorising and combining them rapidly was no hindrance. To prove that Synesius used Ptolemy in any direct way is ultimately much more difficult than arguing that his Alexander anecdote was grounded in a contemporary context of allusive rhetoric and performance culture. Yet, it does raise questions about Synesius' presumed reference to Arrian.

IV. UNDIMINISHED FAME?

Synesius did not pay any special respect to Arrian. Even if he passes the same verdict on the trustworthiness of King Ptolemy, he does not grant Arrian explicit mention or pride of place. Indeed, he has not used Arrian for anything else in the digression. He did not have any author in front of him as he was speaking, as we do when we are attempting to check references. He juxtaposes material from memory, as he saw fit with the aim to repudiate Dio's argument in the *Praise of Hair*. I believe that we need to give Synesius due credit for composing this tale and avoid the pitfall of believing that he engaged exclusively with one particular author. We need to appreciate these orators on their own terms and in their own contexts.

I contend that we still require a more complete view of Arrian's reception. It is certainly misleading to consult Antoon Roos' survey of manuscripts and late antique

²¹ Ennodius of Pavia *Panegyricus Regi Theodorico* § 17 (CSEL 6.282-3).

²² Pace DEMANDT 2009, 2. For Choerilus of Iasus, see HECKEL 2006, s.v. 'Choerilus'. For the verdict in Horace, see *Letters* 2.1.232-44.

references to Arrian, as Bosworth has done²³, because it does not take into consideration that the vast majority of the fourth-century texts echo Arrian allusively and, therefore, are not included in that survey. For instance, the greatest late antique historiographical tradition that began in the fourth century, the Christian chronicle, does not build on Arrian in any way²⁴. As for the strange *Itinerarium Alexandri* that Bosworth discusses in some detail, it is also evident that the author has incorporated Arrian's work into a longer narrative, which is as much based on Arrian as it is on alternative Alexander traditions, such as the Greek *Alexander Romance*²⁵. The late antique was, however, not able to prioritise between texts in the rich tradition available to him. It is telling that Bosworth could only find references to Arrian in this text and a passing mention in the orations of the court rhetorician Themistius. This pattern indicates to me seems that Arrian had not yet established himself as the principal witness to the purest "Alexander Gospel".

Instead I would consider Photius' praise for Arrian a product of the ninth-century Byzantine tradition rather than apply his words to the fourth century. There are probably excellent reasons why the Greek early medieval intellectuals held Arrian in high esteem, why the manuscript tradition for Arrian is so good in comparison to others, and why his work became the preferred source of Alexander history from the European Enlightenment onwards²⁶, but they are not to be found in the fourth century. I hope that further research into the Alexander discourse of this period and other periods will help to shed light on the interest in Alexander across the divides of literary genres, languages, geography and religion²⁷.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>BNJ</i>	<i>Brill's New Jacoby</i> . Leiden.
<i>BNP</i>	<i>Brill's New Pauly</i> . Leiden.
<i>CSEL</i>	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i> . Salzburg.
<i>EAC</i>	Di Berardino <i>et al.</i> 2014.
<i>GCS NF</i>	<i>Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte</i> . Neue Folge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALONSO TRONCOSO, V. (2010): "The bearded king and the beardless hero", in E. CARNEY – D. OGDEN (eds.): *Phillip II and Alexander the Great – Father and Son, Lives and Afterlives*, Oxford: 13-24.
- ANDERSON, G. 1980. "Arrian's *Anabasis Alexandri* and Lucian's *Historia*", *Historia* 29: 119-124.
- BOSWORTH, A. B. (1972): "Arrian's literary development", *CQ* 22: 163-185.
- (1980): *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*, 3 vols. Oxford.

²³ ROOS – WIRTH 2002, i, xxxvi-xli; ii, 315-20 (reprinted volumes).

²⁴ For these, see JOUANNO 2001.

²⁵ For other parallels between Arrian and the Greek *Alexander Romance*, see MCINERNEY 2007.

²⁶ One of the key conclusions in BRIANT 2012.

²⁷ There is a brief survey of the literature in KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 13 n. 5 with further bibliography.

- (2007): “Arrian, Alexander and the pursuit of glory”, in J. MARINCOLA (ed.): *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, 2 vols. Oxford: II, 447-53.
- BORGEAUD, P. (2010): “Trojan excursions: a recurrent ritual. From Xerxes to Julian”, *History of Religions* 49.4: 339-53.
- BRIANT, P. (2012): *Alexandre des Lumières – Fragments d’histoire européenne*, Gallimard.
- CAMMAROTA, M. R. (1998): *Plutarco. La fortuna o la virtù de Alessandro Magno*, Naples.
- CARY, G. (1956): *The Medieval Alexander*, Cambridge.
- DEMANDT, A. (2009): *Alexander der Grosse: Leben und Legende*, Munich.
- DI BERARDINO, A. et al. (eds.) (2014): *Encyclopedia of Ancient Christianity*, 3 vols. Downers Grove, IL.
- DJURSLEV, C. T. 2010. “Plutarch, *Om Alexanders held eller dygtighed*”, *AIGIS* 10.1 [http://goo.gl/wAenfB].
- GRAY, V. J. (1990): “The moral interpretation of the ‘second preface’ to Arrian’s *Anabasis*”, *JHS* 110: 180-6.
- HECKEL, W. (2006): *Who’s Who in the Age of Alexander the Great*, Oxford.
- HIDBER, T. (2004): “Arrian”, in I. DE JONG et al. (eds.): *Narrators, Narratees, and Narrative in Ancient Greek Literature*, Leiden: 165-74.
- JACOBY, F. et al. (eds.) (1923–): *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin–Stuttgart.
- JOUANNO, C. (2001): “L’image d’Alexandre le Conquérant chez les chroniqueurs byzantins”, *Kentron* 17.2: 93-106.
- KOULAKIOTIS, E. (2006): *Genese und Metamorphosen des Alexandermithos im Spiegel der griechischen nithistoriographischen Überlieferung bis zum 3. Jh. n. Chr.*, Konstanz.
- LACOMBRADÉ, C. et al. (1978-2008): *Synésios de Cyrène*, 5 vols., Paris.
- LANE FOX, R. (2015): *Augustine: Conversions and Confessions*, London.
- MCINERNEY, J. (2007): “Arrian and the Greek *Alexander Romance*”, *CW* 100. 4: 424-30.
- MARINCOLA, J. M. (1989): “Some suggestions on the proem and ‘second preface’ of Arrian’s *Anabasis*”, *JHS* 109: 186-9.
- MOLES, J. L. (1985): “The interpretation of the ‘Second Preface’ in Arrian’s *Anabasis*”, *JHS* 105: 162-8.
- PEARSON, L. (1960): *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great*, Philadelphia, PA.
- PRANDI, L. (2000): “L’Alessandro di Plutarco. Riflessioni su *De Al. Magn. Fort.* e su *Alex*”, in L. VAN DER STOCKT (ed.): *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch*, Leuven: 375-86.
- RODRÍGUEZ HORRILLO, M. Á. (2011): “El proemio a la ‘Anábasis’ de Arriano”, *AION* 33: 77-88.
- ROISMAN, J. (1984): “Ptolemy and his rivals in his *History of Alexander*”, *CQ* 34.2: 373-85.
- ROHDE, E. (1883): “Ein unbeachtetes Bruchstück des Ptolemaeus Lagi”, *RhM.* 38: 301-5.
- ROOS, A. G. – WIRTH, G. (2002): *Flavii Arriani quae exstant omnia*, 2 vols., Munich–Leipzig.
- SCHEPENS, G. (1971): “Arrian’s view of his task as Alexander-historian”, *AncSoc* 2: 254-268.

- SENG, H. (2012): “An den Haaren herbeigezogen. Sophistische Argumentation im *Encomium calvitii*”, in H. SENG – L. M. HOFFMANN (eds.): *Synesios von Kyrene: Politik, Literatur, Philosophie*, Turnhout: 125-43.
- SISTI, F. (2002): “La doppia prefazione dell’*Alexandri anabasis* di Arriano”, in E. LELLI: *Arma virumque: studi di poesia e storiografia in onore di Luca Canali*, Pisa: 41-44.
- STADTER, P. A. (1981): “Arrian’s extended preface”, *ICS* 6: 157-71.
- TONNET, H. (1988): *Recherches sur Arrian: Sa personnalité et ses écrits atticistes*, 2 vols., Amsterdam.
- TÓTH, I. (2009): “Notes on Arrian’s preface to the *Anabasis*”, *AAntHung* 49.4; 499-505.
- VIEILLEFOND, J.-R. (ed.) (1970): *Les “Cestes” de Julius Africanus. Étude sur l’ensemble des fragments avec édition, traduction et commentaires*, Florence.
- WALLRAFF, M. et al. (2012): *Iulius Africanus. Cesti: the Extant Fragments*, Berlin.

Icons, Images, Interpretations: Arrian, Lukian, their Relationship, and Alexander at the Kydnos*

by Sabine Müller
Philipps-Universität Marburg
sabine.mueller@uni-marburg.de

ABSTRACT Alexander was the most prominent Argead and one of the major figures in Second Sophistic literature. The Second Sophistic authors had their own respective images of Alexander, treatment of their sources, and intention to write about him. This paper aims at exploring Lucian's ironic response to the historiographical Alexander images in his time. It will be argued that by ridiculing the current Alexander images in Second Sophistic literature, particularly Arrian's Alexander, Lucian did not mean to make fun of the historical Alexander but of his reception and the bias and artifice involved.

KEYWORDS Historiography; Arrian; Lukian; Second Sophistic; Images of Alexander; Kydnos.

INTRODUCTION

In scholarship, the relationship of the satirist Lukian of Samosata (ca. 120-180 A.D.) to his contemporary writer Arrian from Nicomedia has always been a topic of concern and interest. There are speculations that they met during the years they spent in Athens¹. However, it is unclear whether they were in contact at all². Furthermore, the question of Lukian's opinion of Arrian, knowledge of his works, and possible ironical references to them is a matter of debate. Thereby, the suggestion predominates that Lukian knew Arrian's writings such as the *Periplus Ponti Euxini*, *Parthika* or *Anabasis Alexandrou* and reacted to them³, a view also shared by Brian Bosworth⁴.

However, there is no consensus regarding the nature of Lukian's reaction. On the one hand, it is presumed that Lukian was basically critical of Arrian for, in his eyes, Arrian exactly represented the type of self-confident intellectual priding himself with

* Being a tribute to the much-missed Brian Bosworth and his groundbreaking studies that influenced generations of scholars, this paper's subject touches upon one of Brian's special fields of interest, Arrian in a socio-cultural context.

¹ NISSEN 1888, 241, 243.

² ANDERSON 1980, 124; WIRTH 1964, 232.

³ Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 184; KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 184-185; MACLEOD 1987, 257; ANDERSON 1980; ANDERSON 1976, 27; WIRTH 1964, 231-234, 245.

⁴ Cf. BOSWORTH 1988b, 24.

his *paideia*, socio-political status, and benefactions for mankind. Lukian constantly made fun of them, unmasking them as superficial vainglorious hypocrites only interested in their political career, wealth, and social rank⁵. Hence, as Anderson puts it, there “is a strong case that Lucian did indeed ridicule Arrian along with the herd”⁶.

On the other hand, it is argued that Arrian was neither Lukian’s enemy nor his victim but his ideal historiographer⁷. According to this opinion, however, Lukian’s admiration for Arrian did not prevent him from making fun of the writer from Nicomedia integrating him into his “rogues’ gallery”⁸ of intellectuals of his times.

This paper aims at re-assessing Lukian’s literary relationship to Arrian. In this matter so far, the focus was on Lukian’s *Alexander the False Prophet*, *Dialogues of the Dead* in which Alexander appears, and *How to Write History*, mocking the shortcomings of contemporary historiographers writing about the Parthian war⁹. This paper aims at examining a work by Lukian that received less attention: *The Hall*. As the introduction starts with a reference to Alexander, namely his fatal encounter with the river Kydnos (also treated in Arrian’s *Anabasis*), it may be revealing with regard to Lukian’s relationship to Arrian. At least, as it is Lukian’s practice to consciously blur the evidence on his person and hide behind his literary *alter egos*¹⁰, it might cast a light upon his literary pose.

LUKIAN AND ARRIAN

Whatever Lukian’s personal opinion of Arrian might have been, whether or not they had ever met in person, the features of Arrian as a writer revealed in his works are in accordance with the major stock elements of Lukian’s mockery of the boastful, vainglorious intellectuals of his time.

In general, Lukian’s main theme is the relationship of truth and truthfulness with lies and hypocrisy¹¹. He deals with his central concern in different ways. Thus, he makes fun of certain types of hypocrites, frauds, pretenders, liars, impostors, in short, pseudo-

⁵ NISSEN 1888, 245-256; BALDWIN 1973, 30-33.

⁶ ANDERSON 1980, 124. Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 184.

⁷ Cf. BOSWORTH 1988b, 24.

⁸ MACLEOD 1987, 257. Cf. WIRTH 1964, 233-245.

⁹ The question whether Arrian (and his *Parthika*) was ridiculed along with the historiographers writing on the Parthian war (*Hist. Conscr.* 14-19) is a matter of debate. VIDAL-NAQUET 1984, 370 argues in favor of it. Cf. WIRTH 1964, 234-237, 240-241. *Contra*: STROBEL 1994, 1337; JONES 1986, 59. For an overview see MÜLLER 2014d, 125, n. 53; POROD 2013, 20-21. See also KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 183-184 (indecisive). In addition, it is debated whether the cited authors are real writers of Lukian’s time (POROD 2013, 191-196; BALDWIN 1973, 80-85), a blend of reality and fiction (ANDERSON 1994, 1434; HALL 1981, 316, 320) or ironic inventions reflecting certain types of historiographers and their shortcomings (cf. MÜLLER 2014d, 125; STROBEL 1994, 1334-1360; SCHMITT 1984, 451-455; HOMEYER 1965, 20-23; WIRTH 1964, 235). See also ZIMMERMANN 1999, 53 on the real dimension of Lukian’s irony. On the ironic dimension of *How to Write History* see OVERWIEN 2006, 194; RÜTTEN 1997, 36-37; GEORGIADOU – LARMOUR 1994, 1450-1482, 1484, 1505-1506 pointing at the connection to *Verae Historiae*. When Lukian states that the historiographer just has to adorn his material like Pheidias his statues (*Hist. Conscr.* 50-51), the irony is manifest.

¹⁰ Cf. BAUMBACH – VON MÖLLENDROFF 2017, 13; MÜLLER 2014b, 164; MÜLLER 2013a, 171-172; MÜLLER 2013b, 27, 32; BERDOZZO 2011, 213; SIDWELL 2010; ZWEIMÜLLER 2008, 209-210; WHITMARSH 2005, 82-83 (a web of playful Lukianisms).

¹¹ Cf. MÖLLER – MÜLLER 2016, 151; MÜLLER 2014b, 152; POROD 2013, 94; MÜLLER 2013b, 27-29, 35; BERDOZZO 2011, 194-195; PETSALIS-DIOMIDIS 2010, 55-56, 65; SCHLAPBACH 2010, 253; ZWEIMÜLLER 2008, 44-45, 130, 138; GUNDERSON 2007, 479, 482-483; KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 184; SWAIN 2007, 23; RÜTTEN 1997, 35-37.

authorities in different fields of social activity: education, philosophy, historiography and rhetoric, religion and cult, medicine, and politics¹². Mainly, these pseudo-authorities are stock characters embodying recognizable features characteristic of Lukian's times. Thus, there is an underlying real dimension casting light upon certain contemporary socio-cultural conditions. As Lukian refers to existing contemporary phenomena, necessarily, on the base of his irony and parody, there are real developments, problems, phenomena, grievances, and shortcomings of his time his audience could recognize. Arrian and the self-praise in his works was one of these current and characteristic phenomena.

Unmasking pseudo-authorities and their selfish striving for wealth, glory, reputation, or rank, Lukian reveals the harmfulness of such arrogated religious, intellectual or political leaders betraying the people by demonstrating their alleged superiority without possessing the inner qualities to be real moral, political or educative examples. Lukian shows that their *paideia* was either wrong, superficial, or faked. Instead of embodying the lessons of the true *paideia*, hence striving for abstract goods such as wisdom, maturity, inner balance while trying to improve the students and listeners morally by good teaching, the pseudo-authorities just care for themselves. Selfishly, they long for material goods, fame, wealth, and *dolce vita*.

In order to unveil their pretensions, Lukian often uses theatrical metaphors comparing them to tragic actors wearing their *habitus* of alleged authority and superiority like theatre masks and costumes¹³. For example, Lukian's pseudo-philosophers usually dress up as a sage by wearing an extremely long beard and very hairy brows meant to hide their real ambitions that are mostly in contradiction to the ideals of their philosophic schools¹⁴. Lukian's would-be orators want to be famous, rich, and admired, and try to catch the attention of their audience by their extravagant style, behaviour or hairsplitting syllogisms (rather than by the content of his words). The historiographers Lukian makes fun of compare themselves immodestly to "classical" literary authorities like Herodotos, Thukydides, and Xenophon¹⁵, indulge in name-dropping in order to show off their expertise, unscrupulously copy from classical works and (mis)use the famous ancient authors as testimonies to their claims, especially the most absurd¹⁶.

Of course, Lukian is not critical of the knowledge of the Greek "classics" as such. Certainly, he does not intend to diminish their literary rank and achievements. Thus, while in his *True Stories*, he ironically locates Herodotos at the Island of the Damned as a punishment for his lies¹⁷, he will have respected his work at the same time. Lukian criticizes the reception of these literary authorities in his time: the predominant use of them as indisputable testimonies of the sheer truth. He mocks the tendency of contemporary writers to accept everything these ancient authorities wrote as true without thinking twice and their practice of citing them as markers of truth in order to verify their own claims. Thus, Lukian is critical of a kind of misleading and misdirected reception of the Greek literary past: Instead of critically studying the works from the

¹² Cf. SWAIN 2007, 23: Lukian assaulted all who made any claim to intellectual merit, truth, or virtue.

¹³ F.e. Luk. *Ikarom.* 30; *Pisc.* 11, 31, 37, 41, 42; *DM* 10; *Nec.* 16. Cf. MÜLLER 2014b, 157; ZWEIMÜLLER 2008, 131-134, 138.

¹⁴ Beard/brows: f.e. Luk. *DM* 10.9; *Hist. Conscr.* 17. Cf. Porod 2013, 98. Hypocrisy: i.e. Luk. *Symp.* 11-47. Cf. MÜLLER 2013b, 32-34; SCHLABACH 2010, 253. HOPKINSON 2008, 9 argues that only the Cynics were exempted from his mockery but this was not the case. Cf. MÜLLER 2014b, 157-160.

¹⁵ Luk. *Hist. Conscr.* 2.

¹⁶ Cf. Luk. *Hist. Conscr.* 14-15.

¹⁷ Luk. *VH* II 31. Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 181; ANDERSON 1976, 68-69, 72-78 (he respected Herodotos); GEORGIADIOU – LARMOUR 1998, 21, 28.

past, learning from their knowledge *and* errors, Lukian's stock historiographer only treats them as factors of legitimization for his own claims. However, Lukian makes clear that even the heroes of the Greek literary past have to be viewed with critical eyes¹⁸.

Similarly, Lukian was surely not critical of the historical persons of philosophers such as Diogenes of Sinope or Sokrates at whose expense he also joked. Rather, he makes jokes about their reception reflecting the erroneous ways in which the "classical" philosophers served his contemporaries as justifications of their lifestyle. He points out that the contemporary pseudo-philosophers use their references to them as pretexts without having embodied their lessons. In order to reflect this phenomenon of misguided reception, for example, Lukian who knows Plato's works extremely well, consciously and blatantly misinterprets the lessons of Sokrates¹⁹. Lukian uses the past in order to point out shortcomings of the present²⁰. One factor of this critical use of the past was his ironic way of deliberately disappointing general expectations²¹.

Certainly, also the ironic treatment of iconic figures in the collective memory such as Alexander III of Macedon was no proof that Lukian was critical of the historical persons as such. Rather, he was critical of their reception, perception, and use by contemporary historiographers as symbols of their own status, reputation and literary skills²². Aiming at becoming famous by writing about them, such historiographers could be suspected to sacrifice the "historical truth" in favour of a colourful storyline or an idealized portrait of their protagonists.

Significantly, Arrian's "second preface" of his *Anabasis Alexandrou* reflects the phenomenon that historiographers tried to increase their symbolic capital by writing about iconic figures from the past. Explaining his reasons for writing the *Anabasis Alexandrou*, Arrian compares himself to Homer commemorating Achilles' deeds and emphasizes his devotion to *paideia* that made him the only one qualified to write the true history of Alexander:

καὶ εὐδαιμόνισεν ἄρα, ὡς λόγος, Ἀλέξανδρος Ἀχιλλέα, ὅτι Ὀμήρου κήρυκος ἐς τὴν ἔπειτα μνήμην ἔτυχε. καὶ μέντοι καὶ ἦν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ οὐχ ἥκιστα τοῦτου ἕνεκα εὐδαιμονιστέος Ἀχιλλεύς, ὅτι αὐτῷ γε Ἀλεξάνδρῳ, οὐ κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην ἐπιτυχίαν, τὸ χωρίον τοῦτο ἐκλιπὲς ξυνέβη οὐδὲ ἐξηνέχθη ἐς ἀνθρώπους τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργα ἐπαξίως (...) ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις ἄλλος εἰς ἀνὴρ τοσαῦτα ἢ τηλικαῦτα ἔργα κατὰ πλῆθος ἢ μέγεθος ἐν Ἑλλήσιν ἢ βαρβάροις ἀπεδείξατο. ἔνθεν καὶ αὐτὸς ὀρμηθῆναι φημι ἐς τήνδε τὴν ξυγγραφὴν, οὐκ ἀπαξιώσας ἑμαυτὸν φανερὰ καταστήσειν ἐς ἀνθρώπους τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργα. ὅστις δὲ ὦν ταῦτα ὑπὲρ ἑμαυτοῦ γινώσκω, τὸ μὲν ὄνομα οὐδὲν δέομαι ἀναγράψαι, οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ ἄγνωστον ἐς ἀνθρώπους ἐστίν, οὐδὲ πατρίδα ἣτις μοί ἐστιν οὐδὲ γένος τὸ ἐμόν, οὐδὲ εἰ δὴ τινα ἀρχὴν ἐν τῇ ἑμαυτοῦ ἥρξα: ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο ἀναγράψω, ὅτι ἐμοὶ πατρίς τε καὶ γένος καὶ ἀρχαὶ οἶδε οἱ λόγοι εἰσὶ τε καὶ ἀπὸ νέου ἔτι ἐγένοντο, καὶ ἐπὶ τῷδε οὐκ ἀπαξίω

¹⁸ Cf. HOPKINSON 2008, 8; BRACHT BRANHAM 1989, 214. See also MÜLLER 2014b, 29. Cf. KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 184: In Lukian's eyes, *mimesis* means the description of the truth, not the imitation of the works of the Greek literary heritage.

¹⁹ Cf. SCHLAPBACH 2010, 274. Sokrates seems to have been one of Lukian's real champions. On Plato's importance for Lukian see BERDOZZO 2011, 191, 202-203; BRACHT BRANHAM 1989, 67-80.

²⁰ Cf. GILHULY 2007, 67-68; RÜTTEN 1997, 42-44, 133; BRACHT BRANHAM 1989, 4; Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 189.

²¹ Cf. HOPKINSON 2008, 2-3; GILHULY 2007, 68; RÜTTEN 1997, 26-28; BRACHT BRANHAM 1989, 44, 149.

²² Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 188-189; GEORGIADOU – LARMOUR 1998, 2-3. On the iconic status of Alexander in Lukian's time see BURLIGA 2013, 79; BILLAULT 2010, 633-634; KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 179; WHITMARSH 2005, 66-68; STROBEL 1994, 1338.

ἐμαντὸν τῶν πρώτων ἐν τῇ φωνῇ τῇ Ἑλλάδι, εἶπερ οὖν καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις.

“Alexander, so the story goes, blessed Achilles for having Homer to proclaim his fame to posterity. Alexander might well have counted Achilles happy on this score, since, fortunate as Alexander was in other ways, there was a great gap left here, and Alexander’s exploits were never celebrated as they deserved (...) no other single man performed such remarkable deeds, whether in number or magnitude, among either Greeks or barbarians. That, I declare, is why I myself have embarked on this history, not judging myself unworthy to make Alexander’s deeds known to men. Whoever I may be, this I know in my favour; I need not write my name, for it is not at all unknown among men, nor my country nor my family nor any office I may have held in my own land; this I do set on paper, that country, family, and offices I find and have found from my youth in these tales. That is why I think myself not unworthy of the masters of Greek speech, since my subject Alexander was among the masters of warfare”²³.

Moles points out that Arrian’s wording concerning his background evokes the genealogic boast of the Homeric hero: Thus, he claimed “heroic” status and emphasized “the heroic nature of his attempt to write a history worthy” of Alexander: “Great deeds can only be properly commemorated by great literature”²⁴.

Perhaps, Lukian felt challenged by self-praise like that. When he wrote *Alexander or the False Prophet* about the success of a wicked fraud posing as an oracle founder²⁵, the otherwise not attested protagonist of the indeed existing cult seems to carry the name Alexander for a reason: in his introduction, Lukian echoed Arrian’s self-representation in the *Anabasis* claiming that he and Arrian both wrote biographies of criminals:

καὶ Ἀρριανὸς γὰρ ὁ τοῦ Ἐπικτήτου μαθητῆς, ἀνὴρ Ῥωμαίων ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις καὶ παιδείᾳ παρ’ ὅλον τὸν βίον συγγενόμενος, ὁμοίον τι παθὼν ἀπολογήσεται ἂν καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Τυλλορόβου γοῦν τοῦ ληστοῦ κάκεϊνος βίον ἀναγράψαι ἠξίωσεν. ἡμεῖς δὲ πολὺ ὠμότερου ληστοῦ μνήμην ποιησόμεθα, ὅσῳ μὴ ἐν ὕλαις καὶ ἐν ὄρεσιν, ἀλλ’ ἐν πόλεσιν οὗτος ἐλήστευεν, οὐ Μυσίαν μόνην οὐδὲ τὴν Ἰδὴν κατατρέχων οὐδὲ ὀλίγα τῆς Ἀσίας μέρη τὰ ἐρημότερα λεηλατῶν.

“Arrian, the disciple of Epiktetos, a Roman of the highest distinction, and a life-long devotee of letters, laid himself open to the same charge, and so can plead our cause as well as his own; he thought fit, you know, to record the life of Tilloboros, the brigand. In our case, however, we shall commemorate a far more savage brigand, since our hero plied his trade not in forests and mountains, but in cities, and instead of infesting just Mysia and Mount Ida and harrying a few of the more deserted districts of Asia, he filled the whole Roman Empire, I may say, with his brigandage”²⁶.

²³ Arr. *An.* 1.12.1-5. Transl. P. A. BRUNT. Cf. KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 179. On the “second preface”, see BURLIGA 2013, 106; MOLES 1985. On the devotion to *logoi* see MARINCOLA 1989, 187, 189: Arrian’s source-criticism is intended to suggest his superiority.

²⁴ MOLES 1985, 165, 167.

²⁵ Cf. MÜLLER 2015; PETSALIS-DIOMIDIS 2010, 43-66; GUNDERSON 2007, 479-510; SWAIN 2007, 41-43; JONES 1986, 133-148.

²⁶ Luk. *Alex.* 2. Transl. A. M. HARMON. This is the only explicit reference to Arrian by Lukian.

There is no consensus concerning the question whether this reference was a respectful gesture and “complimentary flourish after Arrian’s death”²⁷ or a mocking parody²⁸. Mostly, it is assumed that Arrian served Lukian as an excuse for his subject: if Arrian could devote a biography to such an unworthy figure as a brigand, Lukian was excused²⁹.

However, Arrian’s alleged biography of a robber terrorizing Asia is not attested elsewhere. In addition, unless Arrian used the same self-representation by habit in his works, Lukian clearly alludes to the *Anabasis*. Furthermore, judged against the background that as a writer, Arrian defined himself as such through his subject, he would hardly ever have chosen a minor brigand as his protagonist. “Alexander did the greatest deeds; therefore the *Anabasis* must be a supremely great work of literature”³⁰. However, a biography of a villain who looted parts of Asia is not in accordance with this ideology and cannot be regarded as being written for the good of the mankind as Arrian claims at the end of his *Anabasis*³¹. In consequence, the book will never have existed. It will be nothing but an ironical allusion to Arrian’s *Anabasis*³². The image of the robber is in accordance with Alexander’s reception as a brigand by Roman writers³³. The name Tilloboros/Tilliboros which is attested epigraphically³⁴, may have been associated with a brigand known in his times and therefore chosen by Lukian. In consequence, the name of the false prophet reveals that he makes fun of Arrian’s treatment of Alexander as an iconic figure in his *Anabasis*. The portrait of the *pseudomantis* Alexander is more than “an inversion of encomiastic portrayals of Alexander”³⁵. By paralleling his authorial *persona* with Arrian and associating *Alexander* with Arrian’s *Anabasis*, Lukian reverses Arrian’s way of approaching an iconic figure³⁶. While Arrian claims to write the truth when creating an idealized iconic portrait while in addition emphasizing his own skills as a historiographer, Lukian strips off the idealized features of this Alexander, hence deconstructing the iconic image.

²⁷ ANDERSON 1980, 122. This view is shared by POROD 2013, 20; BURLIGA 2013, 82-83 (an *epitaphios logos*, written seriously and without any irony); BOSWORTH 1980, 37; WIRTH 1964, 233-234, 245. See also CARLSEN 2014, 211. *Contra*: MACLEOD 1987, 258; STADTER 1980, 18.

²⁸ Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 185-187; KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 184-185; MACLEOD 1987, 258. See also JONES 1986, 134 (a sardonic comparison).

²⁹ Cf. BURLIGA 2013, 82; BILLAULT 2010, 629; VICTOR 1997, 9.

³⁰ MOLES 1985, 167.

³¹ Arr. *An.* 7.30.2. Cf. BURLIGA 2013, 121: Arrian wants to be useful. Swain 2007, 42 argues that the ancient elites’ fascination with bandits makes it plausible that Arrian wrote such a biography. However, this is not really convincing.

³² Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 186-187; KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 177; BADIAN 1997; TONNET 1988, 73, 83; WIRTH 1964, 233. See also WHITMARSH 2005, 68, n. 43. However, in great parts, it is indeed taken for granted that Arrian wrote this biography on Tilloboros, cf. BURLIGA 2013, 81; BILLAULT 2010, 629; GRÜNEWALD 1999, 9, n. 19; VICTOR 1997, 133; SWAIN 1996, 326, n. 101; BOSWORTH 1972, 164, 166-167; NISSEN 1888, 241.

³³ Sen. *De ben.* 1.13.3; *Ep.* 94.62; Luc. *Phars.* 10.20-21; Luk. *Navig.* 28. Cf. KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 177; VON MÖLLENDORFF 2006, 322; ANDERSON 1977, 367.

³⁴ PIR² T 210. Cf. VICTOR 1997, 133; STADTER 1980, 162.

³⁵ WHITMARSH 2005, 68, n. 43. Cf. GERLACH 2005, 179, n. 73; KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 184-185 (it is a negative interpretation of Arrian’s biography of Alexander); BRACHT BRANHAM 1989, 190-195. GUNDERSON 2007, 488 characterizes the false prophet also as “something of a conqueror.” Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 184-187.

³⁶ Not surprisingly, there are several ironic references to Alexander III in *Alexander*, predominantly concerned with charges of his hubristic longing for divinity Arrian tried to neutralize: Luk. *Alex.* 1; 6; 7 (cf. Plut. *Alex.* 2.4; Just. 11.11; Arr. *An.* 4.10.2); 16 (cf. Plut. *Alex.* 76.4; Arr. *An.* 7.26.1); 41 (indirect). Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 184-187; PETSALIS-DIOMIDIS 2010, 45; OGDEN 2009, 279-300; JONES 1986, 133, 136. Cf. Arr. *An.* 3.3.2; 7.29.3-4. However, alternatively, BILLAULT 2010, 630-633 argues that Lukian made fun of Plutarch’s biography of Alexander instead of Arrian’s *Anabasis*.

While Arrian ends his *Anabasis* claiming that it was written for the good of the mankind and divinely supported like Alexander's deeds³⁷, Lukian ends his *Alexander* with the comment that it might be useful for all men of sense to be able to face the truth³⁸. The difference is significant: The claim of divine protection is missing and the text will only be useful to people of sense.

Arrian's *Periplus Ponti Euxini* might have provided Lukian with other material to ridicule. Written in the early 130s, the literary letter to Hadrian describes Arrian's voyage of inspection along the coast of the Black Sea commemorating his governorship of Kappadokia as well as hinting at his close relationship with the emperor and distinguishing Arrian as a connoisseur of Greek literature, art, and history³⁹. Thus, he styled himself as a loyal and capable Roman magistrate and Greek man of letters. Continuously, he referred to famous representatives of the Greek cultural heritage—Homer, Aischylos, Herodotos and Xenophon—, touched upon famous myths and artefacts and called himself (the new) Xenophon⁴⁰. The last part of the letter is devoted to the island of Leuke which Arrian himself did not visit. He dwells on the local cult of Achilles associated with Patroklos and proves to be credulous concerning unproven stories about their epiphanies of Achilles and Patroklos attested by second- or third-hand witnesses⁴¹. Probably, he was motivated by the belief in the subject's special significance for Hadrian associating him with Achilles and his recently (130 AD) deceased favorite Antinoos with Patroklos⁴². Summing up, Arrian's *Periplus* echoes Lukian's mockery that the intellectuals of his time tend to indulge into name-dropping and myth-telling, see themselves as a new Thukydides, Herodotos or Xenophon, try to flatter their patrons, and aim at reputation and status.

Now, the similarities might be caused by the fact that Arrian was a child of his time and as such, necessarily reflects the contemporary phenomena of the intellectual circles in the Roman Empire. In addition, as the demonstration of *paideia* by proving intense familiarity with the Greek cultural heritage, ability to imitate the language and style of the past literary celebrities, and art of rhetorical performance formed part of the symbolic capital of the intellectuals in the time of the Second Sophistic⁴³, thus being their "identity card" and legitimization regarding their political career and social status, certainly, they were expected to show such an attitude. As Kate Gilhuly comments: "In a world where one's public activity in the political, social and civic spheres was subject

³⁷ Arr. *An.* 7.30.2.

³⁸ Luk. *Alex.* 61.

³⁹ Cf. MÜLLER 2014c. The literary character of the letter is manifest when Arrian mentions that the real official report(s), written in Latin, were already sent to the emperor (*Per.* 6.2-3). The *Periplus* is an artificial brainchild intended for a wider audience. Cf. BOSWORTH 1993, 242-253 (a literary supplement to the official report).

⁴⁰ Homeric epics: Arr. *Per.* 3.2; 8.2-3; 23.4; Aischylos: Arr. *Per.* 19.2; Herodotos: Arr. *Per.* 18.1-2; Xenophon: Arr. *Per.* 1.1; 1.2-3; 2.3; 3.2; 8.2; 11.1-2; 12.5; 13.5; 14.4-5; 15.1; 16.3; 25.1; myths and artefacts: Arr. *Per.* 8.3; 9.1-2; 11.5; 15.3; 21.1. The view that Xenophon was one of Arrian's names (cf. STADTER 1967) is mostly rejected, cf. MACLEOD 1987, 258, n. 6; WIRTH 1964, 228-229. He will have called himself the new Xenophon. See LIDDLE 2003, 91; FEIN 1994, 181-182; BOSWORTH 1993, 234-243, 273-274 (unclear whether he was granted this name or assumed it himself); OLIVER 1972 (a double herm found near the Acropolis may represent Xenophon and Arrian).

⁴¹ Arr. *Per.* 21.1-3.

⁴² Cf. BOSWORTH 1993, 249.

⁴³ Cf. ZWEIMÜLLER 2008, 107; GALLI 2007, 10-14; CONOLLY 2003, 341-342, 349; VON MÖLLENDORFF 2000, 3; SCHMITZ 1997, 44-67, 83-90, 101-109; ANDERSON 1993, 101-114; JONES 1986, 149. On the imitation see SWAIN 2007, 21; KARAVAS 2005, 10; BRACHT BRANHAM 1989, 4.

to fluctuating and capricious forces, the cultivation of the self became an increasing object of concern”⁴⁴.

Hence, it is possible that for Lukian, Arrian was but one of the exponents of the intellectual vanity fair of his times and thus treated as such. But there might also have been more behind it.

THE HALL

Lukian’s *The Hall* is about the question whether the impact of sight is stronger than the impact of words drawing mental images in the mind of the audience⁴⁵. Thereby, he touches upon one of the major themes of the Second Sophistic: the image and art of word-painting, ἡ γραφή τῶν λόγων⁴⁶. It was central in the “public displays of word power”⁴⁷ of sophists.

A speaker talks about his wish to perform in a beautiful, sumptuously decorated and adorned hall aiming at forming part of this beauty by adding his words. He is opposed by a personified *logos*⁴⁸, a second speaker who intervenes and uses the first speaker’s very arguments in order to prove the contrary. According to him, any sumptuous surrounding is a bad place for a speech. Distracted by the decoration, the supposed listeners turn into mere spectators thus lacking attention to the spoken words. Attracted by the visual sensation, they prefer the physical sight to the metaphorical images painted by the speaker with words in their imagination.

As usual in the time of the Second Sophistic, the speaker starts his oration by referring to a historical example that was widely known:

εἶτα Ἀλέξανδρος μὲν ἐπεθύμησεν ἐν τῷ Κύδνῳ λούσασθαι καλόν τε καὶ διαυγῇ τὸν ποταμὸν ἰδὼν καὶ ἀσφαλῶς βαθὺν καὶ προσηνῶς ὄξυν καὶ νήξασθαι ἡδὺν καὶ θέρους ὥρα ψυχρόν, ὥστε καὶ ἐπὶ προδήλῳ τῇ νόσῳ ἦν ἐνόσησεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, δοκεῖ μοι οὐκ ἂν τοῦ λουτροῦ ἀποσχέσθαι.

“Alexander longed to bathe in the Kydnos on seeing that the stream was fair and clear, safely deep, agreeably swift, delightful to swim in and cool in the height of the summer; even with foreknowledge of the fever which he contracted from it, I do not think he would have abstained from his plunge”⁴⁹.

The beginning refers to a famous incident also mentioned by Arrian in his *Anabasis*:

Ἀλέξανδρος δέ, ὡς μὲν Ἀριστοβούλῳ λέλεκται, ὑπὸ καμάτου ἐνόσησεν, οἱ δὲ ἐς τὸν Κύδνον [τὸν] ποταμὸν λέγουσι ῥίγαντα νήξασθαι, ἐπιθυμήσαντα τοῦ ὕδατος, ἰδρῶντα καὶ καύματι ἐχόμενον. ὁ δὲ Κύδνος ῥέει διὰ μέσης τῆς πόλεως: οἷα δὲ ἐκ

⁴⁴ GILHULY 2007, 63.

⁴⁵ Cf. WEBB 2009, 172-173; VON MÖLLENDORFF 2006b, 230; NEWBY 2002. On *The Hall* in general see MÜLLER 2018.

⁴⁶ Cf. VON MÖLLENDORFF 2006b, 240; FRANCIS 2003, 582, 592.

⁴⁷ SWAIN 2007, 27. On the importance of public declarations see also HOPKINSON 2008, 4-5; ZWEIMÜLLER 2008, 145; WHITMARSH 2005, 73.

⁴⁸ Cf. WEBB 2009, 173.

⁴⁹ Luk. *De Domo* 1. Cf. Curt. 3.5.1-4; Arr. *An.* 2.4.7-8; Just. 11,8,3-9; Val. Max. 3.8.ext. 6; Plut. *Alex.* 19.1-2. Diod. 17.31.4-6 only mentions that he fell ill. On the episode see BICHLER 2013, 303-306; HECKEL 2006, 13; HAMMOND 1981, 92-93; BOSWORTH 1980, 55.

τοῦ Ταύρουδρους τῶν πηγῶν οἱ ἀνισχουσῶν καὶ διὰ χώρου καθαροῦ ῥέων, ψυχρὸς τέ ἐστι καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καθαρὸς σπασμῷ τε οὖν ἔχεσθαι Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ θερμαῖς ἰσχυραῖς καὶ ἀγρυπνίᾳ ξυνεχεῖ.

“Here Alexander fell ill, from fatigue according to Aristoboulos, but others tell the following story. Alexander dived into the river Kydnos and had a swim; he wanted to bathe as he was in sweat and overcome by heat. The Kydnos runs right through the city, and as its springs are in Mount Tauros and it runs through open country, it is cold and its water is clear. Alexander therefore caught a cramp, and suffered from violent fever and continuous sleeplessness”⁵⁰.

It is no surprise that Aristoboulos, “a blatant apologist” for Alexander⁵¹, told a version favorable to his idealized protagonist instead of blaming him for an imprudent swim. According to Lukian, Aristoboulos was noted for his flattering style—even by Alexander himself⁵². This story about Alexander throwing Aristoboulos’ writings in the Hydaspes because of his inventions is an ironical exaggeration serving as an example of certain shortcomings of historiography⁵³. Probably not coincidentally, Lukian’s image of Aristoboulos as a flattering liar contradicts Arrian’s opinion of the man from Kassandreia: Writing his *Anabasis*, Arrian names Aristoboulos as one of his two main sources he regarded as trustworthy and testimony to the truth⁵⁴. Thus, it is no surprise that Arrian mentioned Aristoboulos’ apologetic version first before citing the consensus of the other sources. As Arrian also idealized his protagonist, presumably, he cited Aristoboulos in order to oppose the general impression that Alexander acted irresponsibly and without the sense of duty that suited a commander by plunging directly in a river fed by the snow of the Tauros. As Brian Bosworth observed: “He may have been attempting to exculpate Alexander from charges of folly in blindly diving into the Cydnus without testing the water temperature”⁵⁵.

Lukian aims at exactly the opposite underlining that not even foreknowledge would have prevented Alexander from carelessly diving into the icy river. As Macleod pointed out, the passage in Lukian shares Arrian’s use of the aorist infinitive νήξασθαι, an aorist form of ἐπιθυμῶ and the adjective ψυχρός⁵⁶. Thus, it may have been no coincidence but a pun on Arrian’s image of Alexander in his *Anabasis*.

Regarding the outcome of the plunge, the speaker’s choice of the historical example and comparison of Alexander’s desire to dive into the river with his own desire to deliver a speech in the beautiful *oikos*—here again, Lukian uses the word ἐπιθυμῶ—does not seem to be wise. As the tragic and nearly lethal outcome of Alexander’s bathing fun is clear, the speaker foreshadows his own “drowning”. While Alexander was seduced by the sparkling stream and plunged into disaster, the speaker is blinded by the beautiful adornment of the hall and likely to shipwreck as an orator. Even worse,

⁵⁰ Arr. *An.* 2.4.7-8. Partly, it is suggested that the disease was malaria Alexander had contracted before entering Kilikia. Cf. HECKEL 2006, 13; BORZA 1987, 37; BOSWORTH 1980, 55. However, MACHEREI 2016, 219-226 opts for hypothermia.

⁵¹ HECKEL 2006, 46. See also MÜLLER 2014a, 95-98; BERVE 1926, 65.

⁵² Luk. *Hist. Conscr.* 12. Cf. HECKEL 2006, 294, n. 111; BERVE 1926, 64.

⁵³ Cf. POROD 2013, 95, 125, 127.

⁵⁴ Arr. *Pr.* 1.1. Cf. KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 184. On Lukian’s different image of Aristoboulos see WIRTH 1964, 239.

⁵⁵ BOSWORTH 1980, 190-191. Cf. BICHLER 2013, 303; PEARSON 1960, 157.

⁵⁶ MACLEOD 1987, 260-261.

when stating that also with foreknowledge, Alexander would have jumped into the cold river, he implies that he is aware of the possible failure but ignores it⁵⁷.

This is underlined by the other arguments he utters in favor of speaking in beautiful surroundings. Unconsciously making clear that his wish to deliver his speech is motivated not by reason and consideration but on impulse, he compares himself to Achilles whose anger was enhanced by the sight of his armor⁵⁸. Thus, he gave in to his desire to avenge Patroklos' death. In consequence, he died young and bewailed the loss of his life in the *Odyssee* when, on his *katabasis*, Odysseus met him in Hades and tried to cheer him up⁵⁹. Lukian refers to this scene in his *Dialogues of the Death* portraying Achilles as hopelessly sad⁶⁰.

Next, the speaker draws an inappropriate comparison. Demonstrating his ignorance, he parallels the plane tree under which Sokrates sits down to converse with Phaidros in Plato's *Phaidros* with the golden plane tree of the Achaemenid kings, a prime marker of their display of luxury and thus lack of *sophrosyne* in Greco-Roman literature⁶¹. First of all, the setting of the *Phaidros* being the free landscape outside the walls of Athens is not comparable with the images of the luxurious Achaemenid court, especially in Greek perception. In addition, the attitude of the protagonists in the respective settings differs: While Sokrates praises the beauty of the idyllic setting at the Ilissos⁶², he does not fall for its charms⁶³. Contrarily, according to the stereotypical depiction of notoriously luxurious Achaemenid kings in Greek and Roman sources, the Persian kings were corrupted by wealth and decadence. The plane tree is another signal word. This special artwork the wealthy Lydian Pythios —thus, in Greek eyes, the representative of a region known for its luxury— is said to have given to Dareios I became a famous symbol of the Persian king's indulgence in luxury⁶⁴. The orator characterizes this golden plane tree as “βαρβαρικὸν τὸ θέαμα, πλοῦτος μόνον”⁶⁵. According to him, it symbolizes the difference between the perspective and visual experience of intellectuals on the one hand and poor people (in the sense of less educated and refined persons) as well as “barbarians” on the other hand. While as a spectator, a cultured man is able to see more than mere outer beauty and judge wisely as an expert in art, “barbarians” and less educated people do not apply thought to what they see but are only impressed and astounded by the sheer sight:

⁵⁷ Cf. GOLDHILL 160; THOMAS 2007, 229-230; NEWBY 2002, 127. According to NEWBY 128, also an agonistic rivalry with the beautiful hall is implied.

⁵⁸ Luk. *De Domo* 4. Cf. Il. 19.15-6. Cf. VON MÖLLENDORFF 2006, 298. In *VH* II 20, Lukian makes fun of the famous motif of Achilles' wrath and the contemporary scholarly debate about it. When his narrator meets Homer at the Isle of the Blessed asking him why he began with the wrath of Achilles, Homer answered that it just came to his mind without any further thought.

⁵⁹ *Od.* 11.487-491.

⁶⁰ Luk. *DM* 15.1.

⁶¹ Luk. *De Domo* 5. Cf. Plat. *Phaidr.* 230 B. See LAPLACE 1996, 162-163, 165 on the influence of Plato and Pindar. On the golden plane tree cf. KUHRT 2010, 540; CURTIS 2010, 55; BRIANT 2002, 235-236. Mostly, it is mentioned in connection with the equally famous golden vine (Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.38). The artefacts were said to have been spared and adopted by Alexander for his representation. Phylarchos even mentions more than one golden plane tree (Athen. 12.539 D) and accuses Alexander of having surpassed the Persian display of luxury. See MÜLLER 2014, 110. On the display of enormous wealth and luxury as a characteristic feature of the Greco-Roman images of the Persian court see BICHLER 2010, 155-187; JACOBS 2010, 377-409.

⁶² Plat. *Phaidr.* 230 B-C. Cf. GÖRGEMANNS 2013, 140-141. On the historical setting see LIND 1987, 15-18.

⁶³ GÖRGEMANNS 2013, 142. Cf. FADEN 2005, 197 (an ironical praise of the idyllic scenery).

⁶⁴ *Hdt.* 7.27. It is unclear whether the Great King used to sit under the golden plane tree holding court or whether it was displayed as a royal treasure. See KUHRT 2010, 540, n. 3.

⁶⁵ Luk. *De Domo* 5.

οὐ φιλόκαλοι γάρ, ἀλλὰ φιλόπλουτοὶ εἰσιν οἱ βάρβαροι.

“The barbarians are no lovers of beauty but of wealth”⁶⁶.

However, lumping together poor and less educated (obviously Greek and Roman) people with “barbarians” such as the Parthian Arsacids he mentions, seems to be slightly precarious. Whether he also exposes his ignorance by associating the golden plane tree attested for the Achaemenids with the Arsacids is unclear as in Greco-Roman literature, the Parthians were usually paralleled to the Persians, even labelled as Persians and the Arsacids were regarded as the heirs of the Achaemenids.

In any case, Lukian makes fun of the ideology of different abilities of sight depending on the cultural context of the spectator. Even more so as ironically, his literary alter ego referred to himself as a “barbarian” and “Syrian” because of his origin and mother language⁶⁷. In consequence, according to the speaker’s opinion, Lukian, being himself a master of refined *ekphraseis*, would have not been able to view any beautiful architecture or artwork in a reasonable way. It may be coincidental but one is reminded of Arrian’s comment in the *Periplus* that the local “barbarians” at Trapezous were unable to create refined altars, accurate inscriptions, and beautiful statues of the emperor Hadrian worthy to bear his name and deities⁶⁸. Hence, Arrian as a man of *paideia*, Roman citizen and Greek man of letters had to correct these shortcomings.

Similarly, the metaphor that the ceiling in its reserved decoration is compared to a modest and beautiful woman who does not need much adornment to show her beauty, points at vanity and shallowness: No matter whether the woman decorates herself in a modest way, her aim is still to demonstrate her beautiful looks —instead of her inner qualities.

Next, the speaker comments that the sight of the hall is as seductive as a soft, sloping plain to a horse that wants to run⁶⁹. Hence, he compares his longing to deliver a speech with the instincts of an animal that, according to ancient thought, did not possess the ability to act rationally. In addition, Lukian might have thought of the anecdote that the Scythian king Ateas, a contemporary of Philip II, revealed himself as an uncivilized, un-Greek low-brow by preferring the sound of a horse to music⁷⁰.

Significantly, Lukian compares the orator who longs to form part of the beauty of the hall to a peacock posing in the sunlight⁷¹. Due to its being imported from the East, in antiquity, the peacock was known as “Median bird” (μηδικὸς ὄρνις)⁷² and thus associated with Eastern decadence⁷³. While being an object of fascination⁷⁴, in symbolic terms, the peacock was credited with negative attributes such as vanity, malevolence, and impertinence⁷⁵. Thus, the peacock represented a contrast between its

⁶⁶ Luk. *De Domo* 5. On the ideology of the difference between the perspective of well-educated versus less educated people in Rome see GOLDHILL 160-162; THOMAS 2007, 230.

⁶⁷ Luk. *Bis Acc.* 14, 27, 34; *Pisc.* 19; *Ind.* 19. Cf. POROD 2013, 10; SWAIN 2007, 30-34; KARAVAS 13; SWAIN 1996, 299; BRACHT BRANHAM 1989, 32. It is debated whether Aramaic was his mother language. This is suggested by HOPKINSON 2008, 1; JONES 1986, 7. *Contra*: SWAIN 2007, 34 who argues that there is no proof that Aramaic was his first language; cf. SWAIN 1996, 302 presuming that he spoke Syriac.

⁶⁸ Arr. *Per.* 1.2-3.

⁶⁹ Luk. *De Domo* 10.

⁷⁰ Plut. *Mor.* 334 B-C.

⁷¹ Luk. *De Domo* 11.

⁷² Diod. 2.53.2; *Suda* sv. μηδικὸς ὄρνις; Clem Alex. *Paed.* 3.4. Cf. HÜNEMÖRDER 2000, 689.

⁷³ Cf. WIESEHÖFER 2004, 303.

⁷⁴ Plut. *Perikl.* 13.13; Ael. *HA* 5.21; Aristoph. *Av.* 102, 269. Cf. WIESEHÖFER 2004, 303.

⁷⁵ Aristot. *HA* 488 B; Ov. *Met.* 13.802;

outer beauty and inner badness⁷⁶, a treacherous promise. His inner qualities are not in accordance with his outer appearance, the peacock symbolizes a superficial kind of deceiving beauty. This is also true for the orator who is that ignorant to compare himself to a peacock, hence unmasking himself as a fake: a speaker just aiming at outer beauty of words and admiration while ignoring the content and educational effect of his speech. In consequence, he is another one of Lukian's pseudo-authorities selfishly striving for glory and status instead of deeper inner knowledge and an educational impact on the audience.

The superficiality of the orator's aims also becomes clear when he comments that the colors of the peacock twisting and turning change in the light: The tips of his feathers turn from bronze to gold⁷⁷. Obviously, Lukian refers to the famous passage in Plato's *Symposion* (making recourse to a Homeric quote)⁷⁸ when Alkibiades offered Sokrates his beautiful body in exchange for Sokrates' wisdom. The philosopher turned him down by responding that he intended to exchange gold (wisdom) for bronze (erotic pleasure)⁷⁹. He made clear that he regarded the offer as an unequal transaction⁸⁰: Sokrates' pedagogical *eros* was concerned with Alkibiades' soul instead of the superficial physical sensual pleasures⁸¹.

Given this, the pun is clear: The peacock as a symbol of superficiality and vanity glitters gold in the light while its feathers were previously bronze. It is a double metaphor hinting at treacherous promises and shallowness. It foreshadows the kind of speech that the orator will deliver. Like the peacock in the right light, he poses in the beautiful room trying to enchant his audience by mere beauty—instead of wise words. What they will get is bronze instead of gold: mere sensual pleasure, not wisdom.

The impression that the speaker is driven by vanity is also hinted at before when he refers to the *Parthenos* who answers all who sing and shout, hence the nymph Echo⁸². As Newby points out, by associating the hall with Echo, he associates himself with Narkissos⁸³. Again, the impression prevails that due to his vanity and self-praise, the speaker will fail.

The hint that he was motivated by emotion rather than by reason is underlined by his comment that coming to the hall, he was attracted to it as by a Siren⁸⁴. Again, there is the association of the speech with the risky adventure of seafaring, in antiquity regarded as unsafe and dangerous. Lukian emphasizes the impression of danger and risk by adding the element of the Siren who charms sailors by her music, makes them lose their senses ending in shipwreck. Thus, unconsciously, the speaker admits that the sight of the beautiful hall blew away his senses. In consequence, he will start his speech while being out of his mind—clearly not the best precondition.

⁷⁶ HÜNEMÖRDER 2000, 690.

⁷⁷ Luk. *De Domo* 11: ὁ γὰρ τὸ ἔως χαλκὸς ἦν, τοῦτο ἐγκλίναντος ὀλίγον χρυσὸς ὥφθη, καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ τῷ ἡλίῳ κυανανγές, εἰ σκιασθεῖν ἡλιοανγές ἐστὶν οὕτω μετακοσμεῖται πρὸς τὸ φῶς ἢ πτέρωσις.

⁷⁸ Il. 6.232-236.

⁷⁹ Plat. *Symp.* 218 E.

⁸⁰ GILHULY 2007, 75.

⁸¹ Plat. *Symp.* 218 E-219 A; *Alk.* 135 E; Plut. *Alk.* 4,3. In general see Plat. *Phaidr.* 253 C-256 E; *Symp.* 215 A-219 D. Cf. JOHNSON 2012, 7, 11-14; BLYTH 2012, 40; WOHL 1999, 352. Lukian often parodizes the Socratic *eros* and its misinterpretations, see Luk. *DM* 20.6; *VH* II 19; *Peregr.* 43-44; *Alex.* 5; *DM* 20.6; *Symp.* 39. Cf. MÖLLER – MÜLLER 2016, 152; MÜLLER 2015, 41; BERDOZZO 2011, 194-196, 200; GUNDERSON 2007, 499-500.

⁸² Luk. *De Domo* 4.

⁸³ Cf. NEWBY 2002, 128.

⁸⁴ Luk. *De Domo* 13.

However, according to his pessimistic opinion of the less educated people, all these who might happen to be among the audience, will not be able to apply any thought to his word-painting anyway.

At this point, the speaker voices his irritation because of the interruption by an oratorical opponent who then takes the stage. Lukian styles the scene as a trial, one of his favored forms of scenario⁸⁵.

Trying to prove that the first speaker is wrong, the second argues against all of his statements. However, by taking the first speaker's problematic arguments seriously, he unveils himself as ignorant, too. Furthermore, his comments are as unconvincing and revealing, too. This aspect reminds of Lukian's ironic advice in the *Rhetorum Praeceptor* when the disillusioned teacher claims that laughing at and objecting to all the other speakers is the most important and necessary thing in the contemporary art of rhetoric⁸⁶.

Referring to his opponent's claim concerning the beauty of women, he also exclusively focuses on the superficial aim to find the best strategy to show off with their good looks⁸⁷. Similarly, according to his opinion, in a beautiful surrounding, a speaker vanishes and drowns⁸⁸. Here, he adapts the naval metaphor of shipwrecking the first speaker involuntarily touched upon by referring to the Siren. In addition, he argues that the listeners transform into spectators being so distracted and absorbed by the sight of the hall that they stop listening to the speech⁸⁹.

Stunningly, just like the first speaker, the second's primary concern is not the content of the speech that ought to be the important aspect, but only the place and the effect on the audience. Thus, they both pay attention to mere superficial and shallow factors instead of caring for moral improvement by wisdom. Strikingly, the second speaker also thinks quite negatively about the intellectual qualities of his audience attributing to the recipients only visual skills.

Concerning the first speaker's mentioning of the oral charms of the Siren, he quips by pointing at the visual impact of the Gorgons turning their beholders to stone⁹⁰. He also accepts the precarious argument concerning the peacock replying that it was famous for its looks and not for its voice⁹¹. Next, he pretends to ask a fictitious crier to summon Herodotos in person to be his testimony that the visual impact dominates the oral. Ironically, Lukian makes fun of a central characteristic of his intellectual contemporaries inevitably and regularly citing authorities of the Greek literary heritage in order to underline their arguments⁹². Of course, the speaker delivers Herodotos' testimony in Ionic, imitating the ancient language, and isolates his words from their context. Moreover, it seems awkward that Herodotos who in great parts relied on oral tradition now takes a stand against its impact. In addition, as Goldhill proposes, it might be a pun at Herodotos' debated status as a truth teller⁹³. However, Lukian may in fact defend Herodotos against such accusations: Herodotos does not confirm the second

⁸⁵ Cf. VON MÖLLENDORFF 2006, 298.

⁸⁶ Luk. *Rh. Pr.* 22. Cf. SCHLAPBACH 2010, 254: The loudest seems to be the fittest to impress the masses.

⁸⁷ Luk. *De Domo* 14-15. According to him, she ought not to wear any jewelry or gold in order to avoid any distraction from her looks.

⁸⁸ Luk. *De Domo* 16.

⁸⁹ Luk. *De Domo* 18-19.

⁹⁰ Luk. *De Domo* 19. However, he refers to their stunning beauty (cf. Ov. *Met.* 4.604-5.249) instead of their ugliness (Luc. 9.624-733).

⁹¹ Luk. *De Domo* 19.

⁹² Later on, the speaker does not fail to drop the names of also Euripides and Sophokles (Luk. *De Domo* 23).

⁹³ Cf. GOLDHILL 2001, 164. Cf. Luk. *VH* II 31.

speaker's argument but obviously, he tricks him. For the last clause of this Ionic testimony that really is Herodotean emphasizing the importance of the sight stems from the story of Kandaules, his wife, and Gyges⁹⁴. The words form part of Kandaules' attempt to persuade Gyges to spy on his wife when she is naked. The story ends with Kandaules' violent death⁹⁵. Thus, Herodotos' testimony contradicts the words of the speaker who summons him⁹⁶. And the speaker again unveils his lack of knowledge by failing to notice this contradiction. Apparently, he does not know the *Histories* too well.

Similarly, Lukian unmasks the second speaker by making him cite the Homeric phrase "winged words"⁹⁷, thus reminding the audience of the undying epics as the most famous examples of a literary genre that, initially, was transmitted by the performance of *rhapsodes*. Ironically, simultaneously, Lukian lets him claim that the spoken word will not last⁹⁸.

His "jury", the people around, also seem to be not convinced as they started regarding the hall and its decoration. The second speaker takes the chance to prove his knowledge by describing the subjects of the paintings exhibited. However, he only comments on the identification of the portrayed persons failing to prove his skills in word-painting by describing the colors, lights, dynamics, and settings⁹⁹.

In the end, both speakers aim at the same and morally wrong outcomes: fame and glory¹⁰⁰. Similarly, in Lukian's *Rhetorum Praeceptor*, two ways lead to the personified Rhetoric located on the top of a metaphorical mountain. While one way is easy (symbolizing a superficial education) and the other is exhausting (reflecting the intense study of the literary heritage), the destination is the same: a corrupted Rhetoric styled as a *hetaera* promising wealth and fame¹⁰¹.

In the case of *The Hall*, the two orators fail to care for the educational effect of their speeches. They do not think about the content of their speeches but concentrate upon the splendor of their words, the surroundings, and admiration of the audience. Furthermore, they are only concerned with the outer form of their word-painting. They do not give a thought about convincing by arguments instead of form. This is even more striking, as rhetoric education in this age was designed to train students for civic participation in politics¹⁰².

Water seems to be a key element in *De Domo*. It serves as a marker of danger and (too) high risk. Therefore, the work opens with the scene of Alexander failing to resist the temptation of the Kydnos—and promptly drowning. This motif is adapted again when the first speaker compares himself to a sailor charmed by a Siren and thus doomed to shipwreck. His opponent adds to this image by commenting that in such a beautiful hall, a speaker will drown "as the sea drowns chanty-men when they undertake to sing for the rowers against the noise of the surf"¹⁰³.

While Alexander and the Sirens' victims drown literally, the speaker will drown metaphorically. Driven by , blown up by self-praise and scorn for his audience, without any embodiment of the true lessons of *paideia* but instead just aiming at glory and

⁹⁴ Hdt. 1.8.2.

⁹⁵ Hdt. 1.12.2.

⁹⁶ Cf. MÜLLER 2018, 424.

⁹⁷ *Od.* 1.122. Cf. VON MÖLLENDORFF 2006, 299.

⁹⁸ Luk. *De Domo* 20.

⁹⁹ Luk. *De Domo* 22-31. On the gallery of the paintings see VON MÖLLENDORFF 2006b, 241-242.

¹⁰⁰ Luk. *De Domo* 1, 32. Cf. GOLDHILL 2001, 166.

¹⁰¹ Luk. *Rh. Pr.* 6. See also Luk. *Bis Acc.* 30-31. Cf. MÜLLER 2013b, 30-32; ZWEIMÜLLER 2008, 47-67. The figure of the corrupted Rhetoric is comparable with the *Paideia* in Lukian's *Somnium*.

¹⁰² Cf. CONOLLY 2003, 342.

¹⁰³ Luk. *De Domo* 16.

admiration, he will fail. Interestingly, in his *Deipnosophistes*, Lukian's contemporary Athenaios uses the term (ἐξοκέλλειν εἰς τρυφήν, "to shipwreck onto luxury"), not a literal but a metaphorical shipwreck reflecting moral failings¹⁰⁴. Similarly, Lukian creates images of his speakers shipwrecking onto the treacherous beauty of the hall. His opponent only criticizes his arguments concerning the suitability of the surrounding, not his shallow aims or missing educational insight. In the end, he admits that he himself seeks glory and admiration.

As the opening scene introducing the theme of shipwrecking onto temptation, the incident of Alexander at the Kydnos has a major function. Lukian's and Arrian's respective treatment of the episode instructively reflects their different approach to Alexander as an iconic figure and attitude towards his reception and cultivation of his image in the cultural memory.

Arrian recreates the iconic status of Alexander idealizing him (and himself as his biographer). Thus, he mentions Aristoboulos' apologetic version first, adds the consensus about Alexander's unhappy plunge into the cold river and quickly transforms the story into a hagiographic anecdote about Alexander's loyalty to an old friend, the Acarnanian physician Philip¹⁰⁵. Perhaps, he knew and wanted to correct Curtius' sardonic version of the incident. Styling the scene as particularly embarrassing for Alexander, Curtius reports that he took off his clothes and dived into the river right before the eyes of his assembled troops, trying to show that he was content with a simple way of personal hygiene. Probably, he also intended to demonstrate his physical fitness and excellence. However, he ended up stiffened with chill and had to be carried nearly unconscious to his tent by his servants¹⁰⁶. This is just not like the Roman ideal of a warrior and general who ought to be tough and manly enough to stand the cold of a "barbarian" river in the sun.

While Arrian tries to heroize Alexander even in this moment of failure, Lukian's speaker drops the episode of Philip the Acarnian, focuses on Alexander giving in to temptation as an emotional act and even claims that he would have been as careless again if he knew about the risk. However, one might wonder how the speaker could know about Alexander's thoughts. But this might reflect the intention of Lukian's image of Alexander in *The Hall*. The speaker is not interested in presenting any historical truth about him. He just uses him as a famous example in order to start his speech with a celebrated icon. He uses Alexander in order to define himself as such through his fame. Ironically, thanks to his lack in real knowledge, he chooses a wrong example (among his other fatal examples), thus foreshadowing his metaphorical shipwreck.

CONCLUSION

Exemplarily, Lukian's treatment of the episode of Alexander at the Kydnos as the starting-point of his first speaker in *The Hall* shows the difference of his literary dealing with iconic figures of the past as compared to Arrian.

¹⁰⁴ GORMAN – GORMAN 2007, 41–42. Cf. WILKINS 2008.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. HECKEL 2006, 213; BERVE 1926, 388–389.

¹⁰⁶ Curt. 3.5.1–4. Cf. BAYNHAM 1998, 141: Alexander wanted to demonstrate his physical healthcare. See also BICHLER 2013, 305. According to ATKINSON 1980, 147–148, Curtius wanted to contrast Alexander's (still) simple lifestyle to the luxury of Dareios III. On Curtius' critical attitude to Alexander see MÜLLER 2014, 135–144; SPENCER 2002, 80–81.

Arrian idealized Alexander, thus following the contemporary trend in the Roman elite triggered by Trajan and Hadrian, while simultaneously defining his own status as such through Alexander's fame. Doing so, he showed an attitude towards history and historiography Lukian ridiculed in his works. Therefore, he will have been among the suspects Lukian had in mind when he made fun of the pretensions of his pseudo-intellectuals longing for fame, wealth, and political offices as the wrong approach to writing history.

In contrast, Lukian deconstructs the larger than life-sized artificial images of Alexander in various ways, thus pointing at the misguided ways of his reception making him a useful icon instead of examining his history. In *The Hall*, Lukian demonstrates how a vainglorious orator (mis)uses Alexander as an example in order to justify his desire to deliver a speech in a sumptuous surrounding. However, the example is badly chosen, foreshadowing the failure of the speaker. In addition, in order to legitimize his wish to speak, the orator ascribes thoughts to Alexander he could not have known. It becomes clear that Alexander is only treated as an instrument serving the needs of the intellectuals who refer to him. Lukian mocks this deliberate treatment of historical persons like Alexander by contemporary intellectuals. Probably, he implies that one has to be careful regarding the bias of the authors from the past, too.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ANDERSON, G. (1976): *Lucian. Theme and Variation on the Second Sophistic*, Leiden.
 — (1977): "Some Notes on Lucian's *Navigium*", *Mnemosyne* 30: 363-368.
 — (1980): "Arrian's *Anabasis Alexandri* and Lucian's *Historia*", *Historia* 29: 119-124.
 — (1993): *The Second Sophistic*, London.
 — (1994): "Lucian. Tradition versus Reality", *ANRW* II 34.2: 1422-1447.
 ATKINSON, J. E. (1980): *A Commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus' Historiae Alexandri Magni. Books 3 and 4*, Amsterdam.
 BADIAN, E. (1997): "Arrianos von Nikomedeia", *DNP* 2: 28-29.
 BALDWIN, B. (1973): *Studies in Lucian*, Toronto.
 BAYNHAM, E. (1998): *Alexander the Great. The Unique History of Quintus Curtius*, Ann Arbor.
 BAUMBACH, M. – MÖLLENDORFF, P. von (2017): *Ein literarischer Prometheus. Lukian aus Samosata und die Zweite Sophistik*, Heidelberg.
 BERDOZZO, F. (2011): *Götter, Mythen und Philosophie: Lukian und die paganen Göttervorstellungen*, Berlin.
 BERVE, H. (1926): *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, Vol. 2, München.
 BICHLER, R. (2010): "Der Hof der Achämeniden in den Augen Herodots", in B. JACOBS – R. ROLLINGER (eds.): *Der Achämenidenhof*, Wiesbaden: 155-187.
 — (2013): "Konnte Alexander wirklich nicht schwimmen? Überlegungen zu Plutarch, *Alex.* 58,4", in P. MAURITSCH – C. ULF (eds.): *Kultur(en). Formen des Alltäglichen in der Antike. FS Ingomar Weiler*, Vol. 1, Graz: 301-314.
 BILLAULT, A. (2010): "Une biographie singulière: Alexandre ou le faux prophète de Lucien", *REG* 123: 623-639.
 BLYTH, D. (2012): "Socratic and Platonic Models of Love", in M. JOHNSON – H. TARRANT (eds.): *Alcibiades and the Socratic Lover-Educator*, Bristol: 30-44.
 BOMPAIRE, J. (1958): *Lucien Écrivain*, Paris.
 BORZA, E. N. (1987), "Malaria in Alexander's Army", *AHB* 1: 36-38.

- BOSWORTH, A. B. (1972): "Arrian's Literary Development", *CQ* 22: 163-185.
- (1980): *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*, Vol. 1, Oxford.
- (1988a): *Conquest and Empire. The Reign of Alexander the Great*, Cambridge.
- (1988b): *From Arrian to Alexander. Studies in Historical Interpretation*, Oxford.
- (1993): "Arrian and Rome: The Minor Works", *ANRW II* 34.1: 226-275.
- BRACHT BRANHAM, R. (1988): *Unruly Eloquence: Lucian and the Comedy of Traditions*, Cambridge, Mass.–London.
- BRIANT, P. (2002): *From Cyrus to Alexander. A History of the Persian Empire*, Winona Lake.
- BURLIGA, B. (2013): *Arrian's Anabasis. An Intellectual and Cultural Story*, Gdansk.
- CARLSEN, J. (2014): "Greek History in a Roman Context: Arrian's *Anabasis of Alexander*", in J. MAJBOM MADSEN – R. D. REES (eds.): *Roman Rule in Greek and Latin Writing. Double Vision*, Leiden–Boston: 210-223.
- CONOLLY, J. (2001): "Problems of the Past in Imperial Greek Education", in Y. LEE TOO (ed.): *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, Leiden–Boston: 339-372.
- CURTIS, J. (2010): "The Palace", in J. CURTIS – S. J. SIMPSON (eds.): *The World of Achaemenid Persia*, London: 50-103.
- DUSINBERRE, E. R. M. (2003): *Aspects of Empire in Achaemenid Sardes*, Cambridge.
- FADEN, G. (2005): *Platons didaktische Phänomenologie*, Würzburg.
- FEIN, S. (1994): *Die Beziehungen der Kaiser Trajan und Hadrian zu den Litterati*, Stuttgart–Leipzig.
- FRANCIS, J. A. (2003): "Living Icons. Tracing a Motif in Verbal and Visual Representation from the Second to Fourth Centuries C.E.", *AJPh* 124: 575-600.
- GALLI, M. (2007): "Processi della memoria nell'età della Seconda Sofistica", in O. D. CORDOVANA – M. GALLI (eds.), *Arte e memoria culturale nell'età della Seconda Sofistica*, Catania: 8-14.
- GEORGIADOU, A. – LARMOUR, D. H. J. (1994): "Lucian and Historiography: *De Historia conscribenda* and *Verae Historiae*", *ANRW II* 34.2: 1448-1509.
- (1998): *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel True Histories*, Leiden.
- GERLACH, J. (2005): "Die Figur des Scharlatans bei Lukian", in P. PILHOFER *et al.* (eds.): *Lukian: Der Tod des Peregrinos: Ein Scharlatan auf dem Scheiterhaufen*, Darmstadt: 151-197.
- GÖRGEMANNS, H. (2013): "Zur Deutung der Szene am Ilissos in Platons *Phaidros*", in R. HIRSCH-LUIPOLD – M. BAUMBACH (eds.): *H. Görgemanns, Philologos Kosmos*, Tübingen: 135-162.
- GOLDHILL, S. (2001): "The Erotic Eye: Visual Stimulation and Cultural Conflict", in S. GOLDHILL (ed.): *Being Greek under Rome – Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, Cambridge: 154-194.
- GORMAN, R. J. – V. B. GORMAN (2007): "The *tryphe* of the Sybarites: A Historiographical Problem in Athenaeus", *JHS* 127: 38-60.
- GRÜNEWALD, T. (1999): *Räuber, Rebellen, Rivalen, Rächer*, Stuttgart.
- GUNDERSON, E. (2007): "Men of Learning: The Cult of *paideia* in Lucian's *Alexander*", in T. C. PENNER – C. VANDER STICHELE (eds.): *Mapping Gender in Ancient Religious Discourses*, Leiden: 479-510.
- HALL, J. (1981): *Lucian's Satire*, New York.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L. (1981): *Alexander the Great. King, Commander and Statesman*, London.
- HECKEL, W. (2006): *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander the Great*, Oxford.
- HOMEYER, H. (1965): *Lukian. Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll*, München.
- HOPKINSON, N. (2008): *Lucian. A Selection*, Cambridge.

- HÜNEMÖRDER, C. (2000): "Pfau", *DNP* 9: 689-690.
- JACOBS, B. (2010): "Höfischer Lebensstil und materielle Prachtentfaltung", in B. JACOBS – R. ROLLINGER (eds.): *Der Achämenidenhof*, Wiesbaden: 377-409.
- JOHNSON, M. (2012): "The Role of Eros in Improving the Pupil", in M. JOHNSON – H. TARRANT (eds.): *Alcibiades and the Socratic Lover-Educator*, Bristol: 7-29.
- JONES, C. P. (1986): *Culture and Society in Lucian*, Cambridge, Mass.–London.
- KARAVAS, O. (2005): *Lucien et la tragédie*, Berlin.
- KUHRT, A. (2010): *The Persian Empire. A Corpus of Source from the Achaemenid Period*, London.
- LAPLACE, M. M. J. (1996): "L'ecphrasis de la parole d'apparat dans l'*Electrum* et le *De domo* de Lucien, et la representation de deux styles d'une esthétique inspire de Pindare et de Platon", *JHS* 116: 158-165.
- LIDDLE, A. (2003): *Arrian. Periplus Ponti Euxini*, Bristol.
- LIND, H. (1987): "Sokrates am Ilissos IG I³ 1 257 und die Eingangsszene des Platonischen *Phaidros*", *ZPE* 69: 15-19.
- MACHEREI, A., "Die Medizin in Curtius' Tarsos- und Mallerstadtepisode", in H. WULFRAM (ed.): *Der römische Alexanderhistoriker Curtius Rufus*, Wien: 209-217.
- MACLEOD, M. D. (1987): "Lucian's Relationship to Arrian", *Philologus* 131: 257-264.
- MARINCOLA, J. M. (1989): "Some Suggestions on the Proem and 'Second Preface' of Arrian's *Anabasis*", *JHS* 109: 186-189.
- MÖLLENDORFF, P. von (2000): *Auf der Suche nach der verlogenen Wahrheit: Lukians Wahre Geschichten*, Tübingen.
- (2006a): *Lukian. Gegen den ungebildeten Büchernarren*, Düsseldorf–Zürich.
- (2006b): "Verdichtungen des Alltags. Lukians *Meergötter-Gespräche*", in S. WODIANKA – D. RIEGER (eds.): *Mythosaktualisierung*, Berlin–New York: 227-246.
- MÖLLER, M. – MÜLLER, S. (2016): "A Modern Myth – 30STM und die Heilung der Welt nach dem Modell des $\theta\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\nu\eta\rho$ ", in C. HOFFSTADT et al. (eds.): *Nur Emotionen? Einblicke aus Medizin, Kunst und Geisteswissenschaften*, Bochum–Freiburg: 145-164.
- MOLES, J. L. (1985): "The Interpretation of the 'Second Preface' in Arrian's *Anabasis*", *JHS* 105: 162-168.
- MÜLLER, S. (2013a): "Trügerische Bilder? Lukians Umgang mit Tyrannen – und Orienttopoi in seinen Hadesszenen", *Gymnasium* 120: 169-192.
- (2013b): "Die Schule(n) der Lügen: Lukian über schlechte Vorbilder und ihre Konsequenzen", in C. HOFFSTADT – S. MÜLLER (eds.): *Von Lehrerkritik bis Lehrermord*, Bochum–Freiburg: 25-37.
- (2014a): *Alexander, Makedonien und Persien*, Berlin.
- (2014b): "Denn wer weiß schon, was nach dem Leben kommt? Lukian zu Tod und Jenseits", in C. HOFFSTADT et al. (eds.): *Der Tod in Kultur und Medizin*, Bochum–Freiburg: 151-166.
- (2014c): "Arrian and Visual Arts", *JAC* 29: 87-101.
- (2014d): "Lukian, Ammianus Marcellinus, der Ausbruch der Antoninischen Pest und die literarische Tradition von Götterzorn und Krankheit", in C. HOFFSTADT et al. (eds.): *Zwischen Vorsorge und Schicksal. Über die Beherrschbarkeit des Körpers in der Medizin*, Bochum–Freiburg: 117-134.
- (2015): "Making Money with Sacredness: The Case of Lucian's Alexander of Abonuteichos", *Global Humanities 2: Religion and Poverty*: 35-51.

- (2018): “Wie man vor Publikum untergeht. Rezeptionsblüten und rhetorisches Kentern in Lukians *De Domo*”, in K. RUFFING – K. DROß-KRÜPE (eds.): *Emas non quod opus est, sed quod necesse est*, Wiesbaden: 413–428.
- NEWBY, Z. (2002): “Testing the Boundaries of Ekphrasis: Lucian on the Hall”, *Ramus* 31: 126–135.
- NISSEN, H. (1888): “Die Abfassungszeit von Arrians *Anabasis*”, *RhM* 43: 237–257.
- OGDEN, D. (2009): “Lucian, Glycon, and the Two Alexanders”, in M. ÇEVİK (ed.): *International Symposium on Lucianus of Samosata*, Adiyaman: 279–300.
- OLIVER, J. H. (1972): “Herm at Athens with Portraits of Xenophon and Arrian”, *AJA* 76: 327–328.
- OVERWIEN, O. (2006): “Lukian als Literat, Lukian als Feind”, *RhM* 149: 185–213.
- PEARSON, L. (1960): *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great*, New York.
- PETSALIS-DIOMIDIS, A. (2010): *Truly Beyond Borders: Aelius Aristides and the Cult of Asklepios*, Oxford.
- POROD, R. (2013): *Lukian Schrift Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll. Kommentar und Interpretation*, Wien.
- RÜTTEN, U. (1997): *Phantasie und Lachkultur*, Tübingen.
- SCHLAPBACH, K. (2010): “The *logoi* of Philosophers in Lucian of Samosata”, *ClAnt* 29: 250–177.
- SCHMITT, W. O. (1984): “Bemerkungen zu Lukians Schrift *Wie man Geschichte schreiben muss*”, *Klio* 66: 443–455.
- SCHMITZ, T. (1997): *Macht und Politik*, München.
- SIDWELL, K. (2009): “The Dead Philosopher’s Society”, in A. BARTLETT (ed.): *A Lucian for Our Times*, Cambridge: 109–118.
- STADTER, P. A. (1967): “Flavius Arrianus: The New Xenophon”, *GRBS* 8: 155–161.
- (1980): *Arrian of Nicomedia*, Chapel Hill.
- STROBEL, K. (1994): “Zeitgeschichte unter den Antoninen: Die Historiker des Partherkriegs des Lucius Verus”, *ANRW II* 34.2: 1315–1360.
- SWAIN, S. (1996): *Hellenism and Empire*, Oxford.
- (2007): “The Three Faces of Lucian”, in C. LIGOTA – L. PANIZZA (eds.): *Lucian of Samosata Vivus et Redivivus*, London–Turin: 17–44.
- TONNET, H. (1988): *Recherches sur Arrien*, Vol. 1, Amsterdam.
- THOMAS, E. (2007): *Monumentality and the Roman Empire. Architecture in the Antonine Age*, Oxford.
- VICTOR, U. (1997): *Lukian von Samosata. Alexandros oder der Lügenprophet*, Leiden.
- VIDAL-NAQUET, P. (1984): “Flavius Arrien entre deux mondes”, in P. SAVINEL (ed.): *Arrien, Histoire d’ Alexandre*, Paris: 311–394.
- WEBB, R. (2009): *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*, Farnham.
- WIESEHÖFER, J. (2004): “Persien, der faszinierende Feind der Griechen: Gütertausch und Kulturtransfer in achaimenidischer Zeit”, in R. ROLLINGER – C. ULF (eds.): *Commerce and Monetary Systems in the Ancient World: Means of Transmission and Cultural Interaction*, Stuttgart: 295–310.
- WILKINS, J. (2008): “Athenaeus the Navigator”, *JHS* 128: 132–152.
- WIRTH, G. (1963): “Ἀρριανὸς ὁ φιλόσοφος”, *Klio* 41: 221–233.
- (1964): “Anmerkungen zur Arrian-Biographie: Appian – Arrian – Lukian”, *Historia* 13: 209–245.
- WHITMARSH, T. (2005): *The Second Sophistic*, Oxford.
- WOHL, V. (1999): “The Eros of Alcibiades”, *CA* 18: 349–385.

- ZECCHINI, G. (1983): “Modelli e problemi teorici della storiografia nell’ età degli Antonini”, *CS* 20: 3-31.
- ZIMMERMANN, M. (1999): “Enkomium und Historiographie”, in M. ZIMMERMANN (ed.): *Geschichtsschreibung und politischer Wandel im 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Stuttgart: 17-56.
- ZWEIMÜLLER, S. (2008): *Lukian Rhetorum praeceptor. Einleitung, Text und Kommentar*, Göttingen.

Death on the Nile: The murder of Perdiccas and the river crossing in Ancient Macedonia*

by Antonio Ignacio Molina Marín
Universidad de Alcalá de Henares
miprofeignacio@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT The death of Perdiccas, son of Orontes, during his invasion of Egypt is a fact hardly understandable, so that we can find different explanations for this event. The main goal of this paper is to establish a connection between Perdiccas' death and the importance, meaning of rivers and its crossing for the ancient Macedonians. Indeed, rivers were related to kingship. This fact is reflected in its relationship with kings of the Balkan geographical area (Polyaen. 4.12.3). Thus, we can find passages in which some of most important mythical characters were begotten by a god-river (Asteropaios, Rhesus, Orpheus, etc). Besides, sometimes even the majesty comes from the river, because the kings were crowned into the river or near one (App. Syr. 56; Justin 15. 4.2-7). In fact, the founder of the Argead royal house, Perdiccas I, became king after being saved by a river (Hdt. 8. 138). The strong connection between kings and rivers can be perceived during the crossing, because the Macedonian monarchs, especially Alexander the Great, were responsible of this act. In other words, a true king was able to protect his soldiers during the crossing, given his close link with the water. Perdiccas son of Orontes wanted to become king, therefore the disaster of Nile could be understood like ordeal which showed the will of the river. Perdiccas was not considered a true king, while Ptolemy should become one.

KEYWORDS Perdiccas; Nile; Alexander the Great; Diadochoi; Ancient Macedonian myths; Ancient religion; Orpheus.

“Mirar el río hecho de tiempo y agua
y recordar que el tiempo es otro río,
saber que nos perdemos como el río
y que los rostros pasan como el agua”.
J. L. Borges, *Arte poética*.

Recently, the successors of Alexander the Great have received a great amount of interest from scholars¹. We should be delighted, because this means progress in our subject of study, since this topic has traditionally been forgotten. One of the books that contributed to fill this gap in modern historiography is Bosworth's *The Legacy of Alexander*. However, we still need to ponder many questions about the Diadochi. One

* This paper was written during our stay at the University of Exeter as visiting scholar under the supervision of the Professor Daniel Ogden who we would like to thank his advice.

¹ BOSWORTH: 2002; WATERFIELD 2011; ROMM 2011; ROISMAN 2012; ANSON – ALONSO TRONCOSO 2013.

of these is the murder of Perdiccas during his invasion of Egypt. Although he was never a king, he was the most powerful and important Macedonian immediately after Alexander's death. Indeed, after his victory against Ariarathes², Perdiccas had a larger Empire than his prior sovereign. It is remarkable that he was murdered so easily after his defeat on the Nile (Str. 17.1.8). Ptolemaic's propaganda explained that this fact was due to Perdiccas' brutal authoritarianism:

"Perdiccas, indeed, was a man of blood (φονικὸς), one who usurped the authority of the other commanders and in general, wished to rule all by force (βιαιῶς); but Ptolemy, on the contrary, was generous (εὐεργετικὸς) and fair (ἐπιεικὴς) and granted to all the commanders the right to speak frankly (παρρησίας)". (Diod. 18. 33.3; translated by GEER 1947).

Suda (sv. "Perdiccas") also mentioned that he appeared to be despised because he was exceptionally haughty (ὑπερφρονεῖν) and boasted excessively (μεγαλῆγορον). Extreme pride or excess (*hybris*) seem to have been the words that best describe Perdiccas's personality, terms very much associated with the Greek tyrants, and this was exactly the image that our sources wanted us to believe about him. The use of propaganda was a *leitmotif* of the Diadochi relations between them, and in both texts we can distinguish the remains of Ptolemy's manipulation, who presented himself as the opposite to his hated rival. However, Perdiccas could not have been in power long enough to build a lasting image to leave to posterity. This means that what remains about him was written by the acolytes of his enemies. Although this fact is evident, the savage character of Perdiccas is still present among many scholars³.

Beyond any shadow of doubt the hijack of Alexander's hearse by Ptolemy was an important reason to understand the final fate of Perdiccas⁴, but his soldier only abandoned him after his failure in Egypt⁵. If victory was a source of legitimacy, defeat meant the opposite. Even so it does not seem sufficient motive to explain the whole course of events. In fact, Perdiccas's army was greater than Ptolemy's and the invaders still had the advantage in spite of all the misfortunes that had happened. Ptolemy had mercenaries, "many friends," garrisons, but a much smaller number of Macedonians in his army, therefore fearing a civil war among Macedonians was a remote possibility (Diod. 18.14.1; 21.7; 28.5; 33.3–4). It is not surprising that another explanation has been sought, such as the existence of Ptolemy's collaborators in Perdiccas's camp⁶. It

² Diod. 18.16.1–3; Plut. *Eum.* 3.12–14; App. *Mith.* 8; Arr. *Fr.* 1.11; Lucian. *Macr.* 13; Just. 13.6.1.

³ Cf. BOSWORTH 2002, 14: "Alienated by his autocratic savagery... It is a stereotype, contrasting with Ptolemy's magnanimity and moderation, but there is likely to be some truth behind the contrast of characters"; ROMM 2011, 182: "Many others likewise had an interest in blackening Perdiccas' name—those who colluded in his murder, inherited his power, or joined in the hunt for his partisans. Any or all of these may have helped color the portrait of Perdiccas preserved in the ancient sources. We find in those sources condemnations of Perdiccas' arrogance, high-handedness, and brutality, a portrait that at times verges on slander. Diodorus uses the word *phonikos*, or "man of slaughter," to describe him, an odd barb to throw at a soldier whose stock-in-trade was killing enemies. But when a leader has failed, the very qualities that made him a leader suddenly appear as flaws. Perdiccas' arrogance and bloody-mindedness were no more pronounced than Alexander's, indeed much less so. But Alexander, unlike the hapless Perdiccas, knew little of failure".

⁴ ROISMAN 2012, 92.

⁵ Although Diodorus (18.33.1) states that at the beginning of the invasion many soldiers were reluctant to fight against Ptolemy, this statement should be related to Ptolemaic propaganda since it was a way of proving that the invasion was unfair. Cf. Anson 2002, 383: "Desertions began almost immediately upon Perdiccas' entrance into Egypt (Diod. 18.33.1)".

⁶ WATERFIELD 2011, 64: "Ptolemy undoubtedly had a very active fifth column within Perdiccas's camp".

should also be noted that Perdiccas learned of Eumenes' victory over Neoptolemus shortly after his arrival in Egypt (Diod. 18.33.1). Consequently, he had a clear lead over his enemy. In our opinion the disaster on the Nile was the true reason for Perdiccas's demise, but this fact must be understood in the context of the crossing of the river and its importance for the ancient Macedonians and not only for the number of casualties which seems to have been exaggerated⁷. The main goal of this study is to establish a connection between Perdiccas' death and the importance of the river crossing for the ancient Macedonians.

RIVERS AND ROYALTY IN ANCIENT MACEDONIA

Water was a vital element for the ancient Greeks, given that it was the origin of the world according to their cosmogonies. Even the god Oceanus was said to have the shape of a river, which encircled the world (*Il.* 14.245). There were also rivers such as the Acheron that represented the passage from the world of the living to the dead (Verg. *A.* 6.295-6). These rivers were deities and took part in the assemblies of the gods in the Mount Olympus according to the Homeric world (*Il.* 20.4-9).

However, before starting our study about the rivers of this area, we should be aware of changes that have taken place over time, namely, that the water network is not the same as in antiquity. Water carries life in every possible way conceivable, but sometimes this is not possible without the action of human being. In ancient times the first works to drain swamps were ordered by the Macedonian kings and in the last century a large number of marshes and swamps have been drained which has radically changed the landscape⁸. Therefore, we must remember that the Macedonian rivers do not have the same shape or size as in antiquity. We know that in the time of Herodotus, (7.127) Lydias and Haliacmon must have been connected, but now not.

In Macedonia, their importance was bigger because they were the largest rivers in the Balkan Peninsula, but also because they were related to kingship. This fact is reflected in their relationship with kings of this geographical area. Therefore, we can find texts in which some of the most important mythical characters were begotten by a god-river. The Axios seems to have had a prominent role since it has the earliest mention of a hydronym in this region, although it is not linked to the Macedonians, but to the Paeonian people, one of the first settlers of the region. The *Iliad* (2.848-50) states that Axios is the river with the clearest water in the entire world. Axios was the father of Pelagon and the grandfather of Asteropaios, the opponent of Achilles and leader of the Paeonians in the poem.

The special meaning of rivers for the Paeonian royal house can be understood by reading a passage from Polyaeus (4.12.3), in which Lysimachus conducted Ariston to his father's kingdom of Paeonia; but after the royal bath in the river Astibus, Bregalnica river, that converted Ariston to king, according to the custom of his country, Lysimachus ordered his guards to take up arms. Ariston instantly mounted his horse and escaped to the land of the Dardani; and Lysimachus was left in possession of Paeonia.

⁷ Diod. 18.36.1: "Since more than two thousand men were lost" (translated by Russel M. Geer 1947). This number goes beyond whatever figure comes from Alexander's battles cf. ADAMS 2010, 211: "More than 2,000 men were drowned, more men (we are told) than Alexander had lost in all of his pitched battles combined".

⁸ Cf. BORZA 1979, 97-121.

Water is not only the origin of Paeonian kingship; it is also an essential element in the ritual of investment: the royal bath. Apparently, there is nothing similar in the Macedonian kingdom, given that the kingship does not come from a river in the Macedonian state, but it should be brought to mind that in the folktale about Perdikkas and his brothers, one river, possibly the Haliacmon, protected and supported his claim to the throne (Cf. Hdt. 8.138).

Another interesting story relating to the Paeonian kings is the funeral of Xermodigestus:

“This Xermodigestus, as Diodorus writes, ranking as the most trusted friend, I think, of Audoleon, king of the Paeonians, reveals the treasures to Lysimachus, or to some other king of Thrace (‘tis difficult for me, without books as I am, to relate all, like a god; you to whom I speak know). He revealed to the crowned head of Thrace the treasures hidden beneath the river Sargentius, which he himself, aided only by captives, had buried, turning aside the river bed, and burying the treasure beneath, then letting in the stream, and slaying the captives”.
(Diod. 21.13; translated by GEER 1947).

The slaughter of the captives was a way to conceal the whereabouts of the treasure, but was also a type of atonement for having altered the course of the river. At any rate, if the kingship came from the water, it would be logical that it returned there after the death of every king. This way we can see a cyclical process, which is a symbolic perpetuation of the relationship between Paeonians and their rivers. This passage does not present similarities with the Macedonian customs, since kings were not buried in the rivers, but in the Royal Graves of Vergina. However, we can see that the river was used like a safe to protect the king’s treasure in this story, and the Macedonians, similarly to the Greeks, thought that the river was a synonym of wealth. In this way, throwing something into the river or collecting objects which were expelled by the river was something normal in their myths⁹. Since Alexander a bronze tablet engraved with ancient letters spawned up by a sacred spring found in Xanthus (Plut. *Alex.* 17. 4), he thought the prediction of his victory was true. Finding as well as throwing something into the river had great importance for the Macedonians.

In Macedonia the rivers were also linked to wealth. At least two of the Macedonian rivers Axios and Gallikos were auriferous. The latter was called Echedorus, bearing gifts, because of the gold in its stream¹⁰. The wealth seems to have been a feature of the god river, inasmuch as one of the stories, which explains the origin of the cornucopia, tell us that it came from the river Achelous and was ripped off by Heracles during his fight against this river god¹¹. If wealth was a gift of the rivers is not unthinkable that great treasures were buried in their riverbed, given that it was a way to give them back to its rightful owner.

In addition, Rhesus who was a king of the Edonians (Thracian people) and son of the Strymon river, was called by some sources king of Thrace (Hes. *Th.* 339; Conon. *Narr.* 4; Anton. Lib. 21). There was also a river named Rhesus in Bithynia.

Concerning the Macedonian myths we can find some examples of links between kings and rivers in different stories. Haliacmon was regarded as one of the many sons of

⁹ The most beautiful story is the aquatic ordeal between Minos and Theseus. Minos throws his signet ring to the sea and asks Theseus to bring it back, if he is a true son of Poseidon. The Athenian emerged from the sea with the ring and a golden crown (cf. Paus. 1.17.3; Hyg. *Astr.* 2.5; Bacchyl. 17).

¹⁰ Scyl. *Periplus* 66.7; Str. 7.F 21.

¹¹ Ov. *Met.* 9.1-88.

Oceanus and Tethys, whose children were of no special significance for Macedonians, but his strong connection to the realm is reflected in the legend about the origins of Aigai, in which the oracle states that the city must be founded near the Haliacmon (Diod. 7.16).

We can also find the opposite case: the Macedonian hydronym was not the father but apparently just the descendant of the eponymous hero, and this might be the case of Olganos. This river is usually identified with the Arapitsa, near the actual Naoussa, and is regarded as the grandson of Macedon, eponymous hero of the Macedonians, and son of Beris (Theagenes, *FGrH* 774 F 7). An amazing bust of Olganos as a young man can be found in the Veria Museum (Greece).

Pseudo-Plutarch¹², talking about the Strymon establishes again connections between the leaders of the region and the said river:

“Strymon is a river of Thrace near a city Edonis. Formerly it was named Palaestinus from Palaestinus, son of Poseidon. For when he was at war with the neighboring cities and had fallen ill, he dispatched his son Haliacmon as commander. Fighting too recklessly, he was slain. Informed about what had transpired, Palaestinus, too, unseen by his bodyguards, through an excess of grief flung himself into the river Conozus, which from him was named Palaestinus. Strymon, son of Ares and Helice, when he had heard about Rhesus’ death and had been overcome with despair, flung himself into the river Palaestinus, which from him was renamed Strymon”.

(Ps-Plut. *Fluv.* 1156 E. Translated by BANCHICH 2010).

In all these cases the death of a man in the river entails a new name for that watercourse. So, in this way, we encounter many names for the same current of water: Conozus/Palaestinus/Strymon. The renaming of a river due to someone falling into the current is a leitmotif in the work *De Fluviis* of Pseudo-Plutarch and here the Strymon is mentioned as a Thracian river¹³, so *prima facie*, it is not possible to infer specific information in the text about Macedonia, however its deep relation to Haliacmon, a Macedonian river, allows us to identify a probable Macedonian myth. Indeed, the presence of two nearby rivers, Haliacmon and Strymon, draws our attention. The first one was, without a doubt a Macedonian river, and it is therefore appropriate to use this passage for our study. At any rate, both Palaestinus and Strymon were members of the royalty who finished their days in the same river bed.

Another text of *De Fluviis* tells a similar story, but this time with the Haliacmon and Inachus as protagonists:

“Inachus is a river of the Argive territory. Formerly it was called Carmanor. Haliacmon, by race a Tiryntian, tending sheep on Mount Coccygium and having unwittingly beheld Zeus having intercourse with Rhea, went mad and, borne away with an impulse, flung himself into the river Carmanor, which, from him, was renamed Haliacmon. It was named Inachus for a reason of this sort. Inachus, a child of Ocean, when his daughter Io had been ravished by Zeus, began rebuking the god with blasphemous insults, trailing behind him. Indignant, he sent to him Tisiphone, one of the Erinyes, tormented by whom, he flung himself into the Haliacmon River, which, from him, was renamed Inachus”.

(Ps-Plut. *Fluv.* 1160 E. Translated by BANCHICH 2010).

¹² We are following in part the analysis of MALLIOS 2011, 73-5 about these passages of Plutarch in his thesis, which we highly recommend to all readers.

¹³ Strabo considered the Strymon a natural border between Macedonia and Thrace (Str. 7.4).

We have again three different names for the same river: Carmanor–Haliacmon–Inachus¹⁴. In this occasion the myth establishes a relationship between one Macedonian river (Haliacmon) and one Argive river (Inachus), given that it was a perpetual demand of the Royal Macedonian house throughout its history to descend from Argos. Therefore, we can see in this myth substantial evidence of the existence of a deep union between monarchy and rivers. On the other hand, this myth reminds us of others like Aegeus's death and the persecution of Idas by Evenus¹⁵, so this story is a possible topos in Greek-Macedonian literature. In any case, although it is not an isolated incident of ancient Macedonia, we have to stress that it is a reverse phenomenon compared to the canonical story: it was usual for mortals to receive the name of a river and not otherwise. Indeed, in the Greek *poleis* it was not uncommon for many young people to be called after their natal rivers¹⁶, but we cannot find such a parallel in Macedonia. The adoption of a name through the death of someone is the anomaly.

At some places in Greece where there were large waterways, for example the Achelous, rivers were also the first kings or lords of the region¹⁷, although there were also exceptions, such as the *autochthonoi* in Athens¹⁸. By contrast, when the seed proceeded from a river god, a patrilineal conception of identity was established, because it came from a masculine element, and not from the earth, a feminine element, according to the Greek thought. The god-river was masculine, so this could be the reason why it was always renamed with the sacrifice of men. Not so with the sources and springs, which were often associated with maidens who died giving their name to the sacred waters¹⁹.

A similar case can be found in the legend about Pindus²⁰, son of the king Lycaon. It is said that when Pindus died, he gave his name to the river (Ael. NA10.48), although in later versions, the place that received a new name was given to a mountain and not a river (Tz. *Chilia*. 4. 329-338).

There has been some dispute about the origins of Orpheus²¹, but in any case, he was related to rivers, especially after his death:

“There is also a river called Helikon [in Pieria]. After a course of seventy-five stades the stream hereupon disappears under the earth. After a gap of about twenty-two stades the water rises again, and under the name of Baphyras instead of Helikon flows into the sea as a navigable river. The people of Dion (Dium) say that at first this River flowed on land throughout its course. But, they go on to say, the women who killed Orpheus wished to wash off in it the blood-stains, and there

¹⁴ There are not evidences about the term Conozus, but there are for Carmanor. It was a semi Cretan god of harvest that was one of Demeter's flings, and its etymology may derive from *keiro*, i.e., cutting / shearing, action proper of shepherds as the Haliacmon of this story.

¹⁵ Apollod. 1.7.8-9 (Evenus); *Epit.* 1.10 (Aegeus' death).

¹⁶ LARSON 2007a, 152.

¹⁷ LARSON 2007b, 66: “In myth, the rivers figured as ancestors and primordial figures, the first kings in the land. Examples include Peneus in Thessaly, Inachus in Argos, Asopus in Phlius, and Scamander in the Troad”.

¹⁸ LORAUX 1996.

¹⁹ DOWDEN 2000, 43.

²⁰ OGDEN 2011, 51ff.

²¹ Plut. *Alex.* 2; Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.15 (Thracian); Conon, *FGrH* 26 F1, 45; Paus. 9.30.4 (Macedonian). Cf. GUTHRIE 1993, 45; HERRERO DE JAUREGUI 2010, 84.

at the River sank underground, so as not to lend its waters to cleanse manslaughter”²².

(Paus. 9.30.8. Translated by JONES 1918).

The rivers' sorrow for the death of Orpheus is logical, because his father was another river, Eager (Apollod. 1.3.2). Indeed, as Orpheus played music he was able to stop the course of a river (Sen. *Her.F.* 569-79). The existence of underground rivers was a recurrent theme in Greek ethnography²³, although the reason for the underground escape of the Helikon is more difficult to explain. There is an explanation in the myth itself i.e. the desire of the river not to be contaminated by the blood of Orpheus, is what led it to take refuge in the depths of the earth. In all the above cases the introduction of a foreign substance into the aquatic element meant a change in the onomastic, this time the river was almost polluted by the poet's blood. After all, contamination is also a process of change in which a natural state is temporary or permanently abandoned, however this was not the case since it was not consumed. Helikon fled not only at the possibility of coming into contact with Orpheus's blood that women carried on their hands, but rather for the crime that it represented, because the river did not act like a mere purifier of dirt, the blood was "an offering", which was given by them, on the condition that they were absolved from their criminal act²⁴. Possibly, this would be the reason why crossing a river was not allowed for those who had committed violent crimes²⁵. The only way Helikon could prevent this unwanted exchange was by running underground. An intrinsic quality of the river was its movement: therefore a significant change in its channel meant a change of name. This time the variation was a result of the action, but the indirect cause of it had once again been an object about to be introduced into its waters.

The murder was discovered because another river, Meles, was the place where the head of Orpheus was found (*Orphicorum Fragmenta* no. 115, ed. Kern). And finally, the river Sys was the reason for Orpheus's transfer from Libethra to Dium, which resulted in him becoming a symbol of Macedonian religion (Paus.9. 30.11).

Again, Orpheus was related to a river in a contextual way. But beyond any doubt, all these passages show us that the river was a symbol of kingship in the whole geographical area of the Ancient Macedonia. Only in this way, can we understand why Seleucus had to create stories to ensure his rights to the throne, placing all of them in the course of one river²⁶. We refer to his coronation in the Euphrates²⁷ as well as the loss, near or in the same place, of the ring given to him by his mother, who had augured his royal destiny²⁸: he would become king over the land where he lost the ring, the lands bathed by the river Euphrates.

²² Cf. Ov. *Met.* 11.47, states that the rivers increased their flows because of the tears shed for the death of Orpheus.

²³ Hdt. 2.33; Arist. *Mete.* 351a 9-11; Plb. 12.4d; Sen. *QN* 3; Plin. *NH* 5.51; Str. 6.2.9; Paus. 5.7.3; Procop. *Aed.* 2. 2. Cf. Peretti 1994.

²⁴ The river Anigrus acquired its bad smell when Heracles washed the venom of himself in it after his battle with the Hydra (Paus. 5.5.10). Cf. OGDEN 2013: 59.

²⁵ Asch. *Sept.* 602-604; Eur. *HF* 1295-1297; Apollod. 2.8.3.

²⁶ We would like to thank to Daniel Ogden for show us the relevance of these passages.

²⁷ App. *Syr.* 56.

²⁸ Appian, *Syr.* 56: "Also that his mother saw in a dream that whatever ring she found she should give him to wear, and that he should be king at the place where he should lose the ring. She did find an iron ring with an anchor engraved on it, and he lost it near the Euphrates" (Translated by H. White 1972); Just. 15.4.2-7.

THE MACEDONIAN KING AND THE CROSSING OF RIVER

There is another context in which the Macedonian king had a strong relationship with the rivers: the crossing. In fact, the fight against the greatest rivers of Asia was a leitmotiv of Alexander's conquest. Almost all these passages are part of Arrian's *Anabasis* and have as a main character Alexander the Great. Alexander's interest in geography has been a question commonly accepted²⁹, although sometimes with not enough criticism, and the rivers were one of the aspects he was most curious about: He was one of the first kings on record to have crossed the Danube (Arr. *An.* 1.4.5); he crossed the river Granicus to defeat the Persians in his first battle, despite the objections of Parmenion (Arr. *An.* 1.13.3); he bathed in the cold waters of Cydnus being close to death because of fevers contracted (Arr. *An.* 2.4.7); it is said that he even organized an expedition to the sources of the Nile³⁰; he defeated the strong streams of the Tigris (Arr. *An.* 3.7.4); he worried about the identity of the Tanais and the Jaxartes (Str. 11.7.4); he defeated Poros at Hydaspes after crossing the river that gave name to this battle; he stopped at the Hyphasis when his troops mutinied because they did not want to cross it (Arr. *An.* 4.26); the king and his court were also interested in the hydrography of India, especially the possibility that the Indus and the Nile were the same river (Str. 15.1.25); one possibility defended by Alexander at first, but which he ultimately rejected (Arr. *An.* 6.1.2-3; Str. 15.1.25); perhaps for this reason he showed interest in navigating the Indus Delta (Arr. *An.* 6.1.5), being on the verge of drowning like his ancestor Achilles (Diod. 17.97.3); he made sacrifices to allow his fleet to have a safe journey (Arr. *Ind.* 18.11); Palacopas and Euphrates courses were also explored by the Macedonian (Arr. *An.* 7.21).

Crossing a river seems to have been a feat comparable to a military victory, and therefore it must have played a prominent role in the exaltation of Macedonian leadership³¹.

Some recent studies have appeared about Alexander's logistics in order to cross³². However, the ideological implications of crossing and its ritual have been ignored, as well as the key role of the king in this process. Beyond the use of bridges, tent skins or water skins, it is clear that a type of ceremony must have existed which we need to study. We refer to the sacrifices that were made before and after crossing a river. Indeed allusions to such acts in the sources are numerous: regarding the Danube³³; the Indus³⁴; Hydaspes³⁵ and Acesines³⁶. In all these cases, Alexander himself performed the sacrifice.

²⁹ BODSON 1991, 127-138; ALVAR 2000, 83-98.

³⁰ Curt. 4.8.3; Luc. *Phar.* 10.272-75; John Lydus *De mens.* 4.68; Phot. *Bibli.Cod.* 249, 441 B. The veracity of this travel is denied by many scholars: PÉDECH 1984, 403; PEARSON 1960, 31: "It is hardly necessary to believe on such evidence that Callisthenes had actually been to Ethiopia"; THOMSON 1965, 136: "Unreliable seem two late statements that, inspired by his old tutor, he did in fact send explorers, who already saw the mountain rains that swell the river"; BOSWORTH 1993, 418: "Callisthenes' expedition is a near absurdity, and indeed it is impossible to countenance any new discoveries in Alexander's reign". In pro of its historical veracity cf. BURSTEIN 1976, 144: "He was aware of the potential problems that might arise on Egypt's southern frontier".

³¹ Cf. Curt. 7.18.3: "Then, if you defeat the whole human race, you will be ready to make war on woods, on snow, on rivers, on wild animals", translated by ROLFE 1962.

³² BLOEDOW 2002, 57-75; ROLLINGER 2013, 74ff.

³³ Arr. *An.* 1.4.5.

³⁴ Arr. *Ind.* 18.11.

³⁵ Arr. *An.* 5.28.4.

³⁶ Arr. *An.* 5.29.5.

The first example, the crossing of the Hellespont, relates to this issue:

“According to the prevalent story Alexander made from Elaeus for the Achaean harbour, and steered the admiral’s ship himself when he crossed, sacrificing a bull to Posidon and the Nereids in the midst of the Hellespont strait, and pouring into the sea a drink offering from a golden bowl”.
(Arr. *An.* 1.11.6, translated by BRUNT 1976).

This passage is usually compared to Xerxes’ crossing of the Hellespont³⁷ (Hdt. 7.54), but in our opinion Alexander was not emulating the Achaemenid king, but was making a Macedonian sacrifice similar to others he had made every time his army crossed a river³⁸. Although this time it involved a sea, the ritual was exactly the same, given that rivers and seas were Oceanus’s children (Hes. *The.* 337-70)³⁹. Furthermore, Xerxes himself renamed the Hellespont as a salt river (Hdt 7.35 ἁλμυρῷ ποταμῷ). An example of the same ritual is offered by Euripides (*Hel.* 1578-1589). Therefore, the sacrifices of transit were the same for both rivers and seas, because as mentioned earlier in the Greek mentality, all waters were part of the Ocean, and Hellespont was still seen as a river god. Moreover, Arrian clearly says that it was Alexander who sacrificed and steered the ship. The act of personally directing the ship shows that the result was in his hands. The king of Macedonia was the ferryman who communicated both sides of the river.

However, the data are scarce regarding both the process and its meaning, given that the sources are content simply to mention the sacrifices most of the time, although we do not have a complete description of the ritual in all its phases. Thus, we discover how Alexander offered his gifts to the rivers before or after he crossed. It is logical to assume that the sacrifices would have occurred twice: during the crossing (Arr. *An.* 6.3.1) and after leaving the river bed (Arr. *An.* 1. 4.5). One explanation is that they were a type of agreement, according to which there would be a second sacrifice in gratitude for a quiet crossing without great difficulty⁴⁰. A process that conformed to the mentality of *do ut des*, which prevailing in ancient Greek religion. The first sacrifice would be carried out to change the will of the deity who lived in the river, and established a second offering that would be fulfilled if the crossing had been made safely. Therefore, the sources point out that the sacrifice was performed after landing on the other shore, showing gratitude for a transit without complications. The scarcity of references in our sources about the second sacrifice is explained by a possible confusion with the former; it could have been suppressed because it was deemed repetitive or simply it was cancelled because the crossing of the Macedonian troops was not easy.

Another issue is to determine how was the ceremonial by which the Macedonian king established contact with the river god. Initially, we can assume, without too much risk in presupposing, a libation with water from the river itself or with the introduction of a part of the offeror’s body, the hands, in the stream⁴¹. Therefore, the person who

³⁷ INSTINSKY 1949, 46-53; ZAHRT 1996, 134ff; BRIANT 2002, 548-9; SQUILLACE 2010, 78; 264; Cf. BRIQUEL – DESNIER 1983, 22-30.

³⁸ HOLTZ 2005, 129, states that this way Alexander symbolized the beginning of the conquest of the Persian Empire, and with the same rituals he established the limits of his great empire.

³⁹ Cf. Arr. *An.* 1.13.6, Alexander considers the Granicus as a little stream (σ μικρὸν ῥέμμα) as he compares it to the Hellespont.

⁴⁰ Cf. Hom. *Od.* 11.30-50, during the Nekyia, Odysseus offers Tiresias a first sacrifice when he arrived to the Hades, but perhaps he has to offer a second sacrifice, when he returned home to give him and the other ghosts an incentive to release him from the underworld.

⁴¹ Hes. *Op.* 737-42: “Never cross the sweet-flowing water of ever-rolling rivers afoot until you have prayed, gazing into the soft flood, and washed your hands in the clear, lovely water. Whoever crosses a

made the sacrifice and the entity that received it, were temporarily bonded by contact of their bodies. By becoming familiar with the divine nature of the river, a safe crossing was guaranteed, because briefly through contact, they were one being.

Thereafter, the king proceeded with the offering. The sacrifice to the river god could be direct, i.e. the victim was thrown directly into the water to drown; he could offer the blood of an animal, or of course make some modest sacrifice on an altar and throw objects into the river.

Throwing a victim into the river current to drown recalls myths that we have previously seen, in which the drowned person changed the name of the river that they fell into. Now we can understand that the drowning played the role of a symbolic sacrifice to the river. The intensity and strength of it, since human sacrifices were the most powerful of all⁴², made the offering and receptor perpetually intertwined, which resulted in the name being altered. Change was not just a memorial tribute to the dead, because the body of the deceased was absorbed by the river, therefore merging into one being only. We cannot find examples of human sacrifices to the river outside the mythical world. However, as Daniel Ogden has shown⁴³, authors such as Julian (*Ep.* 82) associated the deaths of Hector, son of Parmenio, and Antinous. This was possible because both were lovers of their master, drowned in the same river, the Nile, but unlike Antinous, Hector's death seemed to have been an accident (*Curt.* 4.8.7ff; 6.9.27).

The second type is characterized by sacrificial bloodshed in honor of the river. One of the rites performed could also have included *Sphagia*⁴⁴, that is to say, bloody sacrifices. The name comes from σφάζω (to cut throat) which shows clearly how the animal was killed⁴⁵. In this case, either an animal or its blood were thrown into the water, therefore water replaced the ground as a vessel for the blood. Again it sought to interact with the receptor of the offering by similarity, namely, it was thought that the combination of two liquid elements would be more easily assimilated. The way in which the blood and water mixed, determined whether or not the crossing was feasible⁴⁶. One of the favorite victims for rivers appeared to have been the bull (βούς). This animal shape was curiously a favorite for rivers when taking on a physical body. Another common sacrifice was the horse⁴⁷, also very related to springs and currents of water in the Greek myths⁴⁸.

The third type of offering could have been to throw an object of great value such as a cup of precious metal⁴⁹, probably the same one with which the initial libation was made. Recently, S. Torallas Tovar and K. A. Worp have stated that among the Greek papyri

river with hands unwashed of wickedness, the gods are angry with him and bring trouble upon him afterwards" (translated by EVELYN-WHITE 1967).

⁴² An example of human sacrifices can be seen in *Hdt.* 7.114, Persians sacrificed nine women and nine men in Ennea Odi. Cf. HENRICHs 1981, 195-235; HUGHES 1991; BONNECHERE 1994.

⁴³ OGDEN 2011, 171-73.

⁴⁴ ZIEHEN 1929, cols.1169-79; EKROTH 2002, 242-7.

⁴⁵ JAMESON 2002, 203: "On the island of Mykonos, in an annual sacrifice for the river Acheloios, the throats of eight lambs were pierced (s[phat]tet[ai]) so that the blood would flow into the river while three other victims, a full-grown sheep and two lambs, were killed for him at an altar (DITTENBERGER SIG3 1024, lines 36-7)".

⁴⁶ *Hdt.* 6.76; 7.113; *X. An.* 4.3.18-19.

⁴⁷ WASER 1909, col. 2777.

⁴⁸ *Il.* 21.124-132. Cf. LARSON 2007a, 152-153.

⁴⁹ We are almost certain that the hair of those who reached maturity was also offered (*A. Ch.* 6; Paus. 8.41.3), as well as honey, animals, but never wine (*Theoc.* v.12, 53, 139, 149; Servius, *On* 4.380 Virgil's *Georgics*, *Eclogues* V.74) although this was the system used by Midas to capture Silenus, namely, he added wine to its waters to intoxicate him (*Theopomp.* *FGH* 115 F 75; Paus.1.4.5).

from Montserrat, a fragment was found, in which Alexander made the same libation with a golden cup mentioned by Arrian⁵⁰. Given that this type of ritual seems to have been very common during the ceremony of crossing, it could be another Macedonian king and not Alexander, but the fragment reveals to us that throwing objects into the stream was an essential part of the ritual.

Moreover, nothing prevented these options happening together at the same time, as in the crossing of the Hellespont. It was the risk of the crossing and the importance of the river that determined the type and value of offering, therefore the greater the difficulty the bigger the object sacrificed had to be.

All cases examined bear a strong resemblance to the sacrifices called *diabateria* (διαβατήρια) that were intended not only for the rivers, but also for the land borders, and they seem to have been frequent during military campaigns, when the army was out of its homeland⁵¹. The Spartan *diabateria* have similarities with the sacrifices made by the Macedonian kings, but there is significant difference among them: if the Spartan king could not impose his will over the waters, he had to come back. Besides this Spartan ritual was celebrated in other places such as crossroads, and if the sacrifice was bad it always meant the end of the military expedition (Hdt. 6.76; Th. 5.54.2; 55.3; 116.1; X. *HG.* 3.1.17; 4.15; 4.4.5; 7.7). The most famous example was the struggle of king Cleomenes against the river Erasinus:

“As Cleomenes was seeking divination at Delphi, the oracle responded that he would take Argos. When he came with Spartans to the river Erasinus, which is said to flow from the Stymphalian lake (this lake issues into a cleft out of sight and reappears at Argos, and from that place onwards the stream is called by the Argives Erasinus) —when Cleomenes came to this river he offered sacrifices (ἐσφαγιάζετο) to it. The omens were in no way favorable for his crossing, so he said that he honored the Erasinus for not betraying its countrymen, but even so the Argives would not go unscathed. Then he withdrew and led his army seaward to Thyrea, where he sacrificed a bull to the sea and carried his men on shipboard to the region of Tiryns and to Nauplia”.
(Hdt. 6.76, translated by GODLEY 1971).

However, in cases in which Alexander faced this problem, he chose to continue with the sacrifices until they were propitious. An example of this occurred near Ciropolis when Alexander was preparing to attack the Scythians:

“But when he sacrificed with a view to crossing, the omens were not favourable. Though much annoyed by this, still he restrained himself and stayed where he was. But as the Scythians did not give up, he sacrificed again with a view to crossing, and Aristander the prophet again said that danger to him was portended. Alexander replied that it was better to go to any extremity of danger than, after subduing almost the whole of Asia, to be a laughing-stock to Scythians, as Darius the father of Xerxes had been long ago. Yet Aristander refused to interpret the sacrifices in any way contrary to the signs from heaven because Alexander desired to hear something different”.
(Arr. *An.* 4.4.3, translated by BRUNT 1976).

Although in this sacrifice Alexander was aided by Aristander the final decision belonged to him and for this reason the Macedonian army crossed the river.

⁵⁰ TORALLAS TOVAR – WOPR 2014, 64ff.

⁵¹ PRITCHETT 1974, 68; MONTERO 2012, 168.

There is no doubt that the mutiny of Hyphasis was an important reason to put an end to Alexander's conquests, but according to Arrian (*An.* 5.28.4-5), the bad omens were another cause. This time, due to the lack of support, the king changed his mind and decided to abandon his plans. Crossing a river without its authorization was very dangerous⁵², but it was even worse without the presence of the king (*Arr. An.* 6.12.2. Cf. *Curt.* 7.7.24). Without their king, crossing the same rivers seemed like an impossible challenge. In a word, the soldiers didn't just think the Macedonian king had to take an active role in the sacrifices, they believed that he made the passage possible.

The Romance of Alexander offers us an example in which we can see that his duty was to choose the way the river would be crossed:

"Next day reached a very large river, so broad that it took three days to cross it. When they came to it and looked at this immense divided, Alexander was at a loss. Alexander sat down on the bank and ordered the men to build a rampart across it. When this had been done according to Alexander's plan for crossing the river the water suddenly dried up and became sand instead. Then Alexander saw how to cross the river. He ordered square containers to be constructed of wooden planks. These were then placed on the river-bed, and when the first one was in place, it was filled with stones so that it would not move. Next, he ordered his men to bring very long planks, 24 to 36 feet long and to place them on the first box, stretching over the second. So they put them on top of the wood, and nailed them down. Then he put down in the stream of sand a second box 24 feet from the first, and filled this with stones; and that likewise remained immobile. And so with the third and subsequent ones, until they had bridged the river. It took the army sixty-six days to cross the river. When they had crossed it, Alexander named it the River the Sand; it flowed three days with water and three days with sand"⁵³.

This text is part of Alexander's legend, but even so it is very useful to us, because it shows that Alexander, that is to say the Macedonian king, was the responsible one in this sort of action, namely, he was the ferryman of his army. The relationship between rivers and the Macedonian dynasty was not limited to a symbolical origin of monarchy, but was also the role of every king to defeat their streams.

Interestingly, these ceremonies coexisted with different methods and techniques of crossing: from swollen skins of the Assyrians to the bridges of boats. Technological progress did not seem to mean the abandonment of this way of thinking. In fact, possessing the means to cross the physical barrier that was the river did not imply that mental barriers had vanished.

On the other hand, the aforementioned interest of Alexander for the rivers has been seen as evidence of his activity as an explorer. Nevertheless, these sacrifices allows us to infer that knowing the name of the river was a necessary element of the ritual, so that the Macedonians could discuss whether a stream of water was a river or its tributary was because, they needed to know to whom river-god they were making sacrifices⁵⁴, as in the same way, someone who prays to one god needs to know the name of this divinity before invoking him. The name is an essential element of every ritual and, of course, of ancient magic⁵⁵.

⁵² The most famous crossing against the will of a river was made by Xerxes. Cf. *Hdt.* 7.35.

⁵³ STONEMAN 1991, 29-30, translated by himself.

⁵⁴ *Arr. An.* 5.6; 6.1; 7.7.

⁵⁵ LUCK 2006, XV.

INTERPRETATIONS ON THE RITUAL

At this point we need to ask ourselves what the goal of the Macedonian king was when he made these rituals:

— 1) It is unquestionable that the sacrifices had a clear purpose, and this was to ensure the crossing from one river bank to another. The crossing was a moment of maximum risk for the soldiers, and the possibility of drowning would worry them, because if the waters of the stream swallowed their bodies, they would become the ghosts of the unburied. The danger was greater when the crossing occurred without the authorization of the river, given that even the mere fact of crossing by bridges or similar forms was seen as an act of *hybris*, arrogance, which could cause the river god's anger⁵⁶. But this danger can only be weathered by paying a price. Offerings for Charon⁵⁷ or the sandal that Jason lost to help cross Hera are some examples of this custom⁵⁸.

— 2) Coming in contact with water means to face the purest form of change. There were many stories of transformation or metamorphosis, by drinking from sources or by bathing in rivers⁵⁹. It is possible, although it is only a hypothesis, that among the demands to the river god was not to change the nature of the men who crossed.

— 3) There is one last possibility and this is to appease the river. The river gods were protecting elements of the people living around them. Peleus sacrificed to Spercheios with the intention of seeking the return of his son Achilles⁶⁰, because it was thought that this river veiled and protected those born near the water. The force of the river was something that Achilles felt when Scamander – Xanthos tried to drown him for filling its riverbed with the bodies of the Trojans (*Il.* 21.235-9). Identifying natural divinities with the culture that develops in its geographical area seems to have been a constant in the ancient world. The army that entered a foreign land had in mind that not only must it fight against their inhabitants, but also against the geographical space. After all, an invading army not only wanted to subject men, but the space they occupied too. Indeed, in a speech by Agricola himself, the adverse nature (rain, mountains, rivers or seas) was presented as another enemy, which he had to fight to win, because the geography of Britain benefited the Roman's enemies and not the invaders⁶¹. Cleomenes of Sparta also felt the Erasinios protected Argos from his army when he did not obtain good omens to cross the river (Hdt. 6.76). Nature protected its

⁵⁶ Hdt. 1.205, Cyrus' crossing of the Araxes; 4.122, Darius' crossing of the Tanais; 7.24, Xerxes makes a canal in the Athos; 7.35; Plut. *Syll.* 27.8-28.1. Luculus cross the bridge on the Euphrates like a *hybris* act. Cf. Verg. *A.* 8. 728; S. *Italicus* 3.355ff; 12.695-7; Plin. *NH* 5.85. Probably Alexander's order to destroy the *kattarraktai* of the river Tigris, was not motivated to improve the navigability, but because he considered an unnatural act to control the stream of the river (Arr. *An.* 7.7.7). About this topic are interesting the works of BRIANT 2008, 155-218.

⁵⁷ Lucian, *Charon* 11; Prop. 4.11.7-8; *AP.* 7.67.1-6.

⁵⁸ A.R 1.10; Hyg. *fab.* 12;

⁵⁹ Cf. Arist. *HA* 519a; Plin. *NH* 31.13-14; Hdt. 3.23. The major change for a human being because of the water was the immortality, which was obtained after drinking of Fountain of Youth.

⁶⁰ *Il.* 23.140-51.

⁶¹ Tac. *Ag.* 33. 2; 3; 5. Cf. BORCA 1996, 337-340.

inhabitants, who not only had a better knowledge of the terrain, but also its protection. Therefore, to conquer a people meant to also conquer their space and geography, that they were subjected too. Thus, when the river facilitated movement, it could be seen as a sign of support to the conquerors. If it did not, as in the case of the crossing of the Tigris and Gureus (Arr. *An.* 4.25), it was seen as a resistance to the conquest as well as to the crossing. This is a possible interpretation of Cyrus the Younger crossing the river Thapsacus:

“The people of Thapsacus said that this river had never been passable (διαβατός) on foot except at this time, but only by boats; and these Abrocomas had now burned, as he marched on ahead of Cyrus, in order to prevent him from crossing. It seemed, accordingly, that here was a divine intervention, and that the river had plainly retired before Cyrus because he was destined to be king (Κύρῳ ὡς βασιλεύσοντι)”.
(X. *An.* 1.4.18, translated by BROWNSON 1968).

Nature also submitted to Alexander's will, the story about mount Climax is evidence of submission to the foreign conqueror:

“Encouraged by this prophecy, Alexander hastened to clear up the seacoast as far as Cilicia and Phoenicia. His rapid passage along the coasts of Pamphylia has afforded many historians material for bombastic and terrifying description. They imply that by some great and heaven-sent good fortune (θεία τινὶ τύχῃ) the sea retired to make way for Alexander, although at other times it always came rolling in with violence from the main, and scarcely ever revealed to sight the small rocks which lie close up under the precipitous and riven sides of the mountain. And Menander, in one of his comedies, evidently refers jestingly to this marvel:
— How Alexander-like, indeed, this is; and if I seek someone, Spontaneous he'll present himself; and if I clearly must Pass through some place by sea, this will lie open to my steps. Alexander himself; however, made no such prodigy out of it in his letters, but says that he marched by way of the so-called Ladder, and passed through it, setting out from Phaselis”.
(Plut. *Alex.* 17.3-4, translated by PERRIN 1971).

Strabo (14.3.9) and Arrian (*An.* 1.26.1-2) describe the episode in a more rational way, but there is no doubt that the version which circulated in Alexander's time was that of Plutarch tells us, otherwise Menander would not have parodied it. The sea retreated from Alexander as if it was making a bow, just like the Thapsacus had done to Cyrus. The two texts have an unquestionable resemblance between them, and were definitely inspired by a passage from the *Iliad* (13. 27-31) in which the sea bowed to Poseidon recognizing his sovereignty over itself. The river that allowed transit was a river that gave to the Macedonian king its approval to conquer the lands, which were irrigated by its waters⁶².

In a word, the crossing of rivers was not a trivial matter for the Macedonians. During this crucial moment, the person in charge, the king, showed his charisma, legitimacy and the favor of gods. So what if he failed in his goal?

PERDICCAS CROSSING THE NILE

⁶² Cf. DESNIER 1995, 31: “Alexandre est donc bien vainqueur de l'eau et reconnu comme prétendant légitime”.

It is logical to assume that as the Macedonian army was separated, the general in chief was the person in charge to organize the crossing and to make the sacrifices. His authority was tested in every transit, but to a lesser degree, because he was a subject of his king. However, in Perdiccas's case he was an aspirant to the throne. He wore Alexander's ring (Curt. 10.5.4; cf. 10.6.4–5; Just. 12.15.12; Diod. 17.117.3; 18.2.4; Nepos. *Eum.* 2.1) and was married to his sister, Cleopatra (cf. Arr. *Succ.* 1.26). Besides, he was the lord protector of his son and wife (*LM* 112,118; Diod. 18.23.2). He was a king without a crown⁶³, and if Perdiccas had buried the body of Alexander in Vergina, he would have become a true king⁶⁴.

Although this ideological paraphernalia we have studied was exclusively associated to the Argeads, we should not underestimate the implications of his wedding to Cleopatra. The Argead dynasty worked like a royal clan throughout its history, so only its members possessed the sacral power and the charismatic authority⁶⁵. Perdiccas was, as regent, the person in charge of protecting the rights of the clan and through his wedding to Cleopatra, almost a full member of the royal family. It should be recalled, that this wedding was the detonator of the first war of the Diadochi (Just. 13.6.6; Diod. 18.23.3; Arr. *Succ.* 1.21).

From that point of view, Perdiccas was almost a king who was testing his legitimacy in every attempt at crossing the Nile. Although a puppet king existed, Philip III, all the Macedonian soldiers knew who was in charge of that expedition and who would be responsible for failing.

Some years ago Desnier drew our attention to a number of cases in which several kings or aspirants to the throne were destroyed after crossing a river⁶⁶. The river always acted like a judge, and only gave its favor to the most deserving of them. It was a river ordeal⁶⁷, in which one of them received the approval of the river and the other his rightful punishment⁶⁸. According to Greenwalt, in ancient Macedonia there was also a fire oracle⁶⁹, and as is well known, water and fire in antiquity were the main ordeal elements. Therefore, it is not impossible that the Macedonians considered the water in this way, because they also had ordeal by fire.

One of the cases studied by Desnier was the first king of Macedonia, Perdiccas I. Herodotus tells the story of Perdiccas, the youngest of three siblings who was blessed by the favor of the gods and persecuted by men of the king of Upper Macedonia. During the persecution a river overflowed, allowing Perdiccas and his brothers to arrive at safe territory where they would find their kingdom. Somehow the river supported the rights of Perdiccas over the region. In gratitude, Perdiccas and his descendants sacrificed annually to the river as their savior (σωτήρ):

⁶³ Curt. 10.7.8: “*Stirpe regia genitus*”.

⁶⁴ HECKEL 1992, 144: “With the Kings securely in his possession and the army favourably disposed towards him on account of his recent successes in Kappadokia and Pisidia, Perdikkas was prepared to take two final steps to the kingship: union with Kleopatra and the ceremonious return of Alexander's body to Makedonia. What army would oppose the man returning to Makedonia with the son of Philip II, the wife, son and sister—indeed, the very body—of Alexander himself?”.

⁶⁵ ANSON 2009, 278.

⁶⁶ DESNIER 1995.

⁶⁷ GLOTZ 1906; DETIENNE 1967, 35–58.

⁶⁸ Desnier identifies this support with the Xvarenah or “light of glory” a concept from the Zoroastrian religion.

⁶⁹ GREENWALT 1994, 7. Cf. Hdt. 7.111; Arist. *Mir.* 842a.

“When the king heard this, he was angered, and sent riders after them to slay them. There is, however, in that land a river, to which the descendants from Argos of these men offer sacrifice as their deliverer (σωτήρι). This river, when the sons of Temenus had crossed it, rose in such flood that the riders could not cross”. (Hdt. 8.138; translated by GODLEY 1969).

It is reasonable to ask: were these sacrifices related to the ritual of crossing? The name of the river that saved Perdiccas is unknown, although it is generally identified as the Haliacmon⁷⁰. We are inclined to think that the sacrifice involved the throwing of a horse into the river. This makes sense, given that Perdiccas escaped from his persecutors on horse-back. This animal was very much related to springs and it is well-known that Pegasus was the creator of the fountain Hippocrene (Anton. Lib. 9; Ov. *Met.* 5.256). Indeed its name recalls a spring (*pegai*).

If the mythology teaches that the sacred horses came from the sacred waters, to offer one of these animals to the current of Haliacmon could have been a good way of showing that the king was grateful to the river. Thus, one of the sacred white horses of Cyrus was drowned in the river Gyndus (Hdt. 1.189) and Xerxes sacrificed white horses to the river Strymon when he was in the region⁷¹. Arrian never mentioned the sacrifice of a horse by Alexander, but it can be found in a fragment of a papyrus:

“The Persians 60 myriads... Alexander, seeing the crisis at hand, was in agony and turned to prayers, invoking Thetis and Nereids and Nereus and Poseidon and ordered a four-horse chariot to be brought up and thrown into the sea. And he sacrificed too at night”. (POxy. 1798 = *FGrH* 148 F 44 Col II)⁷².

In addition, according to *Alexander's Romance* (2.15 recension alpha), Alexander escaped from Darius on horseback, crossing a frozen river, Stranga. Darius sent riders in order to catch him, but they could not follow him because the ice had melted due to sunlight, after Alexander had passed by. Again, the river protected in some way a horse rider, so we might wonder if the presence of a horse in these stories (Perdiccas I; Alexander) could be a *topos* related to the ritual, which does not reproduce a real event, namely, a flight by horse. In other words, the myth is based on the ritual.

The overflowing of the river in the Herodotus' story is the opposite phenomenon to those seen so far, that is to say, the decrease in strength of current or the lowering of the water level, but again emphasizes the deep connection between the water and the Macedonian kings and demonstrates that their offerings to the rivers could have demanded much more than *diabateria* from the Spartans kings. The tale of the three brothers may have had a propagandistic goal intended for the Greek *poleis*, and also unquestionably within Macedonia itself. The power came to Argeads from the same place that their mythical ancestors had received it before them⁷³.

Returning to the crossing of Perdiccas, son of Orontes, we can see the facts presented in different ways by the sources (Paus. 1.6.3; Arr. *Succ.* 1.28; Plut. *Eum.* 8.2–3; Just. 13.8.1–2), but Diodorus gives us the most detailed version:

⁷⁰ MALLIOS 2011, 73 (Haliacmon); HAMMOND 1972, 433–6; II 1979: 6–8, Beres (Tripotamos); ZAHNT 1984, 325–68 (Haliacmon). Cf. HATZOPOULOS 2003, 206–7.

⁷¹ Hdt. 7.113.

⁷² Cf. HAMMOND 1994, 20–21.

⁷³ Despite that fact, DESNIER 1995, 40 thinks all these ordeals comes from the Iranian tradition, he has to admit that “Auquel cas il faudrait estimer que, bien qu'en foui plus profondément que dans le monde indo-iranien, le mythe du descendant des eaux était également actif en Grèce du Nord”.

“But Perdiccas, seeing the difficulty caused by the current, in an effort to break the downward rush of the river, placed the elephants in line on the left, thus mitigating the strength of the current, and placed on the right side the horsemen, through whose agency he kept catching the men who were being carried away by the river and bringing them safe to the other side. A peculiar and surprising thing took place during the crossing of this army, namely, that after the first men had crossed in safety, those who tried to cross afterwards fell into great danger. For although there was no visible cause, the river became much deeper, and, their bodies being totally submerged, they would one and all become completely helpless. When they sought the cause of this rise, the truth could not be found by reasoning. Some said that somewhere upstream a canal that had been closed had been opened and, joining with the river, had made the ford deeper; others said that rain falling in the regions above had increased the volume of the Nile. It was, however, neither of these things, but what happened was that the first crossing of the ford had been free from danger because the sand at the crossing had been undisturbed, but in the course of the other crossings by the horses and elephants which had gone over before and then by the infantry, the sand, trodden by their feet and set in motion by the current, was carried down stream, and the place of crossing being hollowed out in this way, the ford became deeper in the middle of the river. Since the rest of his army was unable to cross the river for this reason, Perdiccas was in great difficulty; and, as those who had crossed were not strong enough to fight the enemy and those on the nearer bank were not able to go to the aid of their fellows, he ordered all to come back again. When all were thus forced to cross the stream, those who knew how to swim well and were strongest of body succeeded in swimming across the Nile with great distress, after throwing away a good deal of their equipment; but of the rest, because of their lack of skill some were swallowed by the river, and others were cast up on the shore toward the enemy, but most of them, carried along for some time, were devoured by the animals in the river”.

(Diod.18.35. Translated by GEER 1947).

Even though there is no mention of ritual, Perdiccas chose the method which should be used to ensure a safe crossing. Therefore, he was assuming his duties as regent and was responsible for the result. He tried to replicate Alexander’s strategy but using elephants instead of horses, in order to defeat the stream, however, as we know now, he failed and was blamed for every casualty. We could say that he did not live up to his own expectations.

Some conclusions can be drawn by comparing the passages of both Perdiccas:

— 1) In both, two men with the same name tried to cross a river. The successful one became king, the failed one died. The defeat of Perdiccas meant the victory of his rival Ptolemy, who became the true owner of Egypt and even was tempted to regency by the Macedonian army (Diod. 18.36.6), but he preferred to grant this honor to Peithon and Arrhidaeus. The river Nile had dethroned a king, but put another in his place.

— 2) The rivers overflowed in both cases to protect the man who was fated to become king. Diodorus gives different explanations and theories about the Nile floods (rains, sand, canals, etc.) but in any case, the consequence is the same: nature was protecting Ptolemy and withdrawing its favor of Perdiccas.

— 3) Curiously the river which saved Perdiccas was adored as the Saviour (*Soter*) and Ptolemy had this epiclesis in his royal name⁷⁴.

The story of Perdiccas and his brothers was well-known in Macedonia, so it was almost impossible for a common soldier to think about it and not conclude that his leader was not blessed by the gods and was the cause of death of countless Macedonians. To make matters worse, Alexander's story about the Mount Climax was equally celebrated by every Macedonian veteran. As in Kipling's *The man who would be king*, Perdiccas must have been to his soldiers just another Daniel Dravot, an imposter hiding behind Alexander's fame.

In short, all that has been said so far does not mean that the disaster was not an important reason to explain the fall of the heir of Alexander the Great. We think that the beliefs and the myths of ancient Macedonians were also significant to understand a fact that in our modern minds could be incomprehensible. Power and wealth were important elements to set the basis of legitimacy of new Hellenistic kings, but this basis was built on the pillars of Macedonian myths.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADAMS, W. L. (2010): "Alexander's Successors to 221 BC", in J. ROISMAN – I. WORTHINGTON (eds.): *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Oxford: 208-224.
- ALVAR, J. (2000): "Alejandro, explorador y hombre de ciencia", in J. M. BLÁZQUEZ – J. ALVAR (eds.): *Alejandro Magno. Hombre y mito*, Madrid: 83-98.
- ANSON, E. M. (2002): "The Dating of Perdiccas' Death and the Assembly at Triparadeisus", *GRBS* 43: 373-390.
- ANSON, E. M. (2009): "Philip II, Amyntas, Perdicca, and Macedonian Royal Succession", *Historia* 58: 276-286.
- ANSON, E. M. – ALONSO TRONCOSO, V. (eds.) (2013): *After Alexander: The Time of the Diadochi (323-281 BC)*, Oxford.
- BANCHICH, T. M. et al. (transl.) (2010): *Pseudo Plutarch: About Rivers and Mountains and Things Found in Them*, Buffalo, NY.
- BLOEDOW, E. F. (2002): "On the crossing of rivers: Alexander's diphtheria", *Klio* 84.1: 57-75.
- BODSON, L. (1991): "Alexander the Great and the scientific exploration of the oriental part of his empire. An overview of the background, trends and results", *AncSoc* 22: 127-138.
- BONNECHÈRE, P. (1994): *Le Sacrifice humain en Grèce ancienne*, Liège.
- BORCA, D. (1996): "Adversus ipsam rerum naturam: Note on Tacitus, 'Agricola' 33", *Britannia* 27: 337-340.
- BORZA, E. (1979): "Some Observations on Malaria and the Ecology of Central Macedonia in Antiquity", *AJAH* 4: 97-121.
- BOSWORTH, A. B. (1993): "Aristotle, India and the Alexander Historians", *Topoi: Orient-Occident* 3: 407-424

⁷⁴ According to Pausanias (1.8.6) the name Soter was given to Ptolemy by the Rhodians. However, in other versions the epiclesis Soter is related to saving Alexander in India (Curt. 9.5.21; Arr. An. 6.11.3; Paus. 1.6.2); cf. HAZZARD 1992, 52-6, notes that "inscriptions from the island of Rhodes did not employ the epiklesis" (55).

-
- (2002): *The Legacy of Alexander. Politics, Warfare and Propaganda under the Successors*, Oxford.
- BRIANT, P. (2002): *From Cyrus to Alexander: a history of the Persian Empire*, Winona Lake, Ind.
- (2008): “Retour sur Alexandre et les katarraktes du Tigre: l’histoire d’un dossier (suite et in)”, *Studi ellenistici* 20: 155-218.
- BRIQUEL, D – DESNIER, J. L. (1983): “Le passage de l’Hellespont par Xerxes”, *BAGB*: 22-30.
- BROWNSON, C. L. (transl.) (1968): *Xenophon: Anabasis*, London.
- BRUNT, P. A. (transl.) (1976): *Arrian: Anabasis of Alexander*, London.
- BURSTEIN, S. M. (1976): “Alexander, Callisthenes and the sources the Nile”, *GRBS* 17: 135-146.
- DESNIER, J. L. (1995): *De Cyrus a Julien l’Apostat: Le passage du fleuve. Essai sur la legitimate du souverain*, Paris.
- DETIENNE, M. (1967) *Les maîtres de vérité dans la Grèce archaïque*, Paris [Spanish translation: (1981): *Los maestros de la verdad en la Grecia antigua*, Madrid].
- DOWDEN, K. (2000): *European paganism: The Realities of Cult from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, London.
- EKROTH, G. (2002): *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-cults in the Archaic to the early Hellenistic periods*, Liège.
- EVELYN-WHITE, H. G. (transl.) (1967): *Hesiod: The Works of Hesiod*, London.
- GEER, R. M. (transl.) (1947): *Diodorus Siculus: Library of History. Vol. IX: Books 18-19.65*, London.
- GLOTZ, G. (1906): *L’Ordalie dans la Grece primitive. Etude de droit et de Mythologie*, Paris.
- GODLEY, A. D. (transl.) (1971): *Herodotus: Histories*, London.
- GREENWALT, W. S. (1994): “A Solar Dionysus and Argead Legitimacy”, *AncW* 25: 3-8.
- GUTHRIE, W. K. C. (1993): *Orpheus and Greek Religion: A Study of the Orphic Movement*, Princeton.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L. (1972): *A history of Macedonia I*, Oxford.
- (1994): “One or two Passes at the Cilicia-Syria border”, *AncW* 25.1: 20-21.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L. – GRIFFITH, G. T. (1979): *A history of Macedonia II*, Oxford.
- HATZOPOULOS, M. (2003): “Herodotos (8.137–8), the Manumissions from Leukopetra, and the Topography of Middle Haliakmon Valley”, in P. DEROW – R. PARKER (eds.): *Herodotus and his World, Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, Oxford–New York: 203-218.
- HAZZARD, R. A. (1992): “Did Ptolemy I get his surname from the Rhodians in 304?”, *ZPE* 93: 52-6.
- HECKEL, W. (1992): *The Marshals of Alexander’s Empire*, London.
- HENRICHs, A. (1981): “Human sacrifices in Greek religion: Three case studies”, in J. RUDHARDT – O. REVERDIN (eds.): *Le sacrifice dans l’antiquité*, Genève: 195-235.
- HERRERO DE JAUREGUI, M. (2010): *Orphism and Christianity in Late Antiquity*, Berlin–New York.
- HOTZ, S. (2005): “Mit Ritualen Grenzen ziehen und überwinden”, in C. AMBOS – S. HOTZ – G. SCHWEDLER – S. WEINFURTER (eds): *Die Welt der Rituale: von der Antike bis heute*, Darmstadt: 129-132.
- HUGHES, D. D. (1991): *Human sacrifice in ancient Greece*, London.
- INSTINSKY, H. I. (1949): *Alexander der Grosse am Hellespont*, Godesberg.

- JAMESON, M. H. (2002): "Sacrifice before battle", in V. D. HANSON (ed.): *Hoplites: the classical Greek battle experience*, London–New York: 98-126.
- JONES, W. H. S. (transl.) (1918): *Pausanias: Description of Greece*, London.
- LARSON, J. L. (2007a): *Ancient Greek Cults: A Guide*, New York–London.
- (2007b): "A Land Full of Gods: Nature Deities in Greek Religion", in D. OGDEN (ed.): *Companion of Greek religion*, Malden, MA–Oxford: 56-70.
- LORAUX, N. (1996): *Né de la Terre. Mythe et politique à Athènes*, Paris.
- LUCK, G. (2006): *Arcana Mundi*, Baltimore.
- MALLIOS, G. (2011): *Μύθος και Ιστορία. Η περίπτωση της Αρχαίας Μακεδονίας*, Thessaloniki.
- MONTERO, S. (2012): *El emperador y los ríos. Religión, ingeniería y política en el Imperio Romano*, Madrid.
- OGDEN, D. (2011): *Alexander the Great. Myth, Genesis and Sexuality*, Exeter.
- (2013): *Dragons, serpents and slayers in the classical and early Christian Worlds: a sourcebook*, Oxford.
- PEARSON, L. (1960): *The lost histories of Alexander the Great*, New York.
- PÉDECH, P. (1984): *Historiens, compagnons d'Alexandre: Callisthène, Onésicrite, Néarque, Ptolémée, Aristobule*, Paris.
- PERETTI, A. (1994): *Dall'Eridano di Esiodo al Retrone vicentino: studio su un idronimo erratico*, Pisa.
- PERRIN, B. (transl.) (1971): *Plutarch: Lives*, London.
- PRITCHETT, W. K. (1974): *The Greek State at War. III*, Berkeley–London.
- ROISMAN, J. (2012): *Alexander's veterans and the early wars of the Successors*, Austin.
- ROLF, J. C. (transl.) (1962): *Curtius: History of Alexander*, London.
- ROLLINGER, R. (2013): *Alexander und die großen Ströme. Die Flussüberquerungen im Lichte altorientalischer Pioniertechniken*, Wiesbaden.
- ROMM, J. (2011): *Ghost on the throne. The death of Alexander the Great and the war for crown and empire*, New York.
- SQUILLACE, G. (2010): "Consensus strategies under Philip and Alexander: The revenge theme", in E. Carney – D. Ogden (eds.): *Philip II and Alexander the Great. Father and son, lives and Afterlives*, Oxford: 69-80, 260-264.
- STONEMAN, R. (trans.) (1991): *The Greek Alexander Romance*, London.
- THOMSON, J. O. (1965): *History of Ancient Geography*, New York.
- TORALLAS TOVAR, S. – WÖRZ, K. A. (2014): *Greek papyri from Montserrat (P.Monts.Roca IV)*, Barcelona.
- WASER, O. (1909): "Flussgötter", *RE* 6: col. 2777-815.
- WATERFIELD, R. (2011): *Dividing the spoils: the war for Alexander the Great's empire*, Oxford.
- ZAHRNT, M. (1984): "Die Entwicklung des makedonischen Reiches bis zu den Perserkriegen", *Chiron* 14: 325–68.
- (1996): "Alexanders Übergang über den Hellespont", *Chiron* 26: 129-47.
- ZIEHEN, L. (1929): "Sphagia", *RE* 3A, 2: cols. 1169–79.



FLASHBACKS

The Coronation of the Diadochi*

by Erich S. Gruen

University of California – Berkeley

gruene@berkeley.edu

The year 310 B.C. witnessed the extinction of the Argead line. Cassander had ordered the murder of Young Alexander IV and his mother Roxane, widow of Alexander the Great. The kingdom of Macedonia was now without a king. Cassander's deed cleared the way for the ambitious dynasts who controlled the armies and lands of the eastern Mediterranean. Yet no one stepped forth to claim the crown. The throne lay vacant for four years. In 306 the situation changed in dramatic fashion. Antigonos Monophthalmus took the title of King, and a chain reaction followed. Within a short span of time, Ptolemy, Seleucus, Lysimachus, and Cassander all acquired the same title. The Hellenistic world which had had no monarch for half a decade suddenly had a plethora of them. But what kind of monarchy, how viewed and how justified? The matter is important. It helped give shape to the age of Alexander's Successors.

A consensus prevails on the subject. Antigonos, it is affirmed, conceived the nature of his kingship in a manner very different from that of his rivals. His realm would be co-extensive with the empire of Alexander, a universal monarchy that would permit no challengers. Those who declined to acknowledge his supremacy would be treated as rebels and enemies. By contrast, the other diadochoi held a more modest notion of royalty. They were content with portions of what had once been Alexander's dominion, each asserting regal privileges within definable territories, whether Egypt, Asia, Thrace, or Macedon. On this analysis, Antigonos may have been the worthiest of Alexander's Successors and most faithful to his aspirations, but the other dynasts had a clearer vision of the future of the Hellenistic world¹. Yet a closer examination gives pause. The sources on assumption of the royal title by the diadochoi offer no hint that the new kings had radically different conceptions of its meanings². The issue warrants renewed scrutiny.

The execution of Alexander IV was accomplished quietly and secretly. How long it remained a secret is unknown. But the news, once reported, stirred hardly a ripple. The dynasts neither grieved nor complained³. The silence of Antigonos One-Eyed is especially surprising. He had been vociferous in condemning Cassander earlier for the

* Originally published in GRUEN 1985. Published in *Karanos* by kind permission of the author.

This paper originated in a graduate seminar in Berkeley, with special gratitude due to the participation of R. Billows, F. De Rose, W. Greenwalt, and J. Scholten. The present version has had the benefit of remarks and suggestions by W. L. Adams, E. N. Borza, and S. M. Burstein.

¹ This interpretation, or some variant thereof, is widely shared. See, e.g., GRANIER 1931, 101-103; AYMARD 1967, 94; 119-120; MANNI 1952, 29-30; 105-106; WILL 1966, I, 64-65; FORTINA 1965, 94-95; RITTER 1965, 93-94; MUSTI 1966, 95; MÜLLER 1973, 88-90; 100-101; 105-107; HAUBEN 1974, 105-106.

² Fullest testimony in Plut. *Demetr.* 17.2-18.1. Briefer versions in Diod. 20.53.1-2; Heid. *Epit.* = *FGrH*, 155 F 1.7; Appian. *Syr.* 54; Justin. 15.2.10; Oros. 3.23.40. Confused and inaccurate statements in Nepos. *Eum.* 13.2-3, and I Macc. 1.7-9.

³ Diod. 19.105.2-3; Trog. *Prol.* 15; Justin. 15.2.4-5; Paus. 9.72.

mistreatment of Roxane and her son⁴. Their assassination, however, left him dumb. None of the diadochoi issued a protest. Cassander undoubtedly denied the deed. There were always others to blame. Diodorus postulates a great sense of relief on the part of Ptolemy, Lysimachus, Antigonus, and Cassander: they no longer need fear that Alexander IV would reach majority, and each could entertain royal ambitions for himself, while holding the territory under his control as a spear-won kingdom. The historian's analysis is anticipatory and conjectural. In fact, the dynasts made no move toward claiming the titles and prerogatives of a king⁵. All had professed loyalty to the Argead house to that point. To usurp kingly office would be more than unseemly; it would deny their own propaganda and undermine their credibility. Moreover, the appeal of the Argead dynasty remained high in Greece and Macedon. The effort to place Heracles, supposed son of Alexander by an Iranian mistress, on the throne demonstrates that clearly enough⁶. So does the scramble to seek the hand of Cleopatra, sister of Alexander the Great – a scramble that precipitated her execution in 308⁷. The diadochoi wisely refrained from pressing any public claims on the inheritance of Alexander. An anomalous situation ensued: the empire had no ruler. Yet the dynasts, the armies, and the inhabitants of what had been Alexander's realm could evidently live with that situation. They had done so *de facto*, of course, ever since the death of Alexander in 323. But none was yet prepared to do so *de iure*. Babylonian and Egyptian records, indeed, continued to count the regnal years of Alexander IV for several years after his death⁸. That comforting fiction covered the interlude and provided a temporary screen for reality. New circumstances and new justifications were required to permit an open break with the tradition of Argead rule.

Conflicts among the leaders persisted, and renewed hostilities soon made a shambles of the peace of 311, to which they had affixed their signatures. No need to rehearse the events here. Only one item is of direct relevance: the first major military victory by any of the dynasts since the death of Alexander IV in 306. And that victory changed everything.

A great naval battle off Salamis in Cyprus seemed to hold world supremacy itself in the balance⁹. The account overdramatizes. But the victor certainly sought to portray it in that light. The forces of Antigonus, led by his dynamic son Demetrius Poliorcetes, smashed the Ptolemaic fleet at Salamis and gained a decisive triumph. Ptolemy lost 120 warships and another 100 transports, in addition to several thousand soldiers captured or surrendered. All of Cyprus was lost, and Ptolemy returned ignominiously to Egypt¹⁰. The Antigoniid cause took a significant jump in prestige and power.

⁴ Diod. 19.61.1; Justin. 15.1.3; cf. Diod. 19.52.4.

⁵ Diod. 19.105.3-4: οὐκέτι γὰρ ὄντος οὐδενὸς τοῦ διαδεχομένου τὴν ἀρχὴν τὸ λοιπὸν ἕκαστος τῶν κρατούντων ἐθνῶν ἢ πόλεων βασιλικὰς εἶχεν ἐλπίδας καὶ τὴν ὑφ' ἑαυτὸν τεταγμένην χώραν εἶχεν ὥσανεί τινα βασιλείαν δορίκτητον. On the concept of "spear-won territory" see SCHMITTHENNER 1968, 31-39; MÜLLER 1973, 116-121; MEHL 1980-81, 187-196. Diodorus may well have found the phrase in Hieronymus of Cardia; HORNBLOWER 1981, 53. The hailing of Antigonus as king and lord of Asia by those dwelling in Persis came on their initiative, not his; Diod. 19.48.1. And Antigonus refrained from adopting the appellation.

⁶ Diod. 20.20.1-4, 20.28.1-4; Justin, 15.2.3. On the strength of support for this effort, see, especially, Diod. 20.20.3-4, 20.28.1.

⁷ Diod. 20.37.3-6.

⁸ See GRAYSON 1975, 118-119; SKEAT 1954, 9.

⁹ Plut. *Demetr.* 15.3: ὥς οὐ Κύπρον οὐδὲ Συρίαν, ἀλλὰ τὸ μέγιστον εὐθὺς εἶναι πάντων τῶν κρατούντων τῆς νίκης προστιθείσης.

¹⁰ Sources on the battle: Diod. 20.47-52; Plut. *Demetr.* 15-16; Justin, 15.2.6; Polyae. 4.76. See the discussion by SEIBERT 1969, 190-206.

What followed carried still greater significance. Antigonos Monophthalmus was at Antigoneia on the Orontes, there supervising the plans for this new city which was to be his capital¹¹. The dynast eagerly awaited word of the contest in Cyprus. Plutarch tells the tale in its fullest form. Having achieved victory, Demetrius selected a trusted officer, Aristodemus of Miletus, to deliver the news to his father. Aristodemus landed alone, leaving the crew aboard ship and keeping the outcome of the battle a secret. His journey to Antigonos' quarters was slow and deliberate, thus to intensify the suspense. Anxious messengers from Antigonos met him en route but were turned away without a word. Aristodemus' solemn pace and stony silence increased the anxiety, and growing numbers swelled his entourage as he approached the residence of Antigonos. Only upon arrival there and direct encounter with the dynast did Aristodemus present his announcement. And he began with a startling address: "Hail, king Antigonos". It was the first time such a salutation had been offered to Monophthalmus. Aristodemus then reported the magnitude of the victory at Salamis, and the gathering took its cue: they declared both Antigonos and Demetrius as kings. A ceremony of sorts followed immediately thereupon. The friends of Antigonos crowned him, and the new ruler sent off a diadem to his son, accompanied by a letter which greeted him as king¹². The Antigonids had now openly proclaimed a new monarchy.

How does one interpret the event? It can on no account be reckoned as spontaneous – or as the flourish of a flatterer. The sequence of developments precludes such inferences: Aristodemus' slow and silent march that heightened tensions, the collecting of a crowd, Antigonos' personal appearance, the messenger's striking address, the immediate acclamation of the kings, the award of the diadem. Only one conclusion is possible: the whole affair was staged. Antigonos had already learned of the outcome of Salamis. And he had the time to orchestrate a drama which would culminate in his coronation¹³.

The means of legitimizing this move, however, remain very much in dispute. Salutation by the army, it has been argued, played a role, authorizing or ratifying Antigonos' elevation¹⁴. Or else the φίλοι of Antigonos, acting as a form of συνέδριον, conferred legitimacy when they crowned the king¹⁵. Or else the coronation ceremony anticipated the future installation of Hellenistic monarchs through formal presentation to the populace¹⁶. Yet a search for constitutional precedent or a rite of investiture takes precisely the wrong approach. No army assembly gave sanction to the kingship of Antigonos Monophthalmus. Only Appian, among our sources, specifies a declaration by the army – and he sets it in Cyprus where the soldiers hailed both Antigonos and Demetrius. That deed, however, if it occurred at all, has no relevance for the formal assumption of royalty. Demetrius, as we know, received his kingly authority only through dispatch of the diadem by his father. Any acclamation by soldiers would lack

¹¹ Diod. 20.47.5.

¹² Plut. *Demetr.* 17.2-18.1. The story presents Aristodemus as the most notorious of Antigonos' flatterers and this episode as the most extreme of his flatteries. And he also gets his comeuppance. Antigonos berates him for generating the anxieties and prolonging the agony; he will have to wait a long time for any reward. Aristodemus' actions are plainly misinterpreted and distorted by Plutarch's source. He was, in fact, a high-ranking, trusted, and respected officer of Antigonos – one who had served him long and well; cf. KIRCHNER 1895, 923-24 n. 16; SCHOCH 1924, 47 n. 16. MÜLLER 1973, 80-81, suggests that Plutarch drew on a source which collected anecdotes on flatterers.

¹³ The manipulative character of the affair has often been recognized; GRANIER 1931, 99; RITTER 1965, 84; BRIANT 1973, 307-310; MÜLLER 1973, 87-93; ERRINGTON 1978, 123-125.

¹⁴ GRANIER 1931, 98-101; RITTER 1965, 79-82, 89-91; MÜLLER 1973, 81-87.

¹⁵ RITTER 1965, 82-89.

¹⁶ BRIANT 1973, 307-109; endorsed by SEIBERT 1983, 138.

juridical significance¹⁷. The same holds for the involvement of the φίλοι. Nothing in Macedonian tradition gave them official status¹⁸. And to regard the crowning of Antigonus as an elaborate ceremony, itself designed to set a precedent for future investitures, goes well beyond our testimony. Among other matters, it overlooks Demetrius' acquisition of the royal title without ceremony or ritual. He needed only a letter and the diadem delivered by couriers. The entire episode is marked by measures tailored for the particular occasion – not governed by standard practice or dependent on constitutional theory.

Novelty rather than tradition stands out here. Antigonus made no appeal to the past, relied on no fixed conventions, called upon no predecessors to legitimize his ascendancy. Only his own accomplishments counted. In particular, the most recent accomplishment. The victory at Salamis broke the stalemate and shot Antigonus to a position of clear superiority, at least for the moment. Antigonus shattered the conspiracy of silence over the absence of kingship. Decisive triumph, it was claimed, proved his quality. Salamis alone justified royalty. On that the texts are consistent¹⁹. Modern assumptions to the contrary, Antigonus did not project himself as heir to Alexander the Great or continuator of the Argead dynasty²⁰. This monarchy would take on a new character: a “personal” or “charismatic” monarchy, as it is often called²¹. But it was more than that. Antigonus created a new dynasty – explicitly and overtly. The assembled throng, no doubt carefully primed and prompted, greeted both Antigonus and Demetrius as kings. The father held precedence: he sent the diadem to Demetrius, and he was responsible for the conferring of royal privileges²². But a dynastic scheme had been set in place. The association of Demetrius in his rule allowed Antigonus to convey a sense of stability and endurance. The charisma of the victor authorized the

¹⁷ The account in Appian *Syr.* 54 is brief and, very possibly, foreshortened: ἐφ' ὅτῳ λαμπροτάτῳ γενομένῳ (the battle of Salamis) ὁ στρατὸς ἀνείπεν ἄμφω βασιλέας. No other source accords any role to the army. Plutarch has τὸ πλῆθος, salute father and son as kings (*Demetr.* 18.1). The term can be used to designate the army, but not inevitably so. In Plutarch's narrative here it is much more naturally taken as the assemblage that had gathered before Antigonus' residence and reacted joyously to Aristodemus' hailing of Antigonus as king (*Demetr.* 17.5-18.1). That Plutarch previously characterized the crowd as ὄχλος (17.4) is irrelevant. He does not employ technical language here. Notice that Justin, 15.2.10, has the acclamation performed, on Antigonus' orders, by the *populus*. BRIANT 1973, 303-10, rightly rejects the notion of the *Heeresversammlung*. But he substitutes a schematic series of steps: acclamation by the troops in Cyprus, a coronation at Antigoneia, and instructions to the people to regard father and son as kings.

¹⁸ The council at Babylon in 323 is not a proper parallel. That was impromptu procedure. The nobles debated and expected to determine Alexander's successor by designating a member of the Argead house. In 306, however, there were no Argeads and all the φίλοι were φίλοι of Antigonus. More important, the φίλοι did not determine the king. They acted only after the rulers had been proclaimed by τὸ πλῆθος; Plut. *Demetr.* 18.1. RITTER's view (1965, 82-89), that the army hailed Antigonus as king of Macedon and the φίλοι crowned him as ruler of Asia, is fanciful.

¹⁹ Diod. 20.53.2: ὁ δ' Ἀντίγονος πυθόμενος τὴν γεγεννημένην νίκην καὶ μετεωρισθεὶς ἐπὶ τῷ μεγέθει τοῦ προτερήματος διάδημα περιέθετο καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ἐχρημάτιζε βασιλεὺς; Plut. *Demetr.* 17.5 (Aristodemus speaking): ‘χαῖρε, βασιλεῦ Ἀντίγονε, νικῶμεν Πτολεμαῖον ναυμαχίᾳ καὶ Κύπρον ἔχομεν καὶ στρατιώτας αἰχμαλώτους μυρίους ἑξακισχίλιους ὀκτακοσίους; Appian, *Syr.* 54, quoted above, n. 17; Justin, 15.2.10: *hac victoria elatus Antigonus regem se cum Demetrio filio appellari a populo iubet*. Cf. The brief but trenchant remarks of WEHRLI 1968, 61.

²⁰ As is asserted, for example, by CLOCHÉ 1959, 194; RITTER 1965, 84; MÜLLER 1973, 91-93. The arguments of EDSON 1934, 213-26, that the Antigonids and Argeads did have a familial connection, are highly speculative.

²¹ Cf. KAERST 1926-27, II, 331; WEHRLI 1968, 61; MÜLLER 1973, 86-87, 92, 108-21 –though he also lays stress on formal ratification or legitimization of the position.

²² Plut. *Demetr.* 18.1: Δημητρίῳ δὲ ὁ πατὴρ ἔπεμψε διάδημα καὶ γράφων ἐπιστολὴν βασιλέα προσεῖπεν. Cf. Diod. 20.53.2: συγχωρήσας καὶ τῷ Δημητρίῳ τῆς αὐτῆς τυγχάνειν προσηγορίας καὶ τιμῆς.

elevation. The event, however, exceeded personal triumph. Inclusion of Demetrius announced a dynastic regime that would fill the gap left by the demise of the Argeads²³. Antigonus did not present his rule as continuous with predecessors or as founded upon precedent. This was to be a new order and a new monarchy. It combined charisma and dynasty.

Antigonus Monophthalmus set a precedent rather than followed one. The other diadochoi son insisted upon royal titles for themselves – a fact that Antigonus must have anticipated. How Swift and under what circumstances they did so remains subject to debate and uncertainty. The literary sources are largely in accord: the coronation of Ptolemy followed shortly upon Antigonus' proclamation, and those of Seleucus, Lysimachus, and Cassander not long thereafter. And there is unanimity on the motive for so rapid a response, at least with regard to Ptolemy: he would not allow his stature to be diminished by defeat and thus took the kingship, lest he be thought dispirited or inferior to his rival²⁴. That testimony, however, evokes suspicion, both as to fact and to interpretation.

Ptolemy's situation needs a closer look. The supposed motive is implausible. Antigonus justified his coronation by pointing to military success as a sign of kingly quality and divine favor. Ptolemy could hardly claim the same distinction in order to compensate for defeat, an act that would only call attention to his weakness²⁵. Unanimity among our authorities is here indecisive, for it involves assessment of motive rather than presentation of fact. And the similarity of statements suggests that all may have drawn ultimately on a single source²⁶. Other evidence outside the literary tradition puts matters in a rather different light. Ptolemy, it seems clear, did not assume royalty as a swift and direct response to Antigonus' move. The chronological canon of Claudius Ptolemaeus sets the first year of Ptolemy's reign in 305/4. By Egyptian reckoning that signifies accession some time between November 7, 305 and November 6, 304²⁷. The date can be further narrowed by the evidence of the Marmor Parium which puts Ptolemy's taking of the crown in the Attic year 305/4, that is, between July 4, 305 and July 3, 304²⁸. Further specification comes from two demotic papyri, the last documents dated by the regnal years of Alexander IV: they belong in the Egyptian month of Hathyr in 305/4, which runs from January 6 to February 4, 304²⁹. The combined testimony yields an accession date some time between January and July, 304³⁰. As is obvious, the declaration of Antigonus, probably in spring of 306, did not trigger the response of Ptolemy – which came two years later³¹. The chronology also

²³ ERRINGTON 1978, 124-125, goes too far in suggesting that Antigonus hit upon this scheme to shore up the weakness and insecurity of his own position.

²⁴ Diod. 20.53.3: Closely comparable statements in Plut. *Demetr.* 18.1; Appian *Syr.* 54; *Heid. Epit.* = *FGrH* 155 F 1.7; Justin. 15.2.11: *Ptolomeus quoque, ne minoris apud suos auctoritatis haberetur, rex ab exercitu cognominatur.*

²⁵ The effort of RITTER 1965, 98-99, to defend the sources' interpretation here is singularly unsuccessful.

²⁶ So, rightly, MÜLLER 1973, 94.

²⁷ SKEAT 1954, 2-4, 28.

²⁸ *FGrH* 239 B 23. Cf. Porphyry, *FGrH* 260 F 21.

²⁹ P. Dem. Louvre, 2427, 2440; cf. VOLKMANN 1959, 1621 n. 18.

³⁰ SAMUEL 1962, 4-11, seeks to push it back to November 7, 305, to coincide with the beginning of the Egyptian year. The demotic papyri are explained by the length of time required for the news of Ptolemy's coronation to reach Upper Egypt. The thesis does not compel assent. It assumes that the last extant documents of Alexander IV's reign were, in fact, the last produced, a hazardous assumption. They supply, of course, only a *terminus post quem*. MÜLLER 1973, 97-100, expresses appropriate reservations about Samuel's arguments but ends by adopting his position anyway. A bibliographical summary on the subject by SEIBERT 1983, 139-140.

³¹ On the date of Salamis, which prompted Antigonus' declaration, see MÜLLER 1973, 79.

rules out what might seem to have been an appropriate occasion: Ptolemy's successful resistance to the Antigonid assault on Egypt in late 306, resistance that forced an embarrassing retreat by his enemies³². Elation followed that triumph. Ptolemy celebrated with a public ceremony of thanks to the gods and a lavish entertainment for friends, and then fired off letters to Seleucus, Lysimachus, and Cassander, announcing his victory and the heavy losses of Antigonos³³. Yet he still withheld any regal acclamations. More than a year would pass before he took that step. The trumpeting of victory perhaps laid the groundwork, but Ptolemy refrained from offending potential allies by jumping the gun.

A further setback for Antigonos may have given Ptolemy the incentive to grasp the kingship: the unsuccessful siege of Rhodes by Demetrius Poliorcetes. Ptolemy provided substantial aid, both men and supplies, in support of Rhodes' struggle³⁴. The islanders expressed gratitude in extravagant fashion. On advice from the oracle of Ammon, they gave Ptolemy honors due to a god³⁵. The siege of Rhodes began probably in the spring of 305, and lasted approximately a year³⁶. Ptolemy may have accepted elevation to monarchy during that period – or, better still, at its conclusion, when his stature had risen markedly and royal privileges could be added to divine honors³⁷. In any case, the new ruler claimed his prerogatives to underscore success, not to mitigate defeat.

Comparable success provided opportunity and occasion for Seleucus to style himself as king. Diodorus places his decision in the context of recovering control over the Upper Satrapies³⁸. Seleucus had previously dealt with Asiatics as a monarch, so Plutarch reports, but now donned the diadem in treating with Greeks as well³⁹. When Seleucus officially took the royal title can be determined within limits. A Babylonian king – list puts his first year as ruler in the seventh year of the Seleucid era, i.e. from March to March, 305/4⁴⁰. Confirmation comes from the earliest Babylonian document dated by Seleucus' reign: April 16, 304⁴¹. Hence, Seleucus, like Ptolemy, accepted the crown nearly two years after the Antigonids had done so. For him too the designation advertised accomplishment and proclaimed ability.

The accession dates of Lysimachus and Cassander remain unknown. Lysimachus, it can be inferred, did not lag long behind Ptolemy and Seleucus – if at all. Once news

³² Diod. 20.73-76; Plut. *Demetr.* 19.1-2; Paus. 1.6.6. Antigonos undertook the invasion in early November, 306; Diod. 20.73.3.

³³ Diod. 20.76.6-7.

³⁴ Diod. 20.88.9, 20.94.3, 20.96.1, 20.98.1, 20.99.2.

³⁵ Diod. 20.100.3-4.

³⁶ Diod. 20.100.1.

³⁷ The possibility that Ptolemy's kingship began after the siege of Rhodes has not previously been considered, though there is no decisive evidence against it. Note, especially, the testimony of the Marmor Parium, *FGrH* 239 B 23: ἀπὸ τῆς περὶ Ῥόδον πολιορκίας, καὶ ἀφ' οἷο Πτολεμαῖος τὴν βασιλείαν παρ[έ]λ[α]β[εν...]. It can be objected that Seleucus became king by April, 304 (see below), and that Ptolemy's proclamation preceded his. The objection is not decisive. The sources which place Ptolemy's coronation before the others' also set them all immediately after Antigonos' declaration – which is demonstrably false; Plut. *Demetr.* 18.2; Appian. *Syr.* 54.

³⁸ Diod. 20.53.4: Σέλευκος μὲν προσφάτως τὰς ἄνω σατραπείας προσκεκτημένος.

³⁹ Plut. *Demetr.* 18.2: καὶ γὰρ Λυσίμαχος ἤρξατο φορεῖν διάδημα, καὶ Σέλευκος ἐντυγχάνων τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, ἐπεὶ τοῖς γε βαρβάροις πρότερον οὗτος ὡς βασιλεὺς ἐχρημάτιζε. RITTER's argument (1965, 100-101), that Seleucus wore the diadem with Asiatics earlier, but was not king until 305/4 strains the evidence. He is obliged, among other things, to read οὗτος, instead of οὗτος without good reason. Cf. MUSTI 1966, 86-87. And since, as Seleucus must have known, Asiatics would regard the wearer of the diadem as king (indeed, perhaps, urged it upon him), the distinction seems pointless.

⁴⁰ SACHS – WISEMAN 1954, 205.

⁴¹ PARKER – DUBBERSTEIN 1942, 18.

spread that certain dynasts arrogated royal titles to themselves, he could hardly have settled for lesser distinctions. Cassander waited rather longer, perhaps wary of Macedonian sensitivity regarding the Argead house and unsure of loyalties in the realm⁴². But he too yielded to temptation, possibly after shoring up support to confront Demetrius in 303/2. Cassander soon designated himself on bronze coinage and epigraphic documents as “king of the Macedonians”⁴³. The maintenance of Prestige demanded the label of monarch. The Hellenistic world in short order had obtained five kings⁴⁴.

The central question can now be addressed. How did the diadochoi and their followers perceive these monarchies? Did Antigonos alone visualize his realm as encompassing the empire of Alexander, an imposing but unrealistic ambition, while his rivals contented themselves with more strictly defined territorial kingdoms, the real harbingers of the future?

Our texts on the assumption of kingship by Antigonos’ rivals betray no suggestion that their view of its meaning differed from his. Quite the contrary. They explain the actions of the diadochoi specifically as emulation of Antigonos, lest they be considered inferior to him⁴⁵. A conception of their rule as bounded by territorial confines would be a gratuitous admission of inferiority. Self-effacement or restraint rarely characterized the actions of the diadochoi. Whence then derives this idea that Antigonos had a more exalted notion of his rule than did his rivals of theirs, an idea shared by so many scholars?⁴⁶ A single anecdote is cited repeatedly as buttress for this conclusion.

⁴² The *Heidelberg Epitome*, notably, omits Cassander when listing the dynasts who took the diadem and royal title after Antigonos and Demetrius; *FGrH* 55 F 1.7. Plut. *Demetr.* 18.2 lends confirmation: Cassander did not employ the royal title in his correspondence, although the other diadochoi used it in addressing him. The rest of the sources fail to draw that distinction; Diod. 20.53.4; Appian, *Syr.* 54; Justin, 15.2.12; Nepos, *Eum.* 13.3.

⁴³ His bronze coinage displays the designation ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΚΑΣΣΑΝΔΡΟΥ; HEAD 1887, 228. And he labels himself in epigraphic documents as βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων; Dittenberg. *SIG*, 332; and a new statue base from Dium, recently announced; PANDERMALIS 1977, 16: ‘ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝ[ΩΝ] ΚΑΣΣΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΑΝΤΙΠ[ΑΤΡΟΥ] ΔΙΙ ΟΛΥΜΠΙΩΙ. AYMARD 1967, 102-106, 120, wrongly regards the designation as official titulature of Macedonian royalty. But ERRINGTON’s argument (1974, 23-25), on the basis of Plut. *Demetr.* 18.27 that it was quite exceptional, is equally unpersuasive. His notion that Cassander used the title for internal consumption but avoided it in foreign policy is difficult to credit. If Cassander were willing to assert his legitimacy within Macedon, why should he shrink from that posture in dealings with the diadochoi? So peculiar a sense of modesty could only diminish his international stature. In the view of MÜLLER 1973, 103-104, Plutarch’s information is a confused reference to rejection of the diadem by Cassander. But that solution, wholly speculative, fails to explain the text. ADAMS 1983, 25-26, rightly sees that Cassander delayed his coronation, though he gives too much weight to “constitutional restraints”. But Adams’ suggested date (after Ipsus) is implausible – a view he has more recently modified in private correspondence. Cassander needed the stature which would put him on a level of equality with allies in resistance to the Antigonids in 303/2; cf. Diod. 20.106.2-107.1.

⁴⁴ MÜLLER 1973, 102-103, takes summer of 304 as *terminus ante quem* for this development, on the basis of Diod. 20.100.2: Rhodes, after the end of her siege, erected statues to “the kings Cassander and Lysimachus”. But it is risky to assume that that information stems from inscriptions on the bases of the statues. Diodorus may simply be maintaining internal consistency: he had placed all the royal acclamations shortly after Antigonos’ initiative; Diod. 20.53.2-4; cf. RITTER 1965, 107 n. 5. Lesser dynasts and tyrants evidently also took the name of king in the last years of the fourth century; for example, Agathocles of Syracuse; Diod. 20.54.1; Dionysius of Heraclea Pontica; Memnon, *FGrH* 3B 434 F 4.6; Eumelus of the Bosporan kingdom; see BRANDIS 1894, 761-762; GEYER 1929, 1542.

⁴⁵ Diod. 20.53.4: καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ δυνάσται ζηλοτυπήσαντες ἀνηγόρευον ἑαυτοὺς βασιλεῖς; Plut. *Demetr.* 18.2: ἐπενείματο δὲ οὕτως τὸ πρᾶγμα τῷ ζήλῳ τοὺς διαδόχους; Heid. *Epit.* = *FGrH* 155 F 1.7: ἰδόντες δὲ καὶ οἱ ἕτεροι, ὅσοι οὐκ ἡλαττοῦντο αὐτοῦ, ἐφόρεσαν κάκεινοι διάδημα καὶ ὠνόμασαν ἑαυτοὺς βασιλεῖς.

⁴⁶ See above n. 1.

Demetrius Poliorcetes, as the tale has it, ridiculed those who called anyone but himself and his father king, and heard with pleasure those who toasted him as monarch, while giving mock-titles to his rivals: Seleucus the master of elephants, Ptolemy the naval lord, Lysimachus the treasurer, and Agathocles the island-ruler⁴⁷. On the face of it, that seems strong testimony for Antigonos' vision of an empire ruled by his house alone, with no room for rivals.

Closer scrutiny causes hesitation. The anecdote concerns Demetrius, not Antigonos. Revelers at a banquet and flatterers eager to please hardly represent official policy – any more than does Demetrius himself when boasting or bantering in his cups. And when did this episode occur? Plutarch appears to put it shortly after the Antigonid revival of the League of Corinth in 302, thus inducing most scholars to assign that year to the event⁴⁸. But the inference is delusive. Plutarch quite clearly transmits the anecdote in an excursus. Demetrius' appointment as hegemon of the League gave the biographer occasion to speak of his excessive self-laudation: he even regarded himself as superior to Philip and Alexander; whereas Alexander addressed other rulers as kings, Demetrius would put none on a par with himself. The anecdote then follows, evidently independent of any chronology. That Plutarch presents it as a digression is plain enough. He signals the fact unambiguously when he returns to the narrative: τότε δὲ⁴⁹. Other chronological indicators point to a later date. Most particularly, the absence of Cassander from the tale suggests a time after the dynast's death in 298/7. A toast in 302 which derided Demetrius' adversaries but omitted Cassander, his principal antagonist in Greece, would make little sense⁵⁰. The phraseology in one version of the anecdote is even more striking: the flatterers toasted Δημητρίου μὲν μόνον βασιλέως⁵¹. That will not fit easily into the lifetime of Antigonos Monophthalmus. Still another clue lends support: the inclusion of Agathocles of Syracuse as among the targets of Demetrius' flatterers. At what point would Agathocles have sufficiently impressed Demetrius to warrant a position among the other dynasts? Surely not before his successful campaign at Corcyra ca. 299, and probably not before the marriage of his daughter to Pyrrhus in 295⁵². The evidence is consistent enough. Demetrius' mockery of his adversaries, even if it were more than a tipsy toast, occurred some time in the 290s and is inadmissible as evidence for Antigonos' attitude toward his monarchy⁵³.

⁴⁷ Plut. *Demetr.* 25.4: ἐκεῖνος [Demetrius] δὲ χλευάζων καὶ γελῶν τοὺς ἄλλον τινὰ πλὴν τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ αὐτοῦ βασιλέα προσαγορεύοντας, ἡδέως ἤκουε τῶν παρὰ πότον ἐπιχύσεις λαμβανόντων Δημητρίου βασιλέως, Σελεύκου δὲ ἐλεφαντάρχου, Πτολεμαίου δὲ ναυάρχου, Λυσιμάχου δὲ γαζοφύλακος, Ἀγαθοκλέους δὲ τοῦ Σικελιώτου νησιάρχου. The same anecdote reappears in Plut. *Mor.* 823c-d. Athenaeus gives a nearly identical version, for which he cites Phylarchus, but which omits Agathocles; Athen. 6.261b = *FGrH* 81 F 31.

⁴⁸ Plut. *Demetr.* 25.3-4.

⁴⁹ Plut. *Demetr.* 26.1.

⁵⁰ MÜLLER 1973, 89, argues that Demetrius' flatterers left out Cassander precisely because he was the most hated rival. That needs no refutation. Similarly implausible is the suggestion of HAUBEN 1974, 112, that Cassander seemed less formidable than the other dynasts and was therefore ignored by Demetrius' circle. He had certainly not been ignored by Demetrius himself.

⁵¹ The version of Phylarchus, in Athen. 6.261b = *FGrH* 81 F 31.

⁵² The campaign at Corcyra; Diod. 21.2; the marriage alliance with Pyrrhus; Plut. *Pyrrh.* 9.1; Diod. 21.4. Agathocles' own marriage to Theoxena from Egypt might indicate a connection with Ptolemy; Justin, 23.2.6. But that marriage itself is almost certainly no earlier than ca. 300; WILL 1966, I, 103; SEIBERT 1967, 73-74.

⁵³ To be sure, Plutarch's version of the anecdote in the *Life of Demetrius* has Demetrius berate those who give the name of king to anyone but himself and his father; Plut. *Demetr.* 25.4. That need not, however, imply that Antigonos was alive at the time. Demetrius simply asserted the monopoly of his line on that distinction. The argument of HAUBEN 1974, 108, that Seleucus would not have been called

On that attitude, a better piece of testimony survives. Plutarch reports that Cassander refrained from calling himself King in letters to the other diadochoi, even though they employed the title in correspondence and direct contact with him⁵⁴. The passage is often discussed with regard to Cassander's kingship. But it has larger implications. The other monarchs who addressed Cassander as βασιλεύς included Antigonus Monophthalmus. The fact needs to be underscored. Antigonus, by acknowledging the royalty of his competitors, conceded that his concept of kingship did not entail exclusivity⁵⁵.

What reason is there to believe that Ptolemy, Seleucus, Lysimachus, and Cassander perceived their royal prerogatives as tied to territorially bounded kingdoms? Certainly none of the first three identified himself in such fashion. No Greek document or coin proclaims Ptolemy as king of Egypt or Seleucus as ruler of Babylon – or indeed as ruler of Asia. And Lysimachus, eager to attract the loyalty of Greeks and Macedonians, would hardly style himself as “King of Thrace”. Cassander alone stands as apparent exception. He did adopt the title “King of the Macedonians” on bronze coins and in inscriptions⁵⁶. But the exception is only apparent. Cassander, it should be observed projected himself as ruler of the Macedonians, not of Macedon. The designation exceeds territorial limits Cassander was king of the Macedonians as Alexander had been – at least in principle. And there were many Macedonians outside the borders of Macedon⁵⁷.

The others too ruled Macedonians. To reckon themselves as kings of Egypt, Babylon, or Thrace would mean the transformation of what had been mere satrapies of the Macedonian crown to the status of kingdoms, an alien and doubtless unacceptable idea. Quite apart from the matter of principle, the dynasts did not in practice confine their interests and aspirations to the territory directly under their control, Ptolemy serves as prime example. His activities since the peace of 311 had included inroads into Asia Minor, the capture of cities in Lycia and Caria, the extension of influence in the Aegean, the acquisition of holdings in the Peloponnese, an endeavor to win the hand of Alexander's sister Cleopatra, and even a plan to resurrect the League of Corinth under his hegemony. Although most of these schemes failed of accomplishment, it is plain that Ptolemy's ambitions went well beyond the mastery of Egypt. When he took the royal title in 304, he still retained garrisons in Corinth and Sicyon⁵⁸. The overseas aspirations of Lysimachus and Cassander were comparably ambitious. In the ultimatum delivered to Antigonus in 315/4, Cassander demanded Cappadocia and Lycia, and Lysimachus laid claim to Hellespontine Phrygia⁵⁹. Nothing suggests that they had modified their objectives in the interim.

A single argument bolsters the view that the diadochoi contented themselves with individual kingdoms: the fact that they recognized one another's claims by joining in coalition against Antigonus. But that coalition had yet to form at the time of the royal proclamations. Indeed, when Cassander was especially hard pressed by Antigoniid forces as late as 302, he still lacked partners and felt compelled to open negotiations

“elephantarch” after Ipsus is inconclusive. Such a designation could indeed be meant to diminish his accomplishment at Ipsus.

⁵⁴ Plut. *Demetr.* 18.2: Κάσσανδρος δέ, τῶν ἄλλων αὐτὸν βασιλέα καὶ γραφόντων καὶ καλούντων, αὐτός, ὥσπερ πρότερον εἰώθει, τὰς ἐπιστολὰς ἔγραφε.

⁵⁵ The implication, generally overlooked, is observed by ERRINGTON 1975, 250-251.

⁵⁶ See above, n. 43.

⁵⁷ WALBANK 1981, 56-57, suggests that Cassander used that title to assert a unique position not open to any of his rivals. But this puts too narrow a construction on the meaning of “king of the Macedonians”.

⁵⁸ It is unnecessary to detail the events here. See the summary in WILL 1966, I, 59-64. The garrisons in Corinth and Sicyon: Diod. 20.37.2; cf. *Suidas*, sv. “Demetrius”.

⁵⁹ Diod. 19.57.1; Appian, *Syr.* 53; Justin 15.1.2.

with Antigonus. Only when the latter proved obdurate did Cassander begin to assemble the grand Alliance that would culminate at Ipsus⁶⁰. Insofar as there was mutual recognition in 304, it included Monophthalmus himself. The willingness of each ruler to use the royal title in addressing the others suffices to establish the fact⁶¹.

The supposed contrast between two conceptions of kingship evaporates. Antigonus did not define his rule by the empire of Alexander, nor did his competitors define theirs by the boundaries of what were to become Hellenistic states. Abandonment of the territorial idea clears the ground for better understanding. A different perspective governed these monarchies. Antigonus the One-Eyed created a new form of kingship when he exorcised the ghosts of the Argeads and claimed legitimacy on the basis of personal achievement and dynastic promise. His rivals could do no less. The coronation of the diadochoi held a meaning that surpassed control of lands, cities, and even populations⁶². It signified an exalted prestige, an aura of power and distinction associated with royalty. Hence it precluded neither coalition nor competition. A monarchy undefined by the territorial or institutional limits allowed for both mutual recognition and intense rivalry. The Hellenistic kingdoms had their origins in the authority of the kings – not the other way round.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADAMS, W. L. (1983): “The Dynamics of Internal Macedonian Politics in the Time of Cassander”, *Ancient Macedonia* 3: 17-30.
- AYMARD, A. (1967): *Etudes d'histoire anciennes*, Paris.
- BRANDIS, C. G. (1894): “Bosporos”, *RE* 3: 761-762.
- BRIANT, P. (1973): *Antigone le Borne*, Paris.
- CLOCHÉ, P. (1959): *La dislocation d'un empire*, Paris.
- COHEN, G. M. (1974): “The Diadochoi and the New Monarchies”, *Athenaeum* 52: 177-179.
- EDSON, C. F. (1934): “Antigonids, Heracles and Beroea”, *HSCPh* 45: 213-246.
- ERRINGTON, R. M. (1974): “Macedonian 'Royal Style' and its Historical Significance”, *JHS* 94: 20-37.
- (1975): “[Review] O. Müller: *Antigonos Monophthalmos und 'Das Jahr der König'*”, *JHS* 95: 250-251.
- (1978): “The Nature of the Macedonian State under the Monarchy”, *Chiron* 8: 77-133.
- FORTINA, M. (1965): *Cassandro, re di Macedonia*, Turin.
- GEYER, F. (1929): “Spartokos”, *RE* III A: 1542.
- GRANIER, F. (1931): *Die makedonische Heeresversammlung*, Munich.

⁶⁰ Diod. 20.106.1-5; Plut. *Demetr.* 28.1; Justin 15.2.15-16. COHEN 1974, 177-179, points out that the diadochoi shied away from marriage alliances with one another until after Ipsus. But it does not follow, as he assumes, that they refused to recognize each other as *basileis* until that time.

⁶¹ In the felicitous formulation of ERRINGTON 1975, 251, the monarchy was “shareable”.

⁶² WALBANK 1981, 56, rightly points to the example of Demetrius who for several years lacked a kingdom but still asserted kingship. He recognizes that the new monarchies were “not closely linked with lands where the king ruled”. Yet his statement that the dynasts claimed “kingship within their own particular territories – though not kingship of those territories” seems to vitiate the point or render it opaque. The brief recent treatment by THOMAS 1983, 87, placed undue emphasis upon the administrative structures, institutions, and fixed territories acquired by Ptolemy, Seleucus, Lysimachus, and Cassander. The dynasts did not define their rule in such terms.

- GRAYSON, A. K. (1975): *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles: Texts from Cuneiform Sources V*, Locust Valley, NY.
- GRUEN, E. (1985): "The Coronation of the Diadochi", in J. EADIE – J. OBER (eds.): *The Craft of the Ancient Historian*, London: 253-271.
- HAUBEN, H. (1974): "A Royal Toast in 302 B.C.", *AncSoc.* 5: 105-117.
- HEAD, B.V. (1887): *Historia Numorum*, Oxford.
- HORNBLOWER, J. (1981): *Hieronymus of Cardia*, Oxford.
- KAERST, J. (1926-27): *Geschichte des Hellenistischen Zeitalters*, Leipzig–Berlin.
- KIRCHNER, J. (1895): "Aristodemus", *RE* 2.1: 923.
- MANNI, E. (1952): *Demetrio Poliorcete*, Rome.
- MEHL, A. (1980-81): "ΔΟΠΙΚΗΤΟΣ ΧΩΡΑ", *AncSoc.* 11-12, 187-96.
- MÜLLER, O. (1973): *Antigonos Monophthalmos und das Jahr der Könige*, Bonn.
- MUSTI, D. (1966): "Lo Stato dei Seleucidi", *SCO* 15: 61-197.
- PANDERMALIS, D. (1977): *Dion*, Thessalonike.
- PARKER, A. – DUBBERSTEIN, W. H. (1942): *Babylonian Chronology, 626 B.C.-A.D. 45*, Chicago.
- RITTER, H. W. (1965): *Diadem und Königsherrschaft*, Munich.
- SACHS, A. J. – WISEMAN, D. J. (1954): "A Babylonian King List of the Hellenistic Period", *Iraq* 16: 202-212.
- SAMUEL, A. E. (1962): *Ptolemaii: Chronology*, Munich.
- SCHOCH, P. (1924): "Aristodemus", *RE Suppl.* 4: 47.
- SEIBERT, J. (1967): *Historische Beiträge zu den dynastischen Verbindungen in hellenistischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden.
- (1969): *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Ptolemaios I*, Munich.
- (1983): *Das Zeitalter der Diadochen*, Darmstadt.
- SKEAT, T.C. (1954): *The Reigns of the Ptolemies*, Munich.
- THOMAS, C. G. (1983): "Philip II, Alexander III, and Hellenistic Kingship", *LCM* 8: 86-87.
- VOLKMANN, H. (1959): "Ptolemaios", *RE* 23.2: 1621.
- WALBANK, F. W. (1981): *The Hellenistic World*, London.
- WEHRLI, C. (1968): *Antigone et Demetrios*, Geneva.
- WILL, E. (1966): *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique*, II vols, Nancy.



MAIN VOICES IN
ANCIENT MACEDONIAN STUDIES

WILLIAM S. GREENWALT*Santa Clara University*

Interviewed by

M. AGUDO VILLANUEVA

Universidad Complutense de Madridmarioagudo@gmail.com

A. I. MOLINA MARÍN

Universidad de Alcalá de Henaresmiprofeignacio@hotmail.com

In this first issue of *Karanos*, the Editorial Board wishes to give recognition to one of the main promoters of *Ancient Macedonian Studies*, William Steven Greenwalt of Santa Clara University. Greenwalt is well-known in our field, although perhaps he has not received appropriate credit for his contributions since he is yet to publish a book length manuscript. Nevertheless, he is a scholar who has primarily contributed, not to the scholarship on Philip II or Alexander the Great, but to the study of the Argead Dynasty and its significance. Thanks to his work, issues such as that of royal Argead *charisma* and polygamy are now widely discussed among Macedonian scholars. In addition, he has popularized the name *Karanos*, accepted during the 4th century b.c.e. as the legendary founder of the Argead Dynasty. Perhaps more importantly for our current purposes, we have chosen *Karanos* as the appropriate title for our new journal: as such, *Karanos* will perhaps found another (hopefully) lasting legacy. It seems then appropriate to begin with Greenwalt as we launch a series of interviews in what will be a recurring element of our publication which we will entitle, *Main Voices in Ancient Macedonian Studies*.

A student of Harry Dell and much influenced by Erich Gruen, Greenwalt has developed a research line focused upon religious themes, having been strongly influenced by anthropological perspectives. Many of his ideas have been challenged by other Macedonian scholars, but so have the ideas of almost every other student of the ancient world. As such, we think that Greenwalt's contribution to the study of ancient Macedonia will influence Argead scholarship for some time to come. Beyond a doubt, we think he has helped to advance and energize the study of our field.

[INTERVIEWER]: First, let me say that it is a honor to have you ask me these questions. Even though compared to many, I have published but a modest amount, but your questions mean that I am being taken seriously. Thank you.

Let's start with the origin of the kingdom of Macedon. What do you think regarding its nature, were they an ethnic group or a federation of states?

[GREENWALT]: As to the origin of the Macedonian kingdom, I do not think that all its inhabitants were from one ethnos, at least from the reign of Alexander I. In addition, my hunch is that from an early date there was a fair amount of marriage between lower Macedonians, upper Macedonians, Illyrians, Thracians, and polis dwelling Greeks. Nor do I think that kingdom was a group of federated states.

There obviously was some kinship link between those in upper and lower Macedonia, but upper Macedonia was not a part of the Temenid (I prefer Argead) realm until the time of Philip II. There were close ties (sometimes) between the Temenids and the royal houses of some of the nearer, upper Macedonian regions, but once you get to the west of Bermion, the upper Macedonian cantons were essentially independent. Kings like Perdiccas II may have thought they were the overlords of the rest, but wishful thinking is not reality, as Thucydides proves.

I believe the kingdom was long held together because those in the Temenid king list were thought to be divinely ordained (Herodotus) --a right recognized throughout lower Macedonia.

It may be a repeated question for the academic world, but it is almost an obligation to make it. In your opinion, Macedonians: Greek, not Greek or depends?

To me, it really doesn't matter. By the fourth century, the institutions of the poleis had evolved so far beyond what the Greeks saw in Macedonia, that many could address the Macedonians as barbarians. I suspect, however, that the bulk of the Macedonians were of Greek extraction. Tombstones and divine names are dominated by Greek names, although there were some that don't appear elsewhere.

What impresses me is how much the Macedonians began to align themselves with Greek culture at large and with the Greek tongue, understandable by other Greeks. The Macedonian dialect itself apparently could not be understood by other Greeks, but the relative isolation of the Macedonians allows for that. If you go to northern England today and talk to most of the locals, especially in the countryside, you probably will not understand the local jargon, if you don't look closely at their lips. Still, those who live from York northward to Scotland, read standard English. I doubt many Macedonians were literate until very much past the Classical Era.

Some scholars have pointed out the existence of a kind of popular assembly among the Macedonians. This question contradicts the full powers we know the argead dynasty had. What do you think about the real influence of this institution?

I don't believe in constitution assemblies of any sort until the Temenids were no more. I admire his scholarship very much, but all of Hatzopoulos' evidence for such groups is either not from Macedonia proper during the Temenid dynasty, or from the Hellenistic Era.

I believe that, in theory, the kings of the Macedonians were absolute in authority, divinely established. But, kings don't rule in theory. They rule because they are followed, or they don't rule for long. No matter how small the realm, a king can't be everywhere at once, so the good will, especially of the Hetairoi, was necessary to give the king some reach.

No sane king would completely ignore advice given by his subjects and they would have been keenly interested in the king abiding by the "law" (=tradition). Woe to the king who thinks he can do anything he wants, whenever he wants. Even Alexander the Great realized this most of the time.

In your opinion, what are the reasons for the longevity of the Temenid dynasty and its marked archaic character?

The longevity of the dynasty, I believe, had everything to do with the foundation story told by Herodotus: that is, the line of the king was divinely ordained and guided. As to its archaic character, although tomb deposits prove that the Macedonians traded with others, mostly polis Greeks, but Macedonia didn't really engage with the rest of Greece until the Persian War. The early Temenids had little power or wealth, and were constantly defending what they had from others, especially Illyrians.

In the fifth century, this begins to change some under Alexander I and Perdiccas II, but the pace of Hellenization (and by this I mean that espoused the those in cities) really begins to accelerate under Archelaus. Still, kingship ran deep in Macedonia (look at what happened when the Romans tried to abolish kingship, without taking direct control of the realm), and kingship is a trait most other Greek states had grown beyond.

Thrace and Persia had a great influence throughout the history of Greece. Macedonia was a part of the Achaemenid Empire in the fifth century BC. On the other hand, they lived in continuous relationship with Thracian during much of its history. In what sense does this contact mark the idiosyncrasy of the Macedonian people?

I have published in several articles, what I believe to be true: that is Temenid kingship was very much influenced by Thracian notions of kingship. Persian kingship is of another kind. Persia's influence across western Asia and southeastern Europe is manifest, even at an early date. I believe that the Macedonians, Thracians, and others paid heed to Persia, even before the Persians essentially annexed lower Macedonia for a time. But Persia was far away (mostly) and I think its influence diminished with distance.

Archelaus hosted during his reign several poets, musicians, tragedians, sculptors and painters from Southern Greece, like Agathon, Euripides, Zeuxis, Callimachus or Cherilus. Was he a point of inflection in the kingdom of Macedonia or was it a trend already evident since Alexander I's time?

I have again published in several pieces that I think the rate of Hellenization in Macedonia was greatly accelerated by Archelaus, but like Borza, I don't think that any Temenid king wanted to become a Greek. These kings and the subjects rather absorbed what they liked about Greek culture into their unique realm.

Alexander I may have competed in the Olympic Games, and Greek goods can be found in Macedonian tombs, but I see no real evidence for a large attempt to appropriate Greek ways until Archelaus. After all, he created a Macedonian Olympics precisely to allow all Macedonians (probably, especially the Hetairoi) to compete for the kind of honors that were denied those who could not "prove" their Greek ancestors.

Obviously, by the end of the fifth century, more Macedonians were assuming some Greek ways, but I don't see much until Archelaus.

What role did Harry Dell play in impulsing the Macedonian studies in USA?

I think Harry Dell, a student of Charles Edson at Wisconsin, did a lot for Macedonian studies in the U.S. About the time he came along, besides Gene Borza (an exact contemporary at Penn State), I don't think there was much attention paid to Macedonia in the Americas (although Beth Carney was working at Duke).

An interesting fact is that he and Gene planned to co-write a version of the book Gene later published some 15 years after Harry's death. Dell would have an even bigger scholar in Macedonian studies if he had not passed (cancer) when he was either 47 or 48 (I don't recall the month of his birth) in 1981. Dell certainly was the reason I decided to do graduate study at UVa.

Anson, Borza, Adams and you come from the University of Virginia, Would it be correct to say that existed a "School of Virginia" for the Macedonian studies?

In the early 70's Dell began to churn out several dissertations dealing with the late Temenid period and the early Hellenistic Era. Not everyone attracted to UVa did work in Macedonian history, but increasing Virginia was becoming a hub for Macedonian studies. Ed Anson, Lindsay Adams, Frank Collins (who chose a career in the foreign service, rather than the path of scholarship) all were finishing up their dissertations, or had just finished when I came on the scene.

When I started graduate work in 1976, others began their work at UVa, too. Pat (now Dintrone), Frank Holt, and Roxane Gilmore (who didn't finish, but who did marry Jim Gilmore, the one time governor of Virginia and Presidential candidate), began to very interested in Macedonia and the Hellenistic Era. Other students began to flow in, but the interest in Macedonia took a big hit in 1981, when Dell died. Unfortunately, Harry did not take the lead in my dissertation since he died just as I was beginning (the unfortunate soul who saw me through was Lindsay Adams).

When Virginia decided not to follow with a second Macedonianist, whatever "Macedonian school of Virginia" might have become, pretty quickly died. Borza was a close friend of Dell, but never at Virginia. He studied at Chicago and taught at Penn

State. I may be wrong, but I think that Dell had more would be Macedonian students than did Borza when he was alive.



R E V I E W S

REVIEWS

Hugh Bowden, *Alexander the Great. A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014, 144 pp. [ISBN: 978-01-9870-615-1].

Very Short Introductions es una colección de la Oxford University Press que tiene el objetivo de acercar el conocimiento a personas dispuestas a adentrarse en nuevos temas de una forma rigurosa. La serie se inició en 1995 y cuenta ya con más de 350 títulos. Uno de ellos es el libro que Hugh Bowden dedica a Alejandro Magno, una obra de carácter divulgativo, coherente con el propósito de la colección de la que forma parte, sin notas a pie de página, ni referencias a las fuentes, una bibliografía muy seleccionada y un estilo ágil, basado en capítulos cortos y variados, no dispuestos en orden cronológico, que pueden leerse incluso de forma independiente, para lo que resultan muy útiles los índices que se aportan como complemento para la lectura.

No es fácil resolver dignamente una nueva biografía sobre Alejandro Magno. La cantidad de títulos que, de una manera más o menos general, abordan su vida y trayectoria es tan grande que cualquier novedad corre el riesgo de no aportar absolutamente nada. No es el caso del libro de Bowden que, si bien es cierto que no arroja ninguna nueva luz sobre la figura del rey macedonio, pone sobre la mesa de una manera amplia, solvente y rigurosa buena parte del estado de la cuestión sobre la materia, lo que supone un instrumento muy útil para aquel que quiera iniciarse en su estudio.

El enfoque es, ciertamente, original. Bowden parte de una aproximación a la figura de Alejandro mediante el análisis de tres objetos que representan la manera en la que los romanos, los babilonios y los egipcios vieron al monarca. El primero es el popular mosaico de la casa del Fauno de Pompeya, hoy en el Museo Arqueológico de Nápoles, datado hacia finales del siglo II a.C., que representa a Alejandro en una batalla contra Darío -bien Isos, bien Gaugamela-, que pudo inspirarse en una pintura griega contemporánea del macedonio. El segundo es una tablilla babilónica inscrita con caracteres cuneiformes conservada en el British Museum, cuya datación corresponde al 11 de junio del año 323 a.C. y se refiere a Alejandro como rey. El tercer objeto es una moneda de plata que representa al monarca con los cuernos de Amón, acuñada en tiempos de Lisímaco. Mosaico, tablilla y moneda son restos materiales que nos acercan, de alguna manera, a la figura de Alejandro, pero los tres ponen de manifiesto, al mismo tiempo, una serie de dudas que suponen importantes retos para todos los que se adentren en el estudio de este personaje histórico.

El desarrollo del libro se inicia con un capítulo que nos pone en antecedentes sobre la relación entre el mundo persa, el mundo griego y el macedonio antes de la aparición de Alejandro, concretamente arranca en la primera campaña de Darío en territorio

europeo, en el año 513 a.C. Aparecen, por tanto, los reinados de Amintas, de Alejandro I y, en especial, el de Filipo II, al que Bowden dedica uno de los capítulos más largos. En el bloque dedicado a Alejandro en la corte macedonia, destaca positivamente el hecho de que el autor haya dedicado un capítulo a las mujeres reales en el mundo macedonio y, en especial, a Eurídice, Olímpíade y Cleopatra. De la misma manera, también se recogen otros importantes aspectos de la corte macedonia, como el destacado papel de la caza o sus enterramientos reales. Quizás, habría que colocar en el debe del autor la ausencia de referencias a la naturaleza de la dinastía argéada y su vinculación con el pueblo macedonio, un hecho social y político de gran relevancia en la interpretación de los acontecimientos que se suceden a lo largo de la campaña asiática y cuyo análisis habría merecido un apartado específico.

Pasamos al núcleo del libro, que se extiende del capítulo tercero al séptimo. En este cuerpo central se detallan diferentes aspectos relacionados con la campaña. El capítulo tercero se centra en la faceta militar, con apartados dedicados al estudio del funcionamiento de su ejército y a las principales batallas, por todos conocidas; mientras que el cuarto aborda la siempre espinosa cuestión de la relación de Alejandro y los macedonios con el resto de griegos, donde no faltan referencias a la polémica entre la facción promacedonia y antimacedonia en Atenas, encarnadas en las figuras de Esquines y Demóstenes, respectivamente, así como al famoso decreto de los exiliados, ya en campaña. Los capítulos 5 y 6 se dedican a la figura de Alejandro como faraón de Egipto y como rey de Persia. En ellos se abordan episodios sumamente conocidos, como la fundación de Alejandría, la consulta del oráculo de Amón en Siwa, la quema de Persépolis o el motín de la *Proskynesis*. El capítulo 7 se centra en la campaña en Asia Central y la India. En este bloque aborda cuestiones tan controvertidas como las intrigas en el seno de la corte alejandrina, el mítico encuentro con la reina de las amazonas y la travesía de regreso por el desierto de Gedrosia.

El último bloque, que podríamos limitar a los capítulos 8 y 9, narra la muerte del rey, sin entrar en la cuestión posterior de los diádocos, y la recepción de su figura en épocas venideras, con un apartado dedicado a Julio César, y otros dos finales centrados en la recepción de Alejandro en el mundo medieval y el renacimiento de su figura en el período que va de los siglos XVII al XIX. Bowden finaliza la obra con un apartado titulado “Héroe o villano”, en el que contrapone dos maneras de interpretar la figura de Alejandro: la de Johann Gustav Droysen y la de George Grote. Debate que da por finalizado este ameno e ilustrador libro sobre la figura del rey macedonio.

M. AGUDO VILLANUEVA
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
marioagudo@gmail.com

Mario Agudo Villanueva, *Macedonia. La cuna de Alejandro Magno*. Madrid, Dstoria edicions, 2016, 254. pp [ISBN: 978-84-941455-7-5].

El título de la obra que reseñamos puede resultar engañoso, puesto que no se trata de otra biografía sobre Alejandro Magno, al contrario, este libro es la primera monografía escrita en lengua castellana sobre la antigua Macedonia. A diferencia de lo que ocurre con el célebre conquistador macedonio, los estudios sobre su lugar de origen no han tenido apenas incidencia en la historiografía española, por lo que resulta un motivo de alegría que por fin podamos contar con una pequeña monografía en nuestra lengua sobre este tema. Si tenemos en cuenta la carencia de fondos bibliográficos que hay en las bibliotecas españolas sobre la antigua Macedonia puede calificarse casi de milagro su publicación. Si observamos la formación del autor, Mario Agudo Villanueva, un periodista especializado en arqueología e historia antigua, podríamos considerarlo como una proeza, ya que un *outsider* del mundo académico ha conseguido lo que otros no pudieron.

Todo lo dicho hasta ahora nos sirve para entender las dificultades que ha tenido que hacer frente el autor para engendrar la obra que reseñamos. Las 254 páginas que conforman el libro se dividen en cuatro bloques:

En el primero, “Los orígenes de Macedonia” (25-87) se estudian los inicios del pueblo macedonio, se delimita el espacio geográfico de su reino y se introduce al lector en la cuestión sobre la pertenencia o no de los macedonios al mundo griego. Un asunto muy interesante, pero tremendamente complicado al estar muy politizado, pero que Agudo Villanueva presenta muy correctamente sin tomar partido abiertamente por ninguno de los bandos. Sus conocimientos arqueológicos y sus contactos con A. Kottaridi, la directora de las excavaciones en Vergina, convierten a este capítulo en uno de los mejores del libro.

En la segunda parte de este bloque se estudian la sociedad, la religión y la organización política de Macedonia, siendo en mi opinión la parte más destacable del libro, pues lo fácil habría sido escribir un estudio positivista en el que primasen la descripción de los acontecimientos históricos, pero de este modo podemos contextualizar a las grandes personalidades históricas de la antigua Macedonia y entender que existieron peculiaridades en este pueblo que muchas veces son obviadas para incrementar sus semejanzas con los griegos. Aspectos como la caza, los banquetes, el papel de la asamblea macedonia o su interpretación del rey macedonio como el padre de su pueblo (pág. 85: “una especie de padre que guía a sus hijos y que cuando muere, deja huérfanos a sus súbditos”) se presentan por primera en lengua castellana de forma clara y lúcida.

El segundo bloque, “La historia de Macedonia” (91-143) está dedicado a los eventos políticos que se produjeron en Macedonia antes del reinado de Alejandro. El autor dedica unas 50 páginas a desarrollar un tema que en las biografías de Alejandro Magno quedaba reducido tradicionalmente a una página. Generalmente suelen hacerse alguna que otra mención a reyes como Alejandro I Filohelene, Arquelao y Filipo II, pero al resto apenas se les ha prestado atención. Se suele reconocer la contribución de Filipo en el engrandecimiento de Macedonia, pero sus logros quedan descontextualizados al no conocer la situación anterior que tuvieron que enfrentar reyes como Amintas III. Ahora bien, hasta la fecha no hay ninguna biografía en castellano sobre Filipo de

Macedonia, sólo contamos con un estudio de Arturo Sánchez Sanz sobre las reformas militares del padre de Alejandro que es bastante irregular¹. Por poner un ejemplo se han traducido al castellano dos biografías de Hammond sobre Alejandro Magno², pero no ha ocurrido lo mismo con su *Philip of Macedon*³. De uno de los grandes historiadores de la Antigüedad, Arnaldo Momigliano se ha traducido prácticamente todo, pero su libro de 1934, *Filippo il Macedone* todavía espera que alguien se decida a traducirlo. En otras palabras, incluso a la hora de hablar de Filipo, el hombre que Teopompo de Quíos (*FGrH*, 115, F27) calificó como el más grande que Europa había conocido, hay carencias en la historiografía española que Mario ha tenido que afrontar y que ha ayudado en la medida de sus capacidades y medios a solventar.

Tal vez por este motivo, el tercer bloque del libro, “Los orígenes de Alejandro” (pp. 147-185) está dedicado a conocer el entorno familiar de Alejandro. Agudo Villanueva ni contrapone ni enfrenta al padre con el hijo como suelen hacer la mayoría de los historiadores. Al contrario, se esfuerza en demostrarnos la deuda de Alejandro con su herencia paterna y con Macedonia.

En el cuarto bloque, “Alejandro en el poder” (pp. 189-210) se centra en la figura de Alejandro. Un personaje sobre el que se han vertido auténticos ríos de tinta. Aquí el problema es completamente diferente, se ha escrito tanto que la posibilidad de decir algo nuevo resulta sumamente remota. Un personaje por el que el autor no oculta su admiración, pero que no duda en criticar cuando es necesario. Como Macedonia es el verdadero objeto de estudio la narración de los hechos finaliza con la salida de Alejandro de su tierra.

El libro concluye con una serie de anexos entre los que destaca una breve presentación de las fuentes, que Mario conoce muy bien, pues, aunque como hemos mencionado tiene un conocimiento más que aceptable de la historiografía macedonia y los estudios alejandrinos, el autor prefiere apoyarse directamente en las fuentes siempre que tiene ocasión. Demostrando que conoce muy bien las obras de Arriano y Curcio. No obstante, eso provoca que en ocasiones pase por alto cuestiones que son comúnmente aceptadas por los investigadores. El asedio de Tebas se nos presenta tal y como Arriano lo describe siguiendo a Ptolomeo, y nunca se pone en guardia al lector de las desavenencias de éste con Pérdicas, hijo de Orontes, que pudieron influir en su descripción de los hechos.

Como toda obra no está exenta de errores. La mayoría se deben a las dudas del autor a la hora de transcribir correctamente los nombres griegos al castellano. Enumeramos algunas de ellas: p. 31, n.6 escribe Pidno cuando quiere decir Pindo; p. 66, escribe Amfópolis en vez de Anfópolis; p. 66, Pella en vez de Pela; p. 78, Eufraios en lugar de Eufreo; p. 159, Peitagoras en vez de Pitágoras. Tampoco se citan los autores clásicos con las abreviaturas convencionales, pero el libro no está dirigido únicamente a especialistas y se ha optado por este sistema para que sea más asequible a la mayor cantidad de lectores.

Hay cuestiones sobre las que se puede disentir con el autor, pero que no empañan en modo alguno la calidad del libro. En la pg. 115 se dice que Filipo se hospedó en la casa del padre de Epaminondas y que sólo volvió a Macedonia tras la muerte de Pérdicas III. Sabemos por las fuentes que Filipo gobernó algunos territorios de Macedonia en vida de su hermano; Se dice que el relato de Arriano en el asedio de Tebas es el “más

¹ *Filipo II y el arte de la guerra*, Madrid, 2013, 152.

² F. J. GÓMEZ ESPELOSÍN, *Alejandro Magno. Rey, general y estadista*, Madrid, 1992, 441; F. J. GÓMEZ ESPELOSÍN, *El genio de Alejandro Magno*, Barcelona, 2004, 288.

³ N. G. L. HAMMOND, , *Philip of Macedon*, London 1994, 235.

técnico y riguroso” (p. 200) de nuestras fuentes cuando sabemos que denigra a Pérdicas (cf. p. 215); p. 231 afirma que el Pseudo-Calístenes fue “una fabulación sin rigor histórico” cuando es una fuente importante para la ascensión de Alejandro o en su posible coronación como faraón en Egipto.

Ser un precursor en un campo nunca es una tarea fácil. Al contrario, abrir nuevos caminos siempre conlleva responsabilidad y la obligación de marchar por donde nadie lo ha hecho antes. Es una empresa difícil y solitaria. Y Mario Agudo Villanueva lo ha recorrido con gran dignidad. Esta obra no sólo llena un vacío, nos obliga a reflexionar sobre los motivos que han provocado que los investigadores españoles hayamos descuidado durante décadas los estudios macedonios.

A. I. MOLINA MARÍN
Universidad de Alcalá
miprofeignacio@gmail.com

Claudia Antonetti – Biagi, Paolo (eds.), *With Alexander in India and Central Asia: moving East and back to West*. Oxford, Oxbow Books. 2017, 292 pp. [978-17-857058-4-7].

Claudia Antonetti y Paolo Biagi compilan en este libro las actas del congreso celebrado en octubre y noviembre de 2014 en Venecia bajo el título *Anabasi: Sulle orme di Alessandro dalla morte di Dario*. Como los propios autores ya indican en la introducción, los once artículos presentados se agrupan en dos categorías temático-geográficas: la primera cubre la etapa de la expedición entre Babilonia y Asia Central, y la segunda se centra en India y el viaje de vuelta a Mesopotamia. Si bien delimitados en el espacio, en el tiempo hay una cierta flexibilidad, incluyendo trabajos que se mueven completamente fuera del marco temporal y geográfico de la conquista de Alejandro, en especial en el primer bloque, donde la figura del rey macedonio sólo se percibe con entidad propia en los artículos de Rabin, Gorshenina y Olbrycht.

En el segundo bloque, por su parte, Alejandro aparece de una manera mucho más difusa y focalizan la atención las contribuciones geográficas y etnográficas de autores como Nearco o Megástenes, entre otros.

Paola Corò firma el primer artículo centrado en la presencia griega en las fuentes cuneiformes. En él presenta una buena aproximación a un ámbito de estudio siempre problemático dado el solapamiento de disciplinas consideradas como “diferenciadas”. Como ocurre en muchos otros espacios de encuentro, esa confluencia acaba generando paradójicamente un cierto temor y vacío historiográfico. Su punto de vista reivindica las posibilidades intrínsecas de un trabajo que trascienda esas fronteras artificiales trazadas desde la academia. El artículo de Corò, sin embargo (y seguramente a causa de las limitaciones de espacio), no va mucho más allá de esta declaración de intenciones metodológica y uno se queda con ganas de ver su aplicación en casos concretos. Su valor como introducción a este campo “olvidado” es innegable no sólo para los estudiosos de Alejandro (aunque lidie con él solo tangencialmente), sino para todos los historiadores del mundo clásico dado su carácter transversal.

El segundo capítulo, a cargo de Vito Messina, se centra exclusivamente en el período seléucida, en concreto de la iconografía real, y, por lo tanto, la figura de Alejandro se encuentra virtualmente ausente. Su enfoque prioriza una interpretación polisémica de los retratos y de los elementos simbólicos presentes en monedas, sellos y estatuas. Su aportación resulta especialmente interesante en estos dos últimos formatos, dada la fuerte preeminencia de la numismática en esta clase de estudios. De esta manera, evidencia la existencia de una intercomunicación a dos o tres bandas entre las diferentes plataformas de representación, ampliando y complementando los datos extraídos únicamente de las acuñaciones monetarias. Quizás hubiese sido interesante establecer más comparaciones con la numismática greco-bactriana e indo-griega, dado que habría podido enriquecido la exposición. También sorprende la virtual ausencia de notas, que en algunos casos se hacen necesarias para glosar ciertos aspectos del estudio.

Claudio Rabin dedica la que es de largo la más extensa contribución de este libro a la siempre complicada cuestión de la geografía y la cronología de las campañas orientales de Alejandro Magno, una problemática que ya ha tratado en otros artículos. Su aportación no sólo se limita a dar una ubicación más o menos precisa de los diferentes hechos de la expedición del rey macedonio, sino que también permite

acercarse a la conceptualización geográfica de los autores antiguos y a la transmisión de ese conocimiento, a menudo erróneo. Así pues, rehúye del literalismo del que han pecado algunos intentos previos y que, a menudo, ha resultado infructuoso. Dada la complejidad del tema, los mapas que ilustran las explicaciones de Rapin son especialmente bienvenidos. Las aportaciones de Rapin no solo se limitan a localizar sobre el terreno estos lugares, sino que sus soluciones sirven para clarificar las confusas y contradictorias versiones presentadas por los autores antiguos.

El siguiente artículo, escrito por Lorenzo Crescioli, trata las influencias presentes en la iconografía y el registro arqueológico escita, en especial de la cultura de Pazyryk. La figura de Alejandro y la conquista macedonia sólo aparece muy vagamente en sus páginas, pese a dedicar un pequeño apartado al final. Su comparativa es de largo alcance y no se centra exclusivamente en los posibles influjos helénicos y helenísticos, sino también próximo-orientales y aqueménidas. Se encuentra a faltar, no obstante, una mayor comparativa con reinos como el arsácida o el greco-bactriano, que podrían haber presentado interesantes puntos de comparación. En relación a este último, por ejemplo, en el caso de los grifos podría haber acarado las representaciones escitas con las presentes en las empuñaduras de marfil de unas espadas votivas halladas en Takht-i Sangin¹. La posibilidad de un impacto directo sobre los flujos de influencias a causa de la llegada de los macedonios no puede ser constatada arqueológicamente, como el propio autor reconoce.

Svetlana Gorshenina es la encargada de redactar el quinto capítulo del libro. En él, la autora permite al lector una interesante mirada a la historiografía rusa, muy a menudo olvidada por los historiadores europeos por su aparente inaccesibilidad. A través del ejemplo de la identificación de Maracanda y Samarcanda, que ocupa gran parte de la extensión de su trabajo, es posible percibir una evolución historiográfica de largo alcance, desde la Edad Media hasta inicios del siglo XX. Resulta también de gran interés la recapitulación de los enfoques de los autores de la segunda mitad del siglo XIX e inicios del XX alrededor de la actuación y el legado de Alejandro en Asia Central y cómo estos se alinean respecto a las diferentes corrientes generadas desde las academias europeas. Sin duda, una segunda parte, quizás ya cubriendo el período soviético, sería muy bien recibida al facilitar el acceso a la desconocida escuela rusa.

Para cerrar esta primera parte, Marek Jan Olbrycht revisita un tema al cual ya ha dedicado varios artículos, como es el de las políticas de Alejandro en sus dominios más orientales, así como la influencia y el rol desempeñados por los súbditos de esos territorios. Olbrycht pone en valor la importancia de los contingentes iranos durante la campaña en India. El carácter multiétnico del ejército de Alejandro va incrementándose conforme avanza la campaña, aunque este hecho ha sido muy a menudo soslayado, minimizado o negado por parte de la historiografía. Merece la pena, pues, reivindicar que el éxito de la expedición no sólo fue gracias a los macedonios y, en menor medida, los griegos, sino que el papel jugado por los soldados de otros orígenes, ya sean tracios o iranos, fue fundamental en diversas etapas. El planteamiento alrededor del posible mensaje hacia los iranos presente en las “monedas de Poro” resulta innovador, pero la siempre flexible interpretación iconográfica me sugiere ciertas dudas acerca de las conclusiones.

¹ B. A. LITVINSKIĬ, - I. R. PIČIKJAN (1995): “An Achaemenian griffin-handle from the temple of the Oxus. The makhaira in northern Bactria”, in A. INVERNIZZI (ed.): *In the land of the gryphons. Papers on Central Asian archaeology in antiquity*, Firenze: 107-128 (el título del volumen ya es indicativo de la relación establecida en la Antigüedad entre esta tierra y los grifos); B. A. LITVINSKIĬ – I. R. PIČIKJAN (1999): “Handles and Ceremonial Scabbards of Greek Swords from the Temple of the Oxus in Northern Bactria”, *East and West* 49.1: 47–104.

El segundo bloque del volumen se abre con un breve artículo de Francesco Prontera. El autor discute las concepciones geográficas de la Antigüedad con especial atención al caso del ubicuo, móvil y de indefinible extensión Cáucaso. Su intención de ponerse en la piel de los antiguos geógrafos, en parte, comparte la esencia de Rapin, aplicada a un nivel macro, si bien no lo aplica para intentar ubicar las rutas y hechos de la expedición de Alejandro. El acento de su trabajo se centra, en especial, en reivindicar el inevitable papel que tuvo la campaña de conquista para renovar los viejos paradigmas y plantear una nueva concepción general del mundo.

La octava contribución corre a cargo de Andrea Zambrini. El objetivo de su artículo ya aparece claro en el título: “Megasthenes Thirty Years Later”, en referencia al libro que él mismo escribió a mediados de los años 80 acerca de este personaje. Su intención, pues, es reivindicar la vigencia de su contribución contra las críticas o visiones divergentes que han ido surgiendo alrededor de su obra. En primer lugar, y enfocado a los investigadores más jóvenes, dedica unas páginas a contextualizar la génesis de esa monografía dentro de las corrientes sociales, antropológicas e historiográficas del momento. Su foco principal, no obstante, es el de contestar a las posiciones de Bosworth sobre la figura y la obra de Megástenes. El ejemplo que elige fundamentalmente para ilustrar su concepción de la motivación tras su *Índica* es el célebre encuentro entre Alejandro y los gimnosofistas, contraponiendo la versión de Megástenes con la de Onesícrito. A partir de ahí, deriva una interpretación propia de la conquista de la India y el papel de diferentes elementos locales (Taxiles, Calano y los Brahmanes), que exuda ciertos aromas de contemporaneidad (en especial, con el colaboracionismo durante la Segunda Guerra Mundial o los conflictos coloniales posteriores). Su interpretación no solo es arriesgada en su planteamiento, sino también en sus consecuencias al dibujar un Megástenes con una cierta hostilidad al imperialismo o al colonialismo, en su caso encarnado por los Seléucidas.

Steffano Beggiora busca en su artículo establecer una necesaria contextualización de las fuentes griegas sobre la India durante la conquista de Alejandro. Los episodios del subcontinente indio hoy aún siguen siendo atractivos y, en especial, por realizarse el primer gran encuentro público entre dos civilizaciones aparentemente tan lejanas. En ocasiones, se han cargado duramente las tintas contra los historiadores clásicos por su falta de objetividad y precisión. Beggiora enfatiza el hecho que resulta del todo inapropiado tratar de trasladar para toda la India las costumbres observadas en unos contextos geográficos muy circunscritos y cómo, dado el tiempo también limitado que allí pasaron algunos de esos autores, pudieron generalizar episodios meramente puntuales. Solamente de esta manera es posible empezar a valorar la verdadera utilidad de estas fuentes para reconstruir la historia y la sociedad de la India antigua.

Paolo Biagi dedica el décimo capítulo a la primera etapa del periplo de Nearco. En él, a través de análisis fundamentalmente malacológicos y de paleopaisaje, busca identificar sobre el terreno los posibles puntos mencionados en el relato de ese viaje. Pero, como ya el propio autor lamenta, no hay ningún indicio en el registro arqueológico que corrobore la presencia helenística en la región. Su trabajo, si bien interesante para reconstruir el antiguo paisaje de ese litoral, resulta de poca utilidad para el historiador de Alejandro. A diferencia del caso de Rapin, estos datos poco pueden ayudar a modificar o ratificar aspectos del paso de Alejandro y su ejército por ese territorio. Además, como el mismo Biagi admite, por sus características esta área ha sufrido grandes cambios en los más de dos mil años transcurridos desde entonces, hecho que a veces parece olvidar en su escrito.

El último artículo es el de Veronica Bucciantini. En él, la autora centra su atención en el relato de Nearco acerca de su navegación entre el Indo y Susa. Es interesante la

primera observación atribuyendo el carácter más sintético de la etapa final a Arriano. En ocasiones, se ha tendido a olvidar la mano de este autor y a pensar que el texto de la *Índica* corresponde a una copia *verbatim* del original, más allá de las intervenciones más manifiestas. También, retomando ideas ya propuestas por otros investigadores, remarca el carácter literario perceptible en el relato (con reminiscencias de la *Odisea*), huyendo del supuesto carácter aséptico y objetivo que se le había atribuido en ocasiones. Es en este punto donde emerge la pregunta sobre a quién hay que atribuir estos toques literarios. La comparación establecida con un pasaje del *Periplo* de Arriano es muy significativa e ilustra claramente que cabe atribuir esas reelaboraciones con regusto homérico a Nearco. No obstante, se encuentra a faltar un apartado o unas líneas en las que pudiese discutir las posibles motivaciones y objetivos tras el relato del navegante cretense, si bien este aspecto ya ha sido tratado por otros autores.

En global, pues, el *With Alexander* del título de este volumen resulta extremadamente flexible. Los aspectos directamente concernientes con la campaña del conquistador macedonio en los territorios de Asia Central e India son una minoría frente a aspectos más colaterales e incluso tangenciales. Los artículos sí que cumplen en el propósito de aportar visiones alejadas del eurocentrismo y el helenocentrismo, con lo que enriquecen discusiones que a menudo repiten y reformulan incansablemente los mismos argumentos, y dotan de entidad propia realidades que han sido consideradas un mero accesorio de la narrativa de Alejandro y sus sucesores.

M. MENDOZA SANAHUJA
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
mendo_coldhill@hotmail.com

Timothy Howe – E. Edward Gavrin – Graham Wrightson (eds.): *Greece, Macedon and Persia. Studies in Social, Political and Military History in Honor of Waldemar Heckel*. Oxford, Oxbow Books, 2015, 214 pp. [ISBN: 978-17-829792-3-4].

Waldemar Heckel is, without any trace of doubt, one of the most influential experts in the world about Ancient Macedonia. Even during my time as an undergraduate, some of his books were always close to me because of how fundamental they are to better understand my current field of expertise, the Successors. In fact, it would be fair to say that his works have reached great fame among the Academics and undergrad students all around the world. It should not come as a surprise, then, that such a prestigious reunion of Academics has decided to prepare this work in his honour.

The book consists of a collection of papers, each dealing with an aspect related in one way or the other with either Greece, Macedonia or Persia.

Nevertheless, Ancient Macedonia is the main protagonist. Most chapters deal with either Macedonia itself in one point or the other of its extensive history, from before Philip and Alexander till Roman times, with only a small amount dealing with Ancient Persia or Greece.

Furthermore, the only chapter focusing on Ancient Persia, by Sabine Müller, deals with Alexander's conquest in a certain way. Despite Darius I being the subject of study, it is clear that his experience, narrated in said chapter, can be applied to Alexander and his military operations against the different pretenders that tried to quickly seize power and grab the throne once Darius III had been murdered.

This chapter, I may add, maybe one of the most interesting ones in the book. Usually the Hellenistic world has been studied as its own separate part of the Middle Eastern history, but for some time now the Academia has started to acknowledge the fact that some ideas of previous kingdoms and states survived well into the Hellenistic era and this chapter is a clear example of a Greek king having to adapt and deal with a problem similar to what a previous, native king may have had to deal with. It is nevertheless a pity that it focuses on the case of Alexander (and, of course, of Darius I and other Persian kings), when similar examples can be found from Seleucid times.

However, the topics, even if they mostly deal with Macedonian affairs, are quite varied when it comes to the aspects of Macedonian history they deal with. Some deal with not so common subject, such as historiography (chapters 3, 10, 13 and 19), religion (chapter 16), gender (chapter 4) and some others deal with more commonly talked about themes such as political events or military concerns and campaigns.

These are, in my humble opinion, the weakest among the many that conform the book. Military history has always been featured often in Ancient History journals and books, undoubtedly because the Roman Legions and the Macedonian phalanx has always been able to captivate the minds of the young and the not so young. Political events and history also used to occupy a dominating role in the very same works, and the same topics have been talked and discussed about for centuries now.

This doesn't mean that the chapter dealing with the Argead infantry (chapter 5) isn't worth a read, but I'd say that there are more interesting chapters within the same book, especially those aforementioned ones that deal with more uncommon themes, such as Macedonian religion or women and the role they played in politics.

The fact that most of the chapters are dedicated in one way or another to Macedonia should not come off as a surprise. Heckel is mainly an Ancient Macedonia scholar, and thus, in this book written in his honour, this land is featured predominantly.

All in all, this is a well recommended book. I found most chapters interesting, even if I have my own preferences and I would recommend some of them more than the others. The selection of scholars that collaborated to bring this book to the public could hardly been better, because most of them are leading scholars in the field of Ancient Macedonian and Hellenistic History.

M. PACHÓN
Universidad de Alcalá
mpachonbarragan@gmail.com

F. J. Gómez Espelosín, *En busca de Alejandro: historia de una obsesión*, Alcalá de Henares, Servicio de publicaciones de la UAH, 2016, 438pp. [ISBN 978-84-16599-88-2].

En 1997 Gómez Espelosín escribía junto con Guzmán Guerra su primer libro sobre Alejandro de Macedonia¹. Pese a su naturaleza divulgativa, el estudio volvía a situar a los historiadores españoles en la órbita de los estudios alejandrinos, pues era la primera obra de cierta relevancia de un investigador nacional desde el libro de Santiago Montero hacía más de un siglo². Diez años después el autor volvía a sacar otro libro sobre Alejandro en el que nuevamente el obsoleto estudio biográfico era obviado en beneficio de estudios temáticos que pudieran beneficiar no sólo al investigador, sino también a todos aquellos que comprendiesen que Alejandro de Macedonia es un mito³. Desde hace años el término mito se asocia al conquistador en cada nueva e insulsa biografía que anualmente ve la luz en el mercado editorial. Cada uno de estos trabajos enriquecen con sus perspectivas el mito que estamos tratando, pero a diferencia de otros autores Gómez Espelosín es plenamente consciente de que se trata de un mito historiográfico. Es por esta razón que en este tercer libro el autor se centra casi exclusivamente en el devenir de la imagen de Alejandro en el tiempo. Desde los primeros historiadores que le prestaron atención hasta las formas más recientes en las que este mito ha evolucionado (novelas, cine, etc) son estudiados en este monumental trabajo: el primer estudio en lengua castellana dedicado plenamente al análisis de la tradición historiográfica sobre Alejandro Magno.

A lo largo de ocho capítulos y siguiendo un hilo cronológico Gómez Espelosín nos lleva de la mano en un intento por comprender la evolución de este mito polimórfico tan fascinante que es Alejandro de Macedonia. El primero de ellos, “Alejandro elusivo” (pp. 15-32) nos explica los motivos por los que es prácticamente imposible conocer al verdadero Alejandro: la obra de Calístenes, las fuentes, la naturaleza homérica de las mismas, etc. Todo ello hace que Alejandro se distancie de forma progresiva de cualquier intento de reconstrucción histórica, y se convierta en “un modelo mítico que se ha ido adaptando casi a la perfección a las necesidades de cada época” (p. 74).

En el segundo capítulo, “La insoportable levedad de nuestros testimonios” (pp. 33-74) enumera toda evidencia de la época de Alejandro: autores contemporáneos, monedas, inscripciones, iconografía, restos arqueológicos, las tumbas de Vergina, el itinerario de la expedición, el espacio geográfico, la documentación oficial, etc. El dominio y el conocimiento del autor en esta cuestión resultan abrumadores.

El tercer capítulo, “Historias antiguas de Alejandro” (pp. 75-134) enumera y comenta todos los autores antiguos que escribieron sobre el macedonio desde su época hasta la tardoantigüedad. Especial atención recibe la novela del Pseudo-Calístenes, un verdadero “imán para toda esta clase de materiales de carácter fabuloso” (p. 125).

El cuarto capítulo, “La metamorfosis de un héroe” (pp. 135-180) explica la transformación de Alejandro en un héroe religioso durante la Edad Media, tanto en la

¹ A. GUZMÁN GUERRA – F. J. GÓMEZ ESPELOSÍN (1997): *Alejandro Magno: de la historia al mito*, Madrid.

² S. MONTERO DÍAZ (1944): *Alejandro Magno*, Madrid.

³ F. J. GÓMEZ ESPELOSÍN (2007): *La leyenda de Alejandro Magno: Mito, historiografía y propaganda*, Alcalá de Henares.

Europa Occidental como en el mundo bizantino, árabe y persa. Aunque la imagen del personaje es generalmente positiva en todas estas tradiciones se mueve a lo largo de dicho período en cierta ambigüedad que ayuda a enriquecer aún más al mismo (p. 175).

El quinto capítulo, “La construcción moderna de Alejandro” (pp. 181-232) se centra en la imagen del rey conquistador durante el Renacimiento y la Ilustración, para después abordar la contribución de los grandes historiadores del macedonio (Droysen, Hogarth, Tarn, Schachermeyr, Badian, etc). El capítulo finaliza con la impronta de Alejandro en la ficción moderna (Renault, Manfredi, Pressfield, etc). Es en nuestra opinión una de las partes más logradas del libro, ya que nos permite reflexionar sobre las diferencias, si las hay, entre el Alejandro histórico y el literario.

En el sexto capítulo, “Tras los pasos de Alejandro” (pp. 233-272) la cronología deja de ser el hilo conductor alrededor del cual se exponen los hechos y es sustituida por el espacio geográfico. En este capítulo se unen las dos grandes especialidades del autor: Alejandro Magno y el viaje. Toponimia (Puertas Caspias, Valle Tenebroso, etc), cartografía (mapa de Hereford) y los relatos de viajeros (Apolonio de Tiana, Marco Polo, Odorico de Pordenone, Ruy González de Clavijo, Robert Byron, Paul Faure, etc) llenan las páginas del libro creando una verdadera geografía en la que realidad y ficción se entremezclan, al igual que ocurre con el objeto de estudio del libro.

El séptimo capítulo, “Los otros Alejandros” (pp. 273-341) estudia el fenómeno conocido como la *imitatio Alexandri*, y no sólo en la antigüedad grecorromana, ya que también se comentan personajes fuera del mundo griego (Sandrocató) y otros cercanos a nuestro tiempo (Napoleón). Todos ellos personifican la obsesión por Alejandro hasta el punto de presentarse como émulos de éste.

En el octavo y último capítulo, “Anatomía de una obsesión. Mitos antiguos y modernos” (pp. 343-364) se repasan algunos de los aspectos que más han sido tratados por autores antiguos y modernos, como general, líder y civilizador.

La obra se cierra con una abundante bibliografía (pp. 365-418) con la que el autor pone de relieve su enorme conocimiento sobre el tema.

En conclusión, Gómez Espelosín nos ofrece un estudio de enorme calidad que llena un vacío no sólo en los estudios alejandrinos de lengua castellana, sino también en el panorama internacional. El investigador que hace más de veinte años empezó como coautor su periplo como especialista de Alejandro Magno ha evolucionado hasta el punto de ser plenamente consciente de que hay muchos *Alejandros* y no uno en concreto. Es capaz de hacer entender a sus lectores que el conquistador macedonio es irre recuperable, pero al mismo tiempo que la verdadera misión de todo historiador es iniciar su búsqueda. Esa es la obsesión que a lo largo cuatrocientas páginas encontraremos en este trabajo.

A. I. MOLINA MARÍN
Universidad de Alcalá
miprofeignacio@gmail.com



Karanos

BULLETIN OF
ANCIENT MACEDONIAN STUDIES

Vol. 1, 2018

ISSN 2604-6199 (paper), eISSN 2604-3521 (online)

<http://revistes.uab.cat/karanos>

Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor to A. B. Bosworth

Baynham, Elizabeth. *Professor Brian Bosworth, a brief biography.*

Papers

Djurslev, Christian Thruë; Ogden, Daniel. Alexander, Agathoi Daimones, Argives and Armenians.

Palagia, Olga. Alexander the Great, the royal throne and the funerary thrones of Macedonia.

Antela-Bernárdez, Borja; Sierra Martín, César. Alexander and the Medicine.

Djurslev, Christian Thruë. Battling without Beards: Synesius of Cyrene's *Calvitii encomium*, Arrian's Anabasis Alexandri and the Alexander discourse of the fourth century AD.

Müller, Sabine. Icons, Images, Interpretations: Arrian, Lukian, their Relationship, and Alexander at the Kydnos.

Molina Marín, Antonio Ignacio. Death on the Nile. The Murder of Perdiccas and the river crossing in Ancient Macedonia.

Flashbacks

Gruen, Erich S. The Coronation of the Diadochi.

Main Voices in Ancient Macedonian Studies

Agudo Villanueva, Mario; Molina Marín, Antonio Ignacio. William Greenwalt.