

# CREATING A HELLENISTIC WORLD



*Edited by*

Andrew Erskine

*and*

Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones

CREATING  
A  
HELLENISTIC  
WORLD

*Editors*

Andrew Erskine  
and  
Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones

*Contributors*

Elizabeth Carney, Stephen Colvin, Andrew Erskine,  
Robin Lane Fox, Richard Hunter, Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones,  
Alan B. Lloyd, Daniel Ogden, James I. Porter, Joseph Roisman,  
Peter Schultz, Shane Wallace, Hans-Ulrich Wiemer,  
Josef Wieshöfer, Stephanie Winder



The Classical Press of Wales

First published in 2011 by  
The Classical Press of Wales  
15 Rosehill Terrace, Swansea SA1 6JN  
Tel: +44 (0)1792 458397  
[www.classicalpressofwales.co.uk](http://www.classicalpressofwales.co.uk)

Distributor in the United States of America  
ISD, LLC  
70 Enterprise Dr., Suite 2, Bristol, CT 06010  
Tel: +1 (860) 584-6546  
[www.isdistribution.com](http://www.isdistribution.com)

© 2011 The authors

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

ISBN 978-1-910589-24-3

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Typeset, printed and bound in the UK by Gomer Press, Llandysul, Ceredigion, Wales

---

*The Classical Press of Wales, an independent venture, was founded in 1993, initially to support the work of classicists and ancient historians in Wales and their collaborators from further afield. More recently it has published work initiated by scholars internationally. While retaining a special loyalty to Wales and the Celtic countries, the Press welcomes scholarly contributions from all parts of the world.*

The symbol of the Press is the Red Kite. This bird, once widespread in Britain, was reduced by 1905 to some five individuals confined to a small area known as 'The Desert of Wales' – the upper Tywi valley. Geneticists report that the stock was saved from terminal inbreeding by the arrival of one stray female bird from Germany. After much careful protection, the Red Kite now thrives – in Wales and beyond.

To  
the two Gillians, our mothers

# CONTENTS

	Page
<u>List of Contributors</u>	ix
<u>Abbreviations</u>	xiii
<u>Introduction</u>	xv
<i>Andrew Erskine and Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones</i>	

## PART I NEW WORLDS

1 <u>The first Hellenistic man</u>	1
<i>Robin Lane Fox</i>	
2 <u>The koine: A new language for a new world</u>	31
<i>Stephen Colvin</i>	
3 <u>The letter of Aristeas</u>	47
<i>Richard Hunter</i>	

## PART II RULERS AND SUBJECTS

4 <u>The Silver Shields, Eumenes, and their historian</u>	61
<i>Joseph Roisman</i>	
5 <u>From satrapy to Hellenistic kingdom: the case of Egypt</u>	83
<i>Alan B. Lloyd</i>	
6 <u>Frataraka rule in Seleucid Persis: a new appraisal</u>	107
<i>Josef Wiesehöfer</i>	

PART III  
THE POLIS

- 7 Early Hellenistic Rhodes: the struggle for independence and the dream of hegemony 123  
*Hans-Ulrich Wiemer*
- 8 The significance of Plataia for Greek *eleutheria* in the early Hellenistic period 147  
*Shane Wallace*

Part IV  
THE COURT

- 9 Between philosophy and the court: the life of Persaios of Kition 177  
*Andrew Erskine*
- 10 Being royal and female in the early Hellenistic period 195  
*Elizabeth D. Carney*
- 11 How to marry a courtesan in the Macedonian courts 221  
*Daniel Ogden*
- 12 A key to Berenike's Lock? The Hathoric model of queenship in early Ptolemaic Egypt 247  
*Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones and Stephanie Winder*

Part V  
CHANGING AESTHETICS

- 13 Against λεπτότης: rethinking Hellenistic aesthetics 271  
*James I. Porter*
- 14 Style, continuity and the Hellenistic baroque 313  
*Peter Schultz*

- Index 345

## CONTRIBUTORS

**Elizabeth Carney** is Professor of History and Carol K. Brown Scholar in the Humanities at Clemson University. She is author of *Women and Monarchy in Ancient Macedonia* (2000), *Olympias, Mother of Alexander the Great* (2006) and co-editor of *Philip II and Alexander the Great: Father and son, lives and afterlives* (2010).

**Stephen Colvin** is Reader in Classics and Comparative Philology at University College London. His main interests are Greek language, dialect and literature; the koine and Mycenaean Greek; historical linguistics and sociolinguistics. Major publications include *Dialect in Aristophanes* (1999), *The Greco-Roman East* (2004), and *A Historical Greek Reader* (2007).

**Andrew Erskine** is Professor of Ancient History at the University of Edinburgh. He is the author of *The Hellenistic Stoa* (1990), *Troy between Greece and Rome* (2001) and *Roman Imperialism* (2010). He is the editor of *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* (2003) and *A Companion to Ancient History* (2009).

**Robin Lane Fox** is Reader in Ancient History at the University of Oxford and Fellow of New College. His publications range widely over the ancient world and include *Alexander the Great* (1973), *Pagans and Christians* (1986), *The Classical World: An epic history from Homer to Hadrian* (2005) and *Travelling Heroes* (2008).

**Richard Hunter** is Regius Professor of Greek at the University of Cambridge and a Fellow of Trinity College. His research interests include Hellenistic poetry and its reception in Rome, ancient literary criticism, and the ancient novel. His most recent book is *Critical Moments in Classical Literature* (2009), and many of his essays have been collected in *On Coming After: Studies in Post-Classical Greek literature and its reception* (2008).

**Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones** is Lecturer in Ancient History at the University of Edinburgh with interests in the socio-cultural history of ancient Greece, Persia and Egypt and in reception studies. He is the author of *Aphrodite's Tortoise: The veiled woman of ancient Greece* (2003) and *Ctesias' History of Persia – Tales of the Orient* (2009; with James Robson).

## *Contributors*

**Alan B. Lloyd** is Professor Emeritus in the Department of History and Classics at Swansea University. He was a member of the Saqqara Epigraphic Project in the 1970s and edited the *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* from 1979 to 1985. He was chairman of the Egypt Exploration Society from 1994 to 2007 (now Vice-President) and is the author of numerous publications on Egyptological and Classical subjects.

**Daniel Ogden** is Professor of Ancient History in the University of Exeter. His publications include *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death* (1999) and *Alexander the Great: Myth, genesis and sexuality* (2010). He is the editor of *The Hellenistic World: New perspectives* (2002) and co-editor of *Philip II and Alexander the Great: Father and son, lives and afterlives* (2010).

**James I. Porter** is Professor of Classics at the University of California, Irvine. He is the author of *Nietzsche and the Philology of the Future* (2000), *The Invention of Dionysus: An essay on the birth of tragedy* (2000), and *The Origins of Aesthetic Thought in Ancient Greece: Matter, sensation, and experience* (2010), and editor, most recently, of *Classical Pasts: The classical traditions of Greece and Rome* (2006).

**Joseph Roisman** is a Professor of Classics at Colby College. His publications include *The Rhetoric of Manhood* (2005) and *The Rhetoric of Conspiracy in Ancient Athens* (2006). He is co-editor with I. Worthington of *Blackwell's Companion to Ancient Macedonia* (2010) and editor of *Ancient Greece from Homer to Alexander: The ancient evidence* (2010).

**Peter Schultz** is Olin J. Storvick Chair of Classical Studies at Concordia College. He is the co-editor of *Early Hellenistic Portraiture: Image, style, context* (2007), *Aspects of Ancient Greek Cult: Ritual, context, iconography* (2009), *Structure, Image, Ornament: Architectural sculpture in the Greek World* (2009) and the author of numerous articles on Athenian art, architecture and topography.

**Shane Wallace** is a PhD student at the University of Edinburgh. Currently based at the British School at Athens, he is completing his thesis 'The Freedom of the Greeks in the Early Hellenistic Period, 336–262: A Study in Ruler/City Relations'.

**Hans-Ulrich Wiemer** holds the chair of Ancient History at the University of Erlangen-Nürnberg. His publications include *Libanios und Julian* (1995), *Rhodische Traditionen in der hellenistischen Historiographie* (2001), *Krieg, Handel und Piraterie. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des hellenistischen Rhodos* (2002), *Alexander*

*der Große* (2005). He also edited *Staatlichkeit und politisches Handeln in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (2006) and, with Hans Beck, *Feiern und Erinnern* (2009).

**Josef Wiesehöfer** is Professor of Ancient History at the University of Kiel. His main publications deal with the history of Pre-Islamic Iran and the history of scholarship and include *Friedrich Münzer* (1982), *Die 'dunklen Jahrhunderte' der Persis* (1994), *Ancient Persia* (3rd ed. 2004) and *Iraniens, Grecs et Romains* (2005). He is editor of *Das Partherreich und seine Zeugnisse* (1998), *Theodor Mommsen* (2005) and *Eran ud Aneran* (2006).

**Stephanie Winder** is a lecturer in Classics at the University of Edinburgh. Her main areas of scholarly interest are Hellenistic poetry and ancient literary theory.

## ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations for ancient texts follow *OCD*<sup>3</sup> for the most part or are easily identifiable. For papyrological abbreviations such as *P.Berol.*, *P.Cair.Zen.*, *P.Herc* see <http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html>.

AB	C. Austin and G. Bastianini (eds), <i>Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia</i> , Milan, 2002.
<i>Agora</i>	<i>The Athenian Agora</i> , New Jersey, 1953–
AHB	<i>Ancient History Bulletin</i> .
AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i> .
AJP	<i>American Journal of Philology</i> .
AncW	<i>The Ancient World</i> .
APF	<i>Archiv für Papyrusforschung</i> .
BCH	<i>Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique</i> .
CAH <sup>2</sup>	<i>Cambridge Ancient History</i> , 2nd edn, Cambridge, 1961–
CEG	P. A. Hansen (ed.), <i>Carmina Epigraphica Graeca</i> , 2 vols, Berlin and New York, 1983 and 1989.
CID	Lefèvre, F., <i>Corpus des Inscriptions de Delphes 4: Documents amphictioniques</i> , Paris, 2002.
CQ	<i>Classical Quarterly</i> .
FD	<i>Fouilles de Delphes</i> , Paris, 1902–
FGrH	Jacoby, F., <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , 1923–
FHG	Müller, C., <i>Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum</i> , Paris, 1841–70.
G-P	Gow, A. S. F. and Page, D. L., <i>The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams</i> , 2 vols, Cambridge, 1965.
GHI	Rhodes, P. J. and Osborne, R., <i>Greek Historical Inscriptions 404–323 BC</i> , Oxford, 2003.
GRBS	<i>Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies</i> .
HSCP	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i> .
I. Amyzon	Robert, J. and L., <i>Fouilles d'Amzyon en Carie I: Exploration, histoire, monnaies et inscriptions</i> , Paris, 1983.
I. Erythrai	Engelmann, H. and Merkelbach, R., <i>Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai</i> , 1972–73.
I. Milet	<i>Milet, Ergebnisse der Ausgrabung seit dem Jahre 1899</i> , Berlin 1906–
I. Mylasa	Blümel, W., <i>Die Inschriften von Mylasa</i> , 1987–88.

*Abbreviations*

- I.Rhannous* Petrakos, B., 'Ο Δήμος τοῦ Ραμνοῦντος, 2 vols., Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθῆναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας 181–2, Athens, 1999.
- I.Stratonikeia* Sahin, M. Ç., *Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia*, 1981–90.
- IG* *Inscriptiones Graecae*, 1873–
- IK* *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*, Bonn, 1972–
- ISE* Moretti, L., *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche*, Florence, 1967–76.
- JdI* *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*.
- JEA* *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*.
- JHS* *Journal of Hellenic Studies*.
- LGPN* *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, Oxford, 1987–
- LSJ* Liddell, H. G., Scott, R. and Jones, H. S., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford, 9<sup>th</sup> edn, 1940.
- Michel, *RIG* Michel, C., *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques*, Brussels, 1897–1900.
- OCD*<sup>3</sup> Hornblower, S. and Spawforth, A. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd edn, Oxford, 1996.
- OGIS* Dittenberger, W., *Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, Leipzig, 1903–5.
- PCPS* *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*.
- Pros. Ptol. VI* Peremans, W. et al., 1968 *Prosopographia Ptolemaica VI: La cour, les relations internationales et les possessions extérieures, la vie culturelle*, Leuven, 1968.
- RC* Welles, C. B., *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period*, New Haven, 1934.
- RE* A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, and W. Kroll, *Realencyclopädie des classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 1893–
- REA* *Revue des études anciennes*.
- REG* *Revue des études grecques*.
- Schmitt, *SdA* Schmitt, H. H., *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums 3: Die Verträge der griechisch-römischen Welt von 338 bis 200 v. Chr.*, Munich, 1969.
- SEG* *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, 1923–
- SH* Lloyd-Jones, H. and Parsons, P., *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, Berlin and New York, 1983.
- SSH* Lloyd-Jones, H., *Supplementum Supplementi Hellenistici*, Berlin and New York, 2005.
- Syll.*<sup>3</sup> Dittenberger, W., *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. 3rd edn, Leipzig, 1915–24.
- TAPA* *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*.
- TGrF* Snell, B., Kannicht, R. and Radt, S., *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Göttingen, 1971–85.
- ZPE* *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*.

## INTRODUCTION

Macedonian kings dominating the eastern Mediterranean, their prayers recorded in Akkadian in Babylonia, their portraits sculpted in the manner of pharaohs in Egypt, Greek communities along the Nile, a flourishing Greek city at its head, Greek philosophy in furthest Bactria, a Macedonian garrison in the Piraeus – and no Persian empire.<sup>1</sup> All this would have struck an Athenian in the mid fourth century as a bizarre fantasy but in the mid third century it was reality. It is this world we study when we study the Hellenistic age.

Alexander the Great's overthrow of the Persian empire was fundamental in enabling this transformation to take place but it was not, one suspects, sufficient. Counterfactual history may be frowned upon but it can sometimes be useful.<sup>2</sup> What would have happened if, instead of dying in 323 BC, Alexander had lived long enough to ensure an heir and a stable succession? Assuming that he had managed to rule this conquered territory successfully, then it is likely that what would have emerged would have been rather similar to the Persian empire that had preceded it but with the addition of the Balkans. We might imagine some form of Greco-Macedonian (and -Persian?) court at its centre, and perhaps a Persian-style satrapal system operating in its territories, but nonetheless wonder how widely diffused Greco-Macedonian culture would have been through this united Macedonian empire.

In other words, if Alexander had lived, there might have been no Hellenistic world, at least not as we know it, and this book and books like it would never have been written. But Alexander died and his empire fragmented as leading figures of the Macedonian military struggled for control. It is out of that fragmentation that the Hellenistic world was born. Kings and kingdoms emerged, the Antigonids in Macedon, the Seleucids in Asia, the Ptolemies in Egypt and failed dynasties such as that of Lysimachos in Thrace and Asia Minor. But it is not the mere fact of these kingdoms that is significant but what those kingdoms brought with them. By their very multiplicity they needed a shared culture and that culture was derived from the Greco-Macedonian homeland, reinforced and sustained among other things by intermarriage and the needs of diplomacy.<sup>3</sup> At the centre of each was a king whose primary means of expressing power was in Greek idioms; this had an impact within the kingdom itself but also beyond it in the smaller non-Greek kingdoms and states that adopted

similar modes of expression to their more powerful neighbours.<sup>4</sup> So at the international level it was Greco-Macedonian culture that was dominant but within the kingdoms outside the Greek mainland there was much cultural variety and the rulers took care to address the native population as well as the Greeks and Macedonians. Nonetheless, when combined with the Greek character of the centre of power, the presence of newly-founded Greek cities and the introduction of Greek settlers such as those in the Fayyum in Egypt meant that things Greek still had priority.

So, although it is tempting to see Alexander as the founder or creator of the Hellenistic world, it may be more appropriate to see him as the catalyst; his actions set in motion this transformation of the eastern Mediterranean. An alternative candidate for the title of its creator might be someone more recent, the German historian Johann Gustav Droysen, who was responsible for coining the term 'Hellenistic'. Without him it could be argued there would be no Hellenistic world. For Droysen what distinguished the Hellenistic age was the fusion of Greek and oriental culture, although as Robin Lane Fox points out in the opening chapter of this volume there are serious problems with this as a defining characteristic, not least because there is evidence for fusion of this sort long before the Hellenistic period. Fusion also suggests some form of equality of status whereas in practice the conquered had to find ways of reaching an accommodation with the conquerors.

That the Hellenistic world was the product of conquest and colonisation is not something neglected by modern scholarship but at the same time it is not to the fore as much as it might be. Perhaps this is in part because these territories were not ruled from afar, for instance from Macedon or Persepolis, but instead by kings who were present, 'exiles from their ethnic homeland', as Graham Shipley puts it.<sup>5</sup> But, although conquest and occupation were fundamental, the Hellenistic world was not like the Persian or the Roman empire because it was not a unity under the rule of one man or one state. It is the fragmented character of power in parallel with a coherence that comes from the acknowledgement of a common Greco-Macedonian culture that helps to make the Hellenistic world distinctive.

The aim of the present volume is to explore this emerging Hellenistic world, its newness but also its oldness, whether real or imagined. It is important to bear in mind its scale and variety and be wary of easy generalisations. The two chapters on Persis and Egypt, by Josef Wiesehöfer and Alan Lloyd respectively, offer case studies in Macedonian rule and give a sense not only of this variety but also of the nature of the transformation, all the more evident because both highlight the native reaction. The

fortunes of the two regions are in many ways reversed. Under the Persian empire Persis was central while Egypt was a troublesome (but economically important) land on the periphery of that empire, but now in the third century Egypt is home to a powerful and rich kingdom and all that that entails while Persis is reduced to being a relative backwater, a mere secondary province of the Seleucid empire. In the old Greece, on the other hand, the polis is learning to cope with this new environment, although there it may be hard to let go of the past. As Shane Wallace demonstrates, the Persian Wars are still a potent symbol on the Greek mainland long after the disappearance of the Persian empire itself. Nor are old aspirations of hegemony easily put aside as Hans-Ulrich Wiemer's chapter on Rhodes makes clear. Here there was the Colossus of Rhodes, a giant statue celebrated in a short and recently discovered epigram by Posidippus. The contrasting scales here, explored in James Porter's chapter, are emblematic not only of Hellenistic art and literature but also of the vast and complex character of the Hellenistic world.

It is common and not unreasonable for scholars examining times of transformation to talk of change and continuity,<sup>6</sup> but these in themselves can mislead. What might be seen as change in one place might be continuity in another. From a Greek perspective we might pick out the court as a new phenomenon, but from a Macedonian and eastern perspective it may have been the polis that was the anomaly. The Macedonian court would of course have been very different from its Persian counterpart (although a Persian model for the fifth-century Macedonian court must not be overlooked) but both took kingship for granted. Several chapters explore various aspects of the court, its tensions and pressures, the place of the intellectual (see Erskine) and in particular the role of women (see Carney; Llewellyn-Jones and Winder; Ogden). We may be able to name few women from Classical Greece, but the same problem does not occur in the Hellenistic period, even if many of them are called Cleopatra. Changes too can be observed that on investigation were already under way; after all change does not come out of nowhere but sometimes circumstances allow things to develop and flourish in ways that would have been otherwise impossible. In other words continuity can be an essential element of change. It is striking in these chapters how influential Athens is on the Hellenistic world, culturally (see Hunter on Alexandria and the letter of Aristeas), artistically (see Schultz on the Hellenistic baroque), linguistically (see Colvin on the koine); in each case, however, Athens' legacy is transformed by contact with this new Macedonian world.

In some ways the end of the old world and the beginning of the new are captured in the story of the demise of the Silver Shields, the veteran

## *Introduction*

soldiers of Alexander whose final years are recounted by Joseph Roisman. These soldiers are presented as icons of a glorious Macedonian past but they are the past and according to one tradition at least they were deliberately done away with after swapping sides from Eumenes to Antigonos. The new world had room for their myth but not for the men themselves.

This volume originates in an informative, instructive, and enjoyable international conference held at the University of Edinburgh early in 2006 on the theme of *Creating a Hellenistic World*, kindly sponsored by grants from the British Academy and the University of Edinburgh Development Trust. The conference coincided with the launch of a new postgraduate study programme in the University's School of History, Classics and Archaeology entitled *Hellenistic Court and Society*. Since its inception, we are pleased to see that the Hellenistic postgraduate programme has proved to be a major player in the recruitment and training of postgraduates at masters and doctorate levels, and the future of the study of the Hellenistic world at Edinburgh looks bright. Forthcoming plans include a close association with colleagues at the University of Waterloo, Canada, and their Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies (WIHS), and 2010 sees the launch of Edinburgh's sister-site, The Centre for the Study of the Hellenistic World (CSHW), with more conferences and workshops planned thereafter.

The editors are grateful to all the participants of the 2006 conference, most of whom (and more) are represented in this volume. We wish to thank our conference co-organiser Dr Stephanie Winder for her input in making the event such a success and we wish to acknowledge too the support and encouragement of all our colleagues in Classics at Edinburgh. We are grateful to Tam Dalyell not only for opening the conference but also for his support for Classics in Scotland more generally. For the book itself we are indebted to Anton Powell whose role has gone far beyond that of publisher and Shane Wallace who checked the proofs and drew up the index. The study of the history and culture of the Hellenistic world continues to grow apace, and scholars and students alike are recognizing the wealth of information to be mined from the diverse, disparate, sometimes frustrating, but always rewarding source materials of the period. This book, it is hoped, goes some way towards delineating the perimeters of that age by attempting to define why and how the Hellenistic world came into being.

*Andrew Erskine and Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones*  
Edinburgh, September 2010

**Notes**

<sup>1</sup> Prayers (on the cylinder of Antiochos I): Kuhrt and Sherwin-White 1991; portraits: Stanwick 2002; Greek communities in Egypt: Rowlandson 2003, Fraser 1972; Bactria (the inscription of Klearchos from Ai Khanoum): Robert 1968, Yailenko 1990; garrison in Piraeus: Habicht 1997.

<sup>2</sup> For some experiments in counterfactual history, Ferguson 1997.

<sup>3</sup> For the common culture of the court, note Strootman's 2007 dissertation, though that did not exclude differences, see Carney this volume.

<sup>4</sup> Ma 2003, 187–8.

<sup>5</sup> Shipley 2000, 295. The extent of colonisation is vividly demonstrated by Getzl Cohen's volumes on Hellenistic settlements (Cohen1995 and 2006).

<sup>6</sup> For example, Erskine 2003, Part III, Chamoux 2003, 255, Davies 1984, 290.

**Bibliography**

Chamoux, F.

2003 *Hellenistic Civilization*, Oxford (first published in French, 1981).

Cohen, G.

1995 *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*, Berkeley.

2006 *The Hellenistic Settlements in Syria, the Red Sea Basin, and North Africa*, Berkeley.

Davies, J.

1984 'Cultural, social and economic features of the Hellenistic world', *CAH*<sup>2</sup> 7.1, 257–320.

Erskine, A. (ed.)

2003 *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, Oxford.

Ferguson, N.

1997 *Virtual History: Alternatives and counterfactuals*, London.

Fraser, P. M.

1972 *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Oxford.

Habicht, C.

1997 *Athens from Alexander to Actium*, Boston.

Kuhrt, A. and Sherwin-White, S.

1991 'Aspects of Seleucid royal ideology: the cylinder of Antiochus I from Borsippa', *JHS* 111, 71–86.

Ma, J.

2003 'Kings', in Erskine 2003, 177–95.

Robert, L.

1968 'De Delphes à l'Oxus: inscriptions grecques nouvelles de la Bactriane', *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 416–57 (reprinted in L. Robert, *Opera Minora Selecta* 5, Amsterdam, 1989, 510–51).

Rowlandson, J.

2003 'Town and country in Ptolemaic Egypt', in Erskine 2003, 249–63.

Shipley, G.

2000 *The Greek World after Alexander 323–30 BC*, London.

Stanwick, P.

2002 *Portraits of the Ptolemies: Greek kings as Egyptian Pharaohs*, Austin.

*Introduction*

Strootman, R.

2007 The Hellenistic Royal Court. Court culture, ceremonial and ideology in Greece, Egypt and the Near East, 336–30 BCE, Dissertation, University of Utrecht. (<http://igitur-archive.library.uu.nl/dissertations/2007-0725-201108/UUindex.html>)

Yailenko, V.-P.

1990 'Les maximes delphiques d'Asoka et la formation de la doctrine du *dhamma* d'Asoka, *Dialogues d'Histoire Ancienne* 16, 239–56.

## PART I

### NEW WORLDS

#### 1

#### THE FIRST HELLENISTIC MAN

*Robin Lane Fox*

#### I

The ancients had no word for the Hellenistic Age. It is the famous coinage of young Johann Gustav Droysen and is explained in the preface to his *History of the Successors* which he published in 1836 at the age of 28. Just as ‘Romanistik’ and ‘Germanistik’ had combined in early medieval Europe and the ‘Romance’ languages had been born, so, Droysen believed, the fusion of the Hellenistic and the Oriental produced the culture and koine-language of a Hellenistic age after Alexander.<sup>1</sup>

The relation between Greek and non-Greek cultures in Asia is still important in Hellenistic studies but it is no longer quite as Droysen proposed. For Claire Préaux there was actually no new ‘mixed’ culture at all.<sup>2</sup> Instead there is a scholarly emphasis on bi-culturalism whereby individuals might speak two languages, adopt two names (one Greek, one non-Greek) and move between two different ways of life.<sup>3</sup> It might seem more reassuring to Droysen that Fergus Millar has argued that there was one area close to his conception: the Phoenician cities in the Hellenistic age. How far their non-Greek culture extended has now been questioned, but even so, Millar poses problems for Droysen’s periodization.<sup>4</sup> Hellenisation, he observes, began in these cities before Alexander, an ‘agreeable paradox’, and even more tellingly ‘we might well wonder why it was in Rome and not in Phoenicia that there evolved, entirely without the aid of a conquering Macedonian state, the only literary culture which really was a fusion in Droysen’s sense.’

Droysen's emphasis on a Hellenistic fusion has not succeeded in defining the Greek world from 320–30 BC, but this idea belonged in a wider framework of thought. He had heard Hegel in Berlin and his theory of history assumed the recurring reconciliation of opposites which then led on to a new historical phase. At first, he believed, Greece had been the 'total opposite' of the Orient but after Alexander this old 'antithesis' was replaced by a new 'synthesis', the mixing of the 'hellenic-macedonian element' with the native life of other countries.<sup>5</sup> Above all there had been a religious mixing or *Theokrasie* in which the cults of different peoples were assimilated beyond their local and national origins. There was also a widespread cult of living mortal rulers. However, these opposites were only partially reconciled and so they gave way to Christianity, which resolved the supra-national mixing of cults and the God-man antithesis in a new way.

Unlike Hegel, Droysen thus saw the Hellenistic world, not the Roman state and its civilization, as the preparation for the Christian age. Yet he failed to publish any detailed study of the new Hellenistic culture whose role he had diagnosed. The reasons for this failure, and the problem of the 'Jewish question' in them, have been brilliantly investigated by Momigliano.<sup>6</sup> Meanwhile, at its starting point, Droysen's periodization has continued to be dissolved by local studies. On Droysen's definition of the Hellenistic we would already have a Hellenistic Cyprus in, say, the sixth century BC, Hellenistic parts of Caria in the mid fourth century and a Hellenistic Mediterranean wherever Greeks sited settlements from c. 760 BC onwards, while (perhaps only for M. L. West) Homeric poetry and Homer himself would be Hellenistic from the start.

Nonetheless, Droysen chose his starting-point for a clear, intelligible reason: his interpretation of Alexander. Before his *History of the Successors* he had published a remarkable study of Alexander, written with the particular gifts of a historian in his early to mid-twenties. Alexander, he believed, had wished for a political union of the peoples of East and West, but the Successors had fragmented this vision and so they were the '*antistrophe*' to Alexander's attempted synthesis. There was another problem. Alexander had 'fulfilled' the anthropomorphism which characterized ancient Greek religion. A man had become a god, but his 'kingdom was of this world', leaving scope for a new Christian phase of history whose founder's kingdom would be other-worldly.<sup>7</sup> While these antitheses awaited reconciliation in a new age, Alexander left one new direction which did survive him: his intended fusion of Greek and Oriental bore fruit in a 'Hellenism which one can call the first-ever unity of the world'. The unity, mixing and even *Theokrasie* of the Hellenistic age were already Alexander's ideals and actions, 'le résultat des audaces créatrices

de son idéalisme dédaigneux de tout ménagement' ('the result of the creative daring of his idealism which disregarded all caution').<sup>8</sup>

I have quoted this conception of Alexander's Hellenistic ideals in French because it was in French that it promptly left a conspicuous, but neglected, mark. Between 1880 and 1888, Droysen's books on Hellenistic history were translated into French. In 1890 Théodore Reinach's excellent study of Mithridates Eupator and his Pontic kingdom then promptly showed their imprint. Around Reinach's Mithridates the same 'antagonism' of East and West was played out, though the West was now Rome, the conqueror, not synthesizer. The synthesis, rather, had occurred in Mithridates's own kingdom, the seat, in Reinach's view, of 'un grand fait historique: l'union féconde de deux grandes civilisations, le persisme et l'hellénisme, dans une oeuvre commune d'éducation morale, union révéée par Alexandre le Grand, tardivement réalisée sur un théâtre malheureusement trop restreint...' ('a great historic moment: the fertile union of two great civilizations, the Persian and the Greek, in a common morality, a union envisaged by Alexander, but only realized too late in a theatre which was unfortunately too limited...').<sup>9</sup> Like Droysen, Théodore Reinach had further grounds for emphasizing this sort of 'union féconde'. Momigliano has pointed to the presence of friends and mentors of Jewish origin, but converted to Protestantism, in the young Droysen's social circle and formation. Théodore himself was Jewish, but was writing in Paris where he had assimilated himself into French and classical culture after his family's departure from their home in Frankfurt. Like his brilliant brother Salomon, Théodore also had a scholarly depth and an openness to the evidence of coins and iconography. It was here that he detected the 'union' of which Droysen's Alexander had dreamed. A sudden flood of bronze coinages was struck in the Cappadocian cities under Mithridates's rule and showed an imagery linked to Perseus, the ancestral hero of Greek-Persian kinship. Reinach's understanding of them still stands, although the imagery is Greek, not a synthesis with anything truly Iranian.<sup>10</sup>

At the beginning and the end of the Hellenistic age, Droysen and Théodore Reinach thus placed Alexander and his bold ambitions. Nowadays this role for him is out of scholarly fashion. Tarn's elaboration of Alexander's 'dream' has caused the notion to be widely mistrusted.<sup>11</sup> Bosworth has even implied that the Alexandrias were a new barbarism from the West. So much for the spread of 'Hellenism', while 'killing' was the one thing at which Alexander excelled.<sup>12</sup> There is a renewed problem of placing him historically: is he the 'last of the Achaemenids' in Pierre Briant's fertile phrase,<sup>13</sup> leading the worst of the 'hooligans' from Maria Brosius's Persian perspective,<sup>14</sup> or a shooting-star, in many modern

scholars' view, who left a terrible problem of sources and Indian topography to subsequent students and only the bad example of conquest and global ambition to his effective and more orderly Successors?

I wish to reconnect the early Hellenistic world to Alexander its founder, following Droysen's example but not his definitions. I will then turn to other constituents of the new age, its art, literature and philosophy where Droysen's 'fusion' is not a defining element. Instead I will consider where, if at all, Alexander's existence made an impact on them too. In conclusion I will connect him to a particular view of 'Hellenistic man' and a particular 'Hellenistic moment'.

## II

If the fusion of Greek and non-Greek does not characterize the Hellenistic age, what does? Warfare, we might think, but it varied over time: during the Roman dominance, cities in Greece have even been credited with ceasing to build or maintain walled defences after the 140s BC.<sup>15</sup> Much depends, as usual, on the social level which we study. One level is the land and those who worked it, to whom the Hellenistic age certainly brought changes of status, economic connections and new crops and technology.<sup>16</sup> Another is the world of Greek *poleis* whose numbers certainly mushroom in western Asia in Alexander's immediate wake. In this world of many more *poleis* we can study their 'network of peer contacts'.<sup>17</sup> But this network existed under yet another level, one which was universal, as never before in Greek history: Greek-speaking kings and their courts, including queens, concubines and daughters. I incline to Daniel Ogden's simple point: kings and courts are the really distinctive element in the Hellenistic age.<sup>18</sup>

There is, however, a problem: kings were not a constant element in its first eighteen years. From June 323 until autumn 317 one king was a half-wit, Philip's son Philip III. From early autumn 323 until 310 the other king was a child, Alexander's son by Roxane, Alexander IV. In 319 the kings were escorted out of Asia where they were never seen again. Then from 310 until 306 there was no king at all: the competing Successors hesitated. In summer 306 Antigonos finally took the title, whereupon the other competitors (including Ptolemy) quickly followed suit.<sup>19</sup> Taking the title meant wearing a diadem like Alexander. But why had they waited?

After Alexander IV's death, one route to legitimacy, an attractive one, was to marry Alexander's sister Kleopatra. In consequence she was killed, in 308/7.<sup>20</sup> Without her, a king needed to be sure of a capable son, the heir for a new dynasty. Ptolemy and Seleukos did not yet have one, but

Antigonos had the flamboyant Demetrios, and when he was proven by his Cypriote victory at Salamis, it was the cue for his father's proclamation. A Successor king needed a dynastic successor before taking the plunge.

Locally, the competing Successors had already been addressed as 'king', but they had not exploited the title publicly. We can now follow the process in contemporary Babylonian documents thanks to the fundamental study of T. Boiy.<sup>21</sup> From 323 Philip Arrhidaios is called 'king' in Babylonian scribes' dating-formulae, as is young Alexander IV. Philip III even persists as 'king' in 316 after his death. Then, in December 316/January 315 the dating is by Antigonos, but only as 'general' (or apparently as 'satrap' on two occasions). From 312/1 Alexander IV is the identifying king with Seleukos now as 'general'. From 305 onwards Seleukos is 'king'. There are two crucial points here. For Babylonians, Antigonos is never the king, although Greek sources do talk of him being addressed as 'lord of Asia' after his victory over Eumenes in 316 BC.<sup>22</sup> Meanwhile, both Philip III and Alexander IV continue to date documents as 'kings' as if their regnal years continued after their death.

The hiatus in kingship was therefore only apparent. Even in the four years from 310 to 306, kings were assumed to be continuous; we can see the same in Egypt where dating by Alexander IV continued long after his death.<sup>23</sup> This formal respect for kings characterized Greek and Macedonian participants too, even in Asia from 319 onwards when the kings were far away in Macedon. Even in 319–15 while the successor-armies fought each other, the treasurers at Alexander's treasuries in Asia guarded the royal resources and did not plunder them.<sup>24</sup> They would make them available only to someone who had letters of permission from the kings. So, too, those hardened Macedonian 'athletes of war', the Silver Shields, would follow Eumenes, the Greek 'pest from the Chersonese', rather than the Macedonian Seleukos, a commander with Alexander, because Eumenes, but not Seleukos, had letters from the kings.<sup>25</sup> The years from 323 to 306 were not years of anarchy, although the kings were weak, absent, or non-existent.

What, though, did non-Greeks think of it? We have only one source surviving in its own non-Greek words, subsumed, but somewhat neglected, in the Old Testament *Book of Daniel*. In the second chapter, an anonymous Jew gives us his impressions of the years after Alexander from 323 to c. 301 BC.<sup>26</sup> Updating an older prophecy about the previous kingdoms in Asia, he presents Alexander's reign (without naming him) as the age of iron 'which breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things', followed by an age in which 'the kingdom shall be divided', the age of the competing Successors. In it, some of the 'strength of the iron' will persist, mixed,

however, with weak 'potter's clay'. The components are grim, but even in this symbolic view of the new age, kings and kingdoms predominate.

Some, at least, of Alexander's all-conquering 'iron' persists in the divided age. How important was Alexander's example to the early Successors' royal style? Their uses of his name as their password, of his idealized image to symbolize continuity on their coins, of his throne and attributes as a setting for their meetings are well known.<sup>27</sup> What about some of the specific items?

Alexander's own weapons, sceptre and diadem were kept on one side and did not follow Philip III and the child to Macedon.<sup>28</sup> Instead what we see is cult paid locally by Greek communities to Philip III and others after him.<sup>29</sup> Inarguably, it was Alexander and his prowess who had made this sort of cult a widespread Greek reaction. There had been stirrings before, and in Philip's lifetime a cult at his Philippi is now almost certain,<sup>30</sup> but Alexander had the unique power, the prowess and the capacity for benefaction to which 'god-like honours' were a response. Here his legacy to the Hellenistic age was decisive. There was no 'deification decree' from Alexander himself<sup>31</sup> and neither he nor the early Successors personally imposed cult on their courtiers or subjects.<sup>32</sup> Just as Alexander had been receiving such honours here and there in the Greek world before his Exiles Decree of summer 324, so we can see how Demetrios at Athens or Sikyon and Ptolemy on Rhodes were honoured locally at a city's own initiative.<sup>33</sup> After Alexander, in return for a big benefaction, no less could be offered to a Successor than had been offered to Alexander himself: his example had established a new norm. As for divine 'sonship', we might query the credibility of Alexander's claims, but Seleukos deliberately emulated them for a 'Successor' public, claiming that oracles of Apollo at Didyma had vouched for his sonship of the god.<sup>34</sup> The huge oracular temple at Didyma is his acknowledgement in stone, our biggest visible survival from the early Successors' years.

Politically, human influence at a Hellenistic court depended on access to the king. We see it already under Alexander, whether for his weapons-officers or even (by letter) his sister.<sup>35</sup> Under the early Successors there were still no constitutions or obligatory council-meetings to bind the kings' actions. A king dispensed decisions and judgements which overrode local laws.<sup>36</sup> Fergus Millar's ideal type of a Roman emperor, dispensing justice and responding to petitions, goes back in the Greek world to Philip, Alexander and the first Successors. Epigraphically we see its role very well in the endless rulings on the status of the tyrants' descendants which were inscribed at Eresos.<sup>37</sup> Spanning Alexander and his early Successors the questions and answers rolled on in the kings' presence as if no wars were going on meanwhile.

The one ‘constitutional’ innovation was simply the consequence of Alexander dying young without an heir: the Macedonian soldiery had to play a role, which later became more formalized, in the wholly irregular circumstances of the succession in June 323.<sup>38</sup> Otherwise, in the Successors’ entourages the old title of ‘Companions’ became the officially recognized title of ‘Friends’. Among the successors there was the same royal response to crisis, the extension of new ‘titles of distinction’ to a king’s supporters. This response had been Alexander’s at Opis, and it was an old Macedonian royal tactic, replayed by the Ptolemies in the crisis of the 190s.<sup>39</sup>

Even those who did not credit the so-called Royal Diaries would remember Alexander as a stupendous hunter and drinker.<sup>40</sup> In their rivalries, therefore, Successors competed to be true lion kings and exploited their hunting exploits as evidence of their prowess.<sup>41</sup> As for the drinking, Eumenes was known to have been drunk on campaign while even old Polyperchon was alleged to dance while wearing a saffron cloak and slippers.<sup>42</sup> However would Alexander IV have danced, taught by his mother Roxane, if he had lived on? Like Alexander and previous Macedonian kings, most of the Successors were polygamous but there was one conspicuous difference in their sexual conduct. Although stories were told of Demetrios’s fancy for boys in Athens (including a descendant of demagogic Kleon), no Successor had a Hephaistion and nobody ordered Greek cities to honour their male lover as a hero.<sup>43</sup> Until Hadrian, Alexander’s actions here were unique.

Alexander had also changed the discourse on luxury. Nobody applied the old stereotype to him, that luxury caused a ruling power to go soft. Alexander combined war, conquest and an unimagined level of splendour in his gifts, festivals and banquets: splendid luxury then became part of the image of a proper king, especially for the Ptolemies in Egypt.<sup>44</sup> From Athenian evidence, Susan Rotroff has pointed to a sharp decline in the surviving numbers of pottery-kraters in the early Hellenistic age and has linked it tentatively to a change from small symposiums to bigger civic banquets given by rich individuals.<sup>45</sup> In royal company the likelier cause would be the widespread use of precious metal instead. Our best evidence for the new splendour of the new rich is the Hippolochos letter describing Karanos’s Macedonian banquet, which is far more instructive and visually illuminating than anything yet known from early Hellenistic archaeology.<sup>46</sup>

War, as Michel Austin reminded us, was central to the Successors’ economies and the resources on which stupendous luxury depended.<sup>47</sup> In warfare the early Successors were simply Alexander’s heirs, although (in my view) he would have defeated all of them.<sup>48</sup> The ships and siege-towers became bigger, Alexander having shown the use of artillery on deck;

elephants still fought, but now on both sides of a battle; one Indian mahout, however, showed Greeks how spikes could be used against their soft feet (Ptolemy then copied him).<sup>49</sup> Bosworth has written bleakly of the 'waste' of forests in Alexander's grand expedition: here too the early Successors followed suit, felling big trees in the Lebanon and even some huge cedars (up to 130 feet high) which still grew on Cyprus.<sup>50</sup>

In their battles, the basic line-up and tactics were still Alexander's too. Tarn, however, suggested that the battle of Antigonos and Eumenes at Paraitakene in late 317 BC was something new, the first example of a battle directed throughout by a general.<sup>51</sup> Tarn's role for Antigonos here is not supported by Diodorus-Hieronimos, the only account of it, while at Gabiene a few months later we see the two generals, 'supercharged on Alexander' as Lendon well puts it, still charging into combat among the first of their men.<sup>52</sup> Under Alexander Ptolemy had killed a chieftain in single combat: even Eumenes had wrestled and duelled with Neoptolemos: prowess was in Alexander's generals' blood as Pyrrhos and his sons exemplified, true followers of Alexander's style.<sup>53</sup> Quite apart from the problem of dust-clouds there was no question of a general departing from Alexander's example and operating as a controller at a distance. Early Hellenistic generalship was not yet the generalship which Polybius admired many years later.<sup>54</sup>

Soldiers for these Hellenistic battles came increasingly from land-grants, the *klēroi* in Ptolemaic Egypt and the *katoikiai* or military colonies, especially those in Seleucid Asia.<sup>55</sup> Alexander had also, of course, founded *poleis*, not 'six' (as Fraser claims) but at least 16. His example was followed by his Successors, especially outside Egypt. Curtius 7.10.15 (not discussed by Fraser) refers to his 6 newly-founded *oppida* on high hills in 'Margania' and although the point has been disputed, I agree with Bosworth that the text should not be emended to Margiana, the Merv oasis. There may have been an Alexandria there too, but the oasis has no such hills.<sup>56</sup> After Grenet and Rapin revisited some of the relevant territory on the Oxus's further bank, they suggested that Curtius's topography is met precisely at one site: Termez.<sup>57</sup> Sir William Tarn would be gratified if his site for an Alexandria had finally proved plausible, though not for the complex reasons which he constructed for it. However, Termez's excavator has vigorously rejected the suggestion: we need to look elsewhere, in my view further to the east along the Oxus's 'Sogdian' bank.<sup>58</sup> Meanwhile, Curtius's precise topographic details cannot simply be rejected: he even adds that the six '*oppida*' there 'nowadays' forget their origins and serve those whom they once commanded. He, or his source, did not believe that they quickly disappeared.

Besides founding new cities, Hellenistic kings had to control existing

ones within a framework of ‘freedom’ and ‘autonomy’. Already Alexander communicated with Greek cities by his Successors’ favoured instrument, the *diagramma*.<sup>59</sup> However, his first general communication by letter (not envoy) to the Greek cities has become obscured by modern scholars. According to Plutarch he wrote to the Greek cities after Gaugamela telling them τὰς τυραννίδας πάσας καταλυθῆναι and to conduct their affairs (πολιτεύειν) autonomously. In 1969 Hamilton insisted that the aorist infinitive here is significant and that its meaning is merely that ‘the tyrannies had been put down’.<sup>60</sup> He has been widely followed but the resulting communication then reads very oddly in context. Alexander’s letter becomes an observation on past history (in 334–2 BC), although the context of Plutarch’s chapter after Gaugamela is one of new initiatives. Did Alexander really need to remind the Greek cities of what had (supposedly) been done, even while Agis’s revolt was looming? The answer is that he ‘wrote’ (ἔγραψε) in the sense of issuing an order and the two infinitives express indirect commands, one after the other: first, ‘let all tyrants be put down’ and then, after that action, in the present tense ‘go on conducting your affairs autonomously’. What we have, then, is Alexander’s Deposition of Tyranny order: it is in need of restoration to our books about him. In 319/8 the *diagramma* of Polyperchon, deposing tyrants and oligarchs in Greece, was not without Alexander’s precedent.<sup>61</sup>

Pierre Briant has traced the underlying Orientalism and ‘colonialist’ assumptions of various modern historians of Alexander: what, though, about Alexander and the Successors themselves?<sup>62</sup> They came, after all, from Philip’s Macedon where access to court-culture had already been used to civilize and ‘tame’ a new generation. How would Asia strike them? There was certainly (in Alexander’s view) much scope for improvement. We may not agree with Droysen that the Persians had ‘sucked away’ the economic strengths of their subject peoples ‘like vampires’ (*vampirhaft*): nonetheless, since Cyrus’s ‘Cyrus the Furthest’, the Achaemenids had not founded a single town.<sup>63</sup> In India, as Alexander’s retained ‘prospectors’ observed, the Indians have great outcrops of salt and mines of gold and silver but they are ‘very simple’ about what they possess.<sup>64</sup> On the Persian Gulf, Alexander planned to settle Phoenicians from the Levant because the place seemed to be (or ‘would be’) prosperous. Likewise he was planning to put *poleis* along the coast of Arabia. On the river Tigris he despised the *katarraktai*, or weirs, which were believed, perhaps wrongly, to be the Persians’ installations against any ships which might invade up river.<sup>65</sup> Briant has argued that he misunderstood the purpose of these barriers, but nonetheless Alexander’s reported attitude to them is revealing.<sup>66</sup> He said that such ‘*sophismata*’, devices, were not worthy of real conquerors and he

proved it by cutting through them ‘without difficulty’. Months later, on the Euphrates, he diverted the river and changed the canal system, replacing at a stroke works which had been taking ‘10,000 Assyrian labourers up to three months’.<sup>67</sup>

So, too, among the Successors: Egypt’s Fayyum was developed for the first time, irrigated and given over to new farming.<sup>68</sup> In north Syria Seleukos’s new city-settlements and man-made harbours brought the biggest change to the area since the Bronze Age.<sup>69</sup> They are the Hellenistic heirs to Alexander’s own spirit of development which existed even without modern concepts of ‘development economics’.

Culturally, the main language of Alexander’s court and army was Greek. Recruits from Asia were expected to learn it. In 331 Alexander had already sent Darius’s mother, daughters and son to Susa and ordered them to be given Greek lessons.<sup>70</sup> Historically Alexander is the founding-father of modern courses in ‘Greek from scratch’. In 327 he ordered 30,000 young Iranians to be taught Greek, Greek *grammata*, even, according to Plutarch.<sup>71</sup> He undertook to give a Greek upbringing to the children of his Macedonian veterans’ mixed marriages.<sup>72</sup> In Droysen’s terms there is no doubt about the first known Hellenistic woman: she emerged from Alexander’s Greek courses. Amastris, the niece of King Darius III, duly learned Greek, was married briefly at Susa to the staunch Macedonian Krateros, and when he left her, was sent off to marry the ruling tyrant of Heraklea beside the Black Sea (two of their three children were given Iranian-Greek names). Succeeding him as ruler after his death, she briefly married Lysimachos; then she organized a new settlement, the coastal city ‘Amastris’, and issued coins with the legend ‘Amastris the Queen’ in Greek.<sup>73</sup>

From King Diodotos’s Bactria to Magas’s Cyrene, the dominant language of the Hellenistic courts was Greek too. In Egypt the Ptolemies encouraged Greek teachers by granting them exemptions from the salt-tax which was otherwise paid by all adults.<sup>74</sup> Meanwhile, dozens of athletic festivals, from the Persian Gulf to the Troad, brought Greeks and Greek values importantly together.<sup>75</sup> Already Alexander had shown the way, holding athletic games and horse racing as far away as the Jaxartes and Indus rivers.<sup>76</sup> By his orders, entertainments in Asia were transformed. When he took Tyre in 332 BC we now know from a victor’s inscription that he held athletic games as a celebration.<sup>77</sup> When he returned to the city in spring 331 he held theatrical contests and used the Cypriote kings as *chorēgoi*.<sup>78</sup> The scale and scope of his wedding-entertainments at Susa in 324 are the forerunners of the big royal Hellenistic festivals. The thousands of actors and entertainers who gathered there mark the origins of the

formalized actor-companies who become so important in Hellenistic cultural life.<sup>79</sup>

Was there any meeting of minds among all this circulating talent, whereby Greeks attended to all that their non-Greek contemporaries already knew? According to Porphyry (c. 280 AD), Kallisthenes arranged for Babylonian records of eclipses to be sent back to Aristotle, all '31,000' years of them, but they have left not a trace in his writings and the story is hard to credit.<sup>80</sup> However, one Indian wise man, whom the Macedonians named 'Kalanos', did converse with his new associates from 326 BC onwards.<sup>81</sup> We may even have some neglected evidence of what he said: in a Milesian inscription, a '*parapēgma*', of the mid-80s BC, statements about the relation between particular stars and the weather are attributed to 'Kallaneus the Indian'.<sup>82</sup> Publishing this rare text in 1904, Diels dismissed the notion that these details really did derive from Alexander's Kalanos as 'a baroque idea'. For him they were pseudepigraphic, like the fictitious letters which were composed in Kalanos's name during the Hellenistic age. But the factual statements in this inscription are quite different from such fictions and Diels did not consider Arrian 7.3.4, evidence that Kalanos's 'wisdom' (*sophia*) had particular 'attendant-admirers' at Alexander's court. It is highly likely that he did talk about the stars and seasons of his homeland and that his knowledge found its way into an Alexander historian and thence to texts on astronomy.

If so, talks with Kalanos are forerunners of the Greek interest in the Egyptians' calendar which is attested in Papyrus Hibeh 27. Writing c. 300 BC, the author tells how he lived for five years in the Saite nome in Egypt and learned from a 'wise man' who showed him all, 'demonstrating it in practice on a stone dial which in Greek is called a "*gnomon*"'. He then gives the details of the calendar, evidently the one which was explained to him. The text's first editors took the text to be based on Eudoxos's Greek theory of astronomy and written by one of Eudoxos's followers.<sup>83</sup> But patently the 'wise man', its source, is an Egyptian and is the source of the calendar's Egyptian dates and astronomical details and its use of Egyptian unit-fractions to give the variations in the lengths of daylight. A Greek had troubled to acquire non-Greek wisdom: he was not, surely, the only one.<sup>84</sup>

What about Droysen's 'mixed' religion? Politically Alexander honoured foreign gods in Egypt and in Babylon: he ordered 'shrines there, and especially the Tomb of Bel', the great ziggurat, to be rebuilt after the damage (allegedly) done to them by Xerxes. This Persian damage was not a Greek fiction or a misunderstanding.<sup>85</sup> When Seleukos I and Antiochos then patronized Babylon's temples, they were simply following in Alexander's footsteps: they were not replacing a previously abrasive

Macedonian-style kingship with a new multi-cultural style.<sup>86</sup> As Droysen observed, Alexander's entourage grew to include Iranian magi who honoured their own gods.<sup>87</sup> The result, however, was not a mixed religious 'fusion'. As a polytheist Alexander honoured the gods of his various subjects out of prudence, not '*Theokrasie*'.

In Greek opinion, the gods encountered in Asia were Greek gods in varying forms. After Alexander, we find that settlers at Ai Khanoum had a temple in the middle of their settlement whose plan is non-Greek (probably Bactrian-Iranian) but whose cult-statue appears to have been a huge Greek Zeus with a sceptre. For Greek speakers the god was Zeus, worshipped in a new architectural form, but non-Greeks worshipped him by placing inverted pots along the shrine's perimeter wall, arguably honouring him as Mithra, a chthonic deity.<sup>88</sup> Here, as elsewhere, there was no 'fusion': there were two separate traditions each worshipping in their own way. In Egypt the major new cult was Serapis, but even here the 'Egyptian' elements were formed by Greeks into a new Greek 'Egyptianizing' cult. It proved much more attractive to Greek-speakers than to the Egyptians themselves.<sup>89</sup>

All across Asia Alexander and his officers continued to understand non-Greek peoples, too, as more like themselves than they really were. The Armenians were kinsmen of Jason, while Indian tribes were descended from Herakles or Dionysos.<sup>90</sup> Foreigners were thus related by kinship to the Greeks' own heroic ancestors. In southern Asia Minor Alexander encouraged these claims by his own benefactions. By favouring self-styled 'kinsmen' of old Argos, he caused others to claim this status, even after his death.<sup>91</sup> So far from contributing to Droysen's new fusion of equals, he caused non-Greek 'others' to compete to be seen as the 'same'. In the late second century BC even the people of Tyre convinced the people of Delphi that they were their kith and kin, related by a *synkrisis*, a genuine 'fusion'.<sup>92</sup> Its logic has never been adequately explained, but it was based, I suggest, on clues which were found in a classic Greek drama. In Euripides's *Phoenician Women* the chorus of well-born Tyrian girls are represented at Delphi on their way to strife-torn Thebes. 'May we be mothers', they pray, 'and may we have fair children...'.<sup>93</sup> Claims to kinship had to rest on good evidence: thanks to Euripides's admired drama the Tyrians had the very proof they wanted. The Delphians were directly descended from their own noble ladies and so the Tyrians and the Delphians were justly 'twinned'. The Phoenician city where Droysen's 'mixed culture' has been most advocated ended by claiming to be the ancestor by marriage of the Greeks at Delphi. But the fusion was not ascribed to Alexander: it was discovered in the distant mythical Greek past.

III

Alexander's warfare, personal style, hunting, drinking and city-founding had all been exemplified by Philip, the other great founding king. In the absence of Asian conquests it would, however, be excessive to credit Philip with being the first Hellenistic king. Some of the Successors grew up with Philip's example, as had Alexander, but nonetheless they continued it only because Alexander exemplified it all over Asia, whereas Philip had not. The first Hellenistic kings then broke no ground which Alexander had not already charted. They merely lost bits of his territory. Even so some of them were thought to be aiming for conquest of 'the whole lot' (*ta hola*) or 'all the world' (in Antigonos's mind in 306 BC).<sup>94</sup> The ambition for 'the whole lot', *ta hola*, in this big Alexander-sense of the term was still ascribed by Polybius to kings of Macedon in the later third century BC.<sup>95</sup>

Around them, meanwhile, Greek literature, art and philosophy were changing importantly. Here Alexander's impact proved more indirect. We have none of the poems which his retained poets wrote for him but they seem most unlikely models for the next Hellenistic generation. It is more plausible that its new poetry grew out of earlier fourth-century poets, however ill-known they are to us. Certainly the big names at Alexandria owed their main debt to the education and *polis*-culture in which they had been formed before ever coming near a king.<sup>96</sup> The mixing of genres, the prominence of the mime and its themes, the realism, the mannerism: none of these Hellenistic features owed a debt to Alexander any more than did the new genre of pastoral. Conversely there was no particular interest by the new Greek poets in the new non-Greek horizons which Alexander opened up. As John Elliott has shown for English poets of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, Hellenistic poets in Asia ignored the 'New World', its scenery and cultures.<sup>97</sup> After Alexander it impinged on them only in 'wonders' which were sent West, whether jewelled cups or rich ex-mercenaries: all sorts of things arrived, including the gold necklaces and gold rhyton which Roxane gave as dedications to Athena on the Athenians' Acropolis.<sup>98</sup> The comic poet Antiphanes evokes the arrival of fruits of the citron-tree at Athens from 'the king' in Persia, surely Alexander.<sup>99</sup> We then meet similar new knowledge in Theophrastus's botany-works, also written at Athens, using the texts of authors who had gone east with Alexander.<sup>100</sup>

In prose Alexander's presence was much more influential. The political fictions of his early Successors were Alexander-fictions, his alleged 'Diaries', his 'Will', a polemical list of guests at his fatal dinner-party, perhaps another such text on cities which he was alleged to have

founded.<sup>101</sup> The existing genre of fictitious letters was greatly increased by a flood of letters composed in his name. Elements of a long-lived fictitious Romance about him also began early. Above all there was a reshaping of the conquering heroes in Greek ethnographic prose-works, whether Egypt's Sesostris and Osiris, 'eastern' Dionysos or Herakles. Their legendary deeds were enhanced by prose-authors to keep up with Alexander's own, a process which began early with Megasthenes and with Hekataios of Abdera in Ptolemy I's Egypt.<sup>102</sup>

As for Hellenistic art, we still need to know more about it, but some of its obvious features had already been much publicized by Alexander's own taste.<sup>103</sup> For Préaux the Hellenistic age 'expresses itself in the baroque': the difficulty is to define what exactly is 'baroque' and when it begins.<sup>104</sup> Alexander's amazing funeral-cart combines Greek and non-Greek forms, but it is not quite 'baroque', at least in its best modern reconstruction: in sculpture, we must also do credit to Skopas, active before Alexander and already inventor of the 'nude of ecstasy', in Andrew Stewart's appraisal of him.<sup>105</sup> The 'gigantism' of Hellenistic art is nearer to being baroque and here Alexander certainly set the standards with his vast funerary monument for Hephaestion, even if he also refused a proposal to turn the cliff-face of Mount Athos into a huge memorial to himself.<sup>106</sup> 'Individualism' was evident not only in his own portraits and coin-types but also in the widespread patronage of portraits by his officers, including such localized players as Peukestas.<sup>107</sup> 'Hunting art' was commissioned by Alexander while in the near East in 332/1, as was big battle-painting, still visible in our Alexander-mosaic.<sup>108</sup> Emotional art appealed to him too, as we can see from his choice of a painting of a dying captive lady, with a baby crawling to her breast, fearing to find blood, not milk: he took this lost masterpiece from the spoils at Thebes, and significantly it was a picture which appealed to later Hellenistic taste.<sup>109</sup> The often-cited theatricality of Hellenistic style was also already evident in Alexander's 'Tent City' for the Susa weddings.<sup>110</sup> As for a pronounced Hellenistic sweetness and a decorative use of myth, Aetion's remarkable painting of the Wedding to Roxane in 327 had both in abundance: it was even displayed, we are told, at Olympia.<sup>111</sup>

The grotesque and the 'realistic' were not in evidence around Alexander, but there were more general changes, ultimately more important for Hellenistic artists. Alexander vastly enriched all the courtiers and followers who survived him: he thus marks the start of a Hellenistic age in which rich art and precious-worked objects were to be so much more widely patronized than ever before.<sup>112</sup> We meet them, even, in Alexandrian poetry, especially in the epigrams on cleverly-worked gemstones in the recently-published poems by Posidippus.<sup>113</sup> Even more widely-seen were coin-types

of Alexander<sup>114</sup> which set an enduring image of the idealized conqueror, as their impact on the imagery of his Successors and the later Bactrian kings exemplifies: his idealized features were still one of the coin-types there of king Agathokles (c. 160 BC).<sup>115</sup> Bosworth has tended to describe Alexander's Indian invasion as an immoral bloodbath, to be regretted but not admired, but the image of Alexander wearing the elephant-scalp, symbol of his Indian prowess, was one promptly continued on coins by Ptolemy, far away in Egypt, and it was repeated, many years later, by Demetrios out in Bactria when he invaded India too.<sup>116</sup> Above all, Alexander represented a new style of art for the individual man of power, riding and driving in conquest, holding or wearing divine attributes, battling on a world-famous horse. Importantly this art was court-art, made in a new era of 'art and power' and approved by the artists' subject himself. When Italian Renaissance authors looked for antique stories about the good relations between artists and patrons, stories about Alexander were, significantly, the ones which they found most quotable.<sup>117</sup>

Apart from paying divine honours in their cities, or ridiculing them, did thinking men react to him too? Cynicism had begun to exist before the young Alexander proved himself and the response of the great Diogenes was simply to tell Alexander to stand out of the sun. During and after his reign, however, three new philosophies arose, the last three in Greek antiquity. Did his example influence the new Epicureans, Stoics or Sceptics?

None of them was a response to a vast and insecure new world, created by Alexander, in which the social bonds of the *polis* had somehow broken down. Bevan, Dodds, Festugière and others have written eloquently of this supposed context, but a weakening of the *polis* and its social ties is no longer a sustainable view of the matter.<sup>118</sup> Perhaps we should look instead to developments within philosophy itself, especially to the challenge of Plato's writings and the anarchy proposed by the Cynics (Diogenes died in 321). They, not Alexander, are the new developments which led to the new word '*cosmopolitēs*' or to aspects of Zeno's ideal state. Curiously the philosophy of Alexander's own tutor Aristotle remained the least influential. His school's collections of constitutions had an impact on Alexandrian literature and perhaps on the city's laws,<sup>119</sup> but Sandbach's study of his importance for the Stoics concludes only that 'for the generality of what may be called the intellectual public Aristotle was a welcome target for scandal and his views largely unknown or unrepresented. There is no proof that even philosophers recognized his greatness'.<sup>120</sup>

Like Aristotle, however, Hellenistic philosophers started to write and publish letters of advice to kings.<sup>121</sup> Because of their status and their

Macedonian contacts they acquired a new role: cities began to send philosopher-ambassadors to kings and generals. The first philosopher-ambassador is Xenokrates the Platonist, famous for his embassy to plead for Athens in 322 BC.<sup>122</sup> Such people knew the kings first hand, but even so, their own texts on ethics did not address the obvious defects of an Alexander. Discussion of Plato's 'emotional' part of the soul ceased; ethics were intellectualized, as if 'reason' could be trained to control 'disturbance';<sup>123</sup> even the long-running debate about anger-management, Alexander's weakness, simply recommended its distraction by thinking of something else or by taking good advice.<sup>124</sup> The human impetuosity and ferocity of an Alexander were not seriously addressed.

In Oswyn Murray's view, 'philosophers [after Alexander] were too engaged with the real world to trouble much with cities of the imagination...'. For 'behind the uniform conventions of the Hellenistic Greek city with its Delphic code and standard civic institutions...lies a huge institutional programme designed by philosophers like Klearchos (whose presence at Ai Khanoum is attested) which spread the Hellenic *polis* as a standard form across the oikoumene'.<sup>125</sup> Klearchos did bring Delphic precepts to Ai Khanoum while Demetrios, a peripatetic pupil, may have had some influence on Ptolemy's library and the laws in Alexandria, but I see no trace of Murray's 'huge programme' in action.<sup>126</sup> Philosophers were not appointed to legislate for the new Hellenistic cities, as Protagoras was said to have legislated back in the 440s for Periclean Thurii.<sup>127</sup> Klearchos was surely only a visitor, not a global moderator with an official commission for the new cities in Asia. Plutarch, notoriously, wrote as if Alexander had indeed realized Zeno's ideal city for 'all men', but here Murray's penetrating critique is decisive: Zeno's ideal city was a 'community of the wise' only.<sup>128</sup> It was markedly deficient in institutional forms, let alone in any elements of a 'huge institutional programme'. It had nothing in common with a typical Alexandria made up of Macedonian veterans, Greeks and local volunteers under the aegis of a governor or satrap.<sup>129</sup> Alexander did not want a 'kingdom of the wise'. His spin, as the shrewd Eratosthenes realized, was a 'kingdom of the best', Greek and non-Greek alike.<sup>130</sup> The 'best' were to be chosen and ruled by himself.

One impact, however, was widely credited in antiquity: the birth of serious scepticism. Pyrrho, its founder, is said to have travelled with Alexander and seen so much which was so paradoxical that he concluded that nothing can be known for certain.<sup>131</sup> It is quite hard to derive the sceptical programme from previous Greek philosophers and perhaps this connection was more than anecdotal. If so Alexander did make an impact on thinkers: significantly, it was inadvertent and negative.

IV

Our image of 'Hellenistic man' tends to be based on these philosophies and to be visualized through the busts and portraits of philosophers which the Hellenistic age widely popularized.<sup>132</sup> For Walbank it was a 'time singularly free of obscurantism and censorship'; for Rostovtzeff, an age of rational, commercially-talented bourgeoisies.<sup>133</sup> But if we fasten on kings and courts as the age's distinctive feature, the 'ideal type' of a Hellenistic man needs to be rather different: he is calculating but also impassioned, combative but generous, guided by the gods but capable of a furious ferocity, educated but fearless in hunting, given to planning, and city-founding; in short, he is exemplified by Alexander the first 'Hellenistic man'. For Alexander should not be reduced to nothing but a killer. Part of him looks forward to the kings who struggled to succeed him, but part of him also looks back, to the type of the 'curious, inquiring king' whom Matthew Christ has so aptly picked out in Herodotus's histories. Measurement, exploration and experiment, Christ shows, typify the Herodotean ruler.<sup>134</sup> They also typify Alexander, who measured Asia with his bematists, explored at least three sides of the Ocean with a view to conquest and was not above a disastrous experiment with Stephanos the handsome singing-boy and the naphtha which was discovered near Babylon.<sup>135</sup>

Curiosity and inquiry did not depend on a new humane ethic or a respect for constitutional rule. In royal company the priorities were different. J. G. A. Pocock has accustomed us to the idea of a defining 'moment' in historical eras, in his case a Machiavellian one.<sup>136</sup> My defining early Hellenistic 'moment' falls in 316 BC when those hard-bitten veterans, the elderly Silver Shields, betrayed their commander Eumenes in order to preserve their baggage: they were then punished in turn by being sent off to Arachosia with orders to be killed on special missions, a few of them at a time. Our main source, Diodorus, remarks only that 'sacrilegious acts of necessity prove profitable to dynasts because of their authority, but ordinary subjects find them generally the cause of great evil'.<sup>137</sup> In the Hellenistic age of kings there was now one rule for the powerful, one for the ordinary man: the comment is peculiar to Diodorus and is highly likely to be due to his source, the hardened old Hieronymos of Kardia, present in 316 BC and himself an archetypal 'Hellenistic man'.<sup>138</sup> We have come far from Herodotus, from the belief that the gods punish great wickedness, and that they do so whatever the rank of its perpetrator; far, too, from the moral, pious Xenophon and his ideals for members of his own class.<sup>139</sup> Like Thucydides, Hieronymos seems to have excluded the gods as causes

of the events which he narrated,<sup>140</sup> but unlike Thucydides he accepted through his own experience of kings and courts that ‘impious’, necessary actions were often to a ruler’s profit. We are faced with a new ‘Machiavellian’ ethic, but it is one of which Philip and Alexander were the first ‘Hellenistic’ exponents.

### Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to Dr. J. L. Lightfoot, Dr. J. Ma, and Dr. Paolo Crivelli for extremely helpful advice and expertise. This paper was composed in early 2006 and then reorganized after the February Conference in Edinburgh. I therefore wrote it without reference to the excellent *Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World*, edited by Glenn R. Bugh (published in 2006) where A. B. Bosworth also writes on ‘Alexander the Great and the Creation of the Hellenistic Age’ (pages 9–27). Our chosen themes and approaches are very different (even down to the editions of Droysen we cite), but I continue to disagree with some of Bosworth’s main points, that after Alexander ‘nothing more was heard of world conquest’ (his p. 11; my n. 94), that like other foundations Alexandria-the-Furthest was seen as a ‘sinister parasite’ (contrast Arr. 4.1.3–5 and even Curt. 7.7.1), that the taking of the kings back to Macedon in 319 ‘marked the real beginning of the new age’ (his p. 13) or that there is ‘no parallel to Alexander’s self-conscious promotion of his own divinity’ (his pp. 20–1; with Plut., *Demetr.* 10–13). I hope that my readers, too, will engage and profit, as I do, from the challenge of his views.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> Droysen 1836, preface; Bichler 1983.

<sup>2</sup> Préaux I 1978, 5–9; II 1978, 542ff., 562, 598–9; Préaux 1965, 129–39, a very important paper.

<sup>3</sup> Stephens 2003; Koenen 1973, 25–115; Sherwin-White 1983, 209–21; Thompson 2001, 301–22; Boiy 2005, 105–10.

<sup>4</sup> Millar 1983, 55–71, esp. 68; P.-L. Gatier, 97–115.

<sup>5</sup> Droysen I 1883, 696–7; Bravo 1968.

<sup>6</sup> Momigliano, 1970, 139–53; 1977, 307–23.

<sup>7</sup> Droysen 1925, 446, with 432–47.

<sup>8</sup> Droysen I 1883, 696–8.

<sup>9</sup> Reinach 1890, 249; Mayor 2009, 65–7 is excellent on Alexander as a source for Mithridates’ image.

<sup>10</sup> Robert 1976, 25–26.

<sup>11</sup> Robert 1983, 117 sees Asandros, satrap of Karia under Philip III, as ‘exécuteur de la volonté du défunt Alexandre pour une symbiose irano-grecque’. I doubt it. He was intervening in a local dispute (could an Iranian be Artemis’s *neokoros*?),

and he had it submitted to the Delphic oracle which did, separately, endorse the Iranian.

<sup>12</sup> Bosworth 1988, 250 and 1996, 29–30.

<sup>13</sup> Briant 1982, 318–30 and 1996, 896, but contrast Lane Fox 2007.

<sup>14</sup> Brosius 2003, 183.

<sup>15</sup> Camp 2000, 41–58.

<sup>16</sup> Thompson 1999, 107–38.

<sup>17</sup> Ma 2003, 24.

<sup>18</sup> Ogden 2002, x–xi.

<sup>19</sup> Diod. 20.53; Plut. *Demetr.* 17.2–18; Heidelberg. *Epitom. FGrH* 155 F 1; Just. *Epit.* 15.2.10; Nep. *Eum.* 13.2; Müller 1973, 79. Gruen 1985, 260 is corrected by Lehmann 1988, 1–17; I disagree with Hammond 1989, 261–70 who has Alexander IV killed ‘c.309’, but his death concealed by Kassander until 306.

<sup>20</sup> Diod. 20.37.5.

<sup>21</sup> Boiy 2002, 241–57.

<sup>22</sup> Diod. 19.90.4; Parke 1985, 45; J. Hornblower 1981, 170 n. 276.

<sup>23</sup> Mehl 1986, 139–47.

<sup>24</sup> Diod. 18.60.2, 62.2, 63.4–6.

<sup>25</sup> Plut. *Eum.* 16.4, 18.2, 13.3–4; Diod. 18.58.3–59.3.

<sup>26</sup> *Book of Daniel* 2.31–45; Bickerman 1988, 23–6.

<sup>27</sup> Plut. *Eum.* 6.10; Diod. 19.90.4; 18.60–61; 19.19.3–4; Plut. *Pyrrh.* 7–8.

<sup>28</sup> Diod. 18.61.1; Borza 1987, 110–20 is quite unconvincing in claiming that they ended up in Vergina Tomb II (actually Philip II’s Tomb).

<sup>29</sup> I assume the royal festival on Samos, 321–319 BC, involved cult; Habicht 1957–8, 152.

<sup>30</sup> *SEG* 38.658, with M. Hatzopoulos 1989, 435.

<sup>31</sup> Lane Fox 1973, 439 and 545; Lane Fox 1986, 115; Flower 1997, 258–60.

<sup>32</sup> Bickerman 1963, 71–85, still the decisive study: Lane Fox 1973, 322–3 and 439; Arr. *Anab.* 4.10.5–11 is inconsistent with Arr. 4.12.3 (which emphasises the kiss, based on the well-placed contemporary Chares) and is therefore later fiction.

<sup>33</sup> Plut. *Demetr.* 10.4–12; Diod. 20.102.3; 20.100.3–4.

<sup>34</sup> Just. *Epit.* 15.4.8; Parke 1985, 50–1 and n. 233.

<sup>35</sup> *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 312; Delrieux 2001, 160–89. Memnon *FGrH* 434 F 1 (4.1).

<sup>36</sup> Bickerman 1938, 11; Fraser 1972, 114–5; Rhodes and Lewis 1997, 544.

<sup>37</sup> Rhodes and Osborne 2003, no. 83; Koch 2001, 169–217 is the best discussion.

<sup>38</sup> Lock 1977, 91–107; Hammond 1985, 156–60; Hammond and Walbank 1988, 129–31 and 253, in contrast to 217, 243, 337.

<sup>39</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 7.11.5–7; Bickerman 1938, 40–5; Fraser 1972, 102–3.

<sup>40</sup> Ephemerides 117 F 1–3; Plut. *Alex.* 17.9; 40.4–5.

<sup>41</sup> Lund 1992, 6–8; Lane Fox 1996, 137–46; Wootton 2002, 265–74.

<sup>42</sup> Diod. 19.24.5; Plut. *Eum.* 14.3–5; Athen. 4.155 C; compare Antiochos III, in Aelian *VH.* 2.41 and Athen. 4.155 B.

<sup>43</sup> Plut. *Demetr.* 24, esp. 24.6–12; Davies 1971, 319.

<sup>44</sup> Passerini 1934, 35–6; Tondriau 1948, 49–54.

<sup>45</sup> Rotroff 1996.

<sup>46</sup> Athen. 4.128 A–130 D.

<sup>47</sup> Austin 1986, 450–66.

<sup>48</sup> Chaniotis 2005 says surprisingly little about this early phase or the excellent evidence in Diod. 18–20.

<sup>49</sup> Meiggs 1982, 137–40 and 165–9; Diod. 18.71.3 and 19.83.2.

<sup>50</sup> Bosworth 1996, 30; Diod. 19.58.2–5 and Pliny *HN* 16.203, brilliantly illumined by Meiggs 1982, 134–7 and 493 n. 61.

<sup>51</sup> Tarn 1936, 34–6. [Editorial note: see also Roisman, this volume, ch. 4, section 2.]

<sup>52</sup> Devine 1985, 75–86; Lendon 2005, 149.

<sup>53</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 4.24.4–5; Plut. *Demetr.* 7.4–12; Diod. 18.31; Plut. *Pyrrhb.* 7.5–10 and 24.5; Just. *Epit.* 25.4.8–10.

<sup>54</sup> Polyb. 10.3–7; 10.24.3–4; 10.32.9–11; 11.2.9–11.

<sup>55</sup> Cohen 1978; Uebel 1968.

<sup>56</sup> Fraser 1996, 201; Bosworth 1981, 23–9 and 1995, 108.

<sup>57</sup> Grenet and Rapin 1998, 78–89.

<sup>58</sup> Tarn 1940, 89–94; Fraser 1996, 154 and n. 97: ‘This seductive story...need not be further considered’; Leriche 2002, 411–15.

<sup>59</sup> Bickerman 1940, 25–35.

<sup>60</sup> Plut. *Alex.* 34.2 with Hamilton 1969, 91; Flacelière and Chambry 1975, 75.

<sup>61</sup> Diod. 18.55.4–56; Nawotka 2003, 15–41, on Alexander and Asia Minor.

<sup>62</sup> Briant 2004, 9–70.

<sup>63</sup> Droysen 1926, 438.

<sup>64</sup> Gorgos, ap. Strabo 15.1.30.

<sup>65</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 7.19.5 (where the ‘äv’ is an editorial insertion).

<sup>66</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 7.20.2; 7.7.7; Briant 1999, 15.

<sup>67</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 7.21.5–7; Boiy and Verhoeven 1998, 147–58.

<sup>68</sup> Thompson 1999, 107–38; Orrieux 1980.

<sup>69</sup> Seyrig 1970, 290–311; compare Le Rider 1965, 267 on Greeks’ use of the river-system near Susa.

<sup>70</sup> Diod. 17.62.1.

<sup>71</sup> Plut. *Alex.* 47.3; Arr. *Anab.* 7.6.1; Curt. 8.5.

<sup>72</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 7.12.2.

<sup>73</sup> Wilcken 1894, 1750.

<sup>74</sup> *P.Hal.* 1.260–5; Thompson 1994, 75.

<sup>75</sup> Roueché and Sherwin-White 1985, 33, on the Greek games at Failaka.

<sup>76</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 4.4.1; 5.3.6.

<sup>77</sup> *SEG* 48.716B

<sup>78</sup> Plut. *Alex.* 29.6.

<sup>79</sup> Chares 125 F 4; Le Guen 2001, Rapin 1987: 253–7, a text of Greek iambs, probably a lost Greek drama, on parchment at Ai Khanoum.

<sup>80</sup> Simplicius, *Comm. In Aristot. De Caelo* II.12, ed. I. L. Heiberg, *Comm. In Aristot. Graeca* VII, 1894, 506.11–15; Neugebauer 1975, 608, ‘obvious nonsense.’

<sup>81</sup> Berve 1926, 187–8.

<sup>82</sup> Diels and Rehm 1904, 1–20, esp. 16; Taub 2003, 23–4; Whitehead and Blyth 2004, 44 and Philo, *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Est*, 96 for very different Kalanos-fictions.

<sup>83</sup> Grenfell and Hunt 1906, 139–57, esp. 143.

<sup>84</sup> Neugebauer 1975, 599, 607–9, 706; compare the evidence in Rémondon 1964, 126–46.