CENTRO RICERCHE E DOCUMENTAZIONE
SULL'ANTICHITÀ CLASSICA
MONOGRAFIE

39

ALEXANDER'S LEGACY

Atti del Convegno
Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore
Milano 2015

a cura di
CINZIA BEARZOT e FRANCA LANDUCCI

«L'ERMA» di BRETSCHNEIDER

Moncerdac, 39

Alexander's Legacy

Atti del Convegno
Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore
Milano 2015

Il Periodico adotta un sistema di Peer-Review

ISBN CARTACEO: 978-88-913-1015-6
ISBN DIGITAL EDITION: 978-88-913-1017-0

Il volume è stato stampato con il contributo della linea di finanziamento D. 3.1 del 2016 dell'Università Cattolica di Milano e del Dipartimento di Storia, Archeologia e Storia dell'arte dell'Università Cattolica di Milano

INDEX

PHILODEMUS OF GADARA ON CALLISTHENES AND ALEXANDER
(new light from *PHerc* 1675 and 1050)

ABSTRACT

Starting with Aristotle, the article re-examines the opinions of ancient authors regarding the relationship between Callisthenes and Alexander with the purpose to identify connections and dependencies among them. The position of Philodemus of Gadara is taken in special consideration through the re-examination of two fragments from his works, one from *De Adulatione* and one from *De Morte*. During the last years, these texts have been the object of new investigations. The first, in particular, has been re-published with a new reading. It is, therefore, possible to postulate a new position for Philodemus in the text-tradition.

1. Ancient writers left a considerable quantity of observations and divergent opinions concerning the deeds and the destiny of Callisthenes. Along with the events involving Philotas and Cleitus, the examination of this topic is one of the most complicated matters concerning the reign of Alexander. This paper is an updated overview of my research, which I published 30 years ago.[1] While correcting a few oversights and hasty conclusions in my earlier work, I take advantage of the new reading of a fragmentary papyrus from Herculaneum.[2]

Besides some minor works, Callisthenes of Olynthus wrote a history of Greece, the *Hellenika*, displaying an attitude favorable to the Macedonians. On his mother's side, he was related to Aristotle, with whom he collaborated, especially in reorganizing the lists of winners in the Delphic agons. As a member of the Asiatic expedition, he narrated the events in an "instant book", the *Alexandrou praxeis*. A growing dissatisfaction that culminated in the open refusal to practice the *proskynesis* marked his participation in court life. After a conspiracy that the group of pages had formed against the king had been revealed, Callisthenes was suspected of being the instigator: consequently, he was arrested and sentenced. Later, in 327 BC, he died in Bactria under circumstances that cannot be fully ascertained, and his historical work was left unfinished.

[1] PRANDI 1985. I refer to this work for further information on the questions examined in this article. Where necessary, I will provide more detailed references.

[2] CAPASSO 2005, 47-52.

2.1. The writers who have commented on the relationship between the historian and the Macedonian king are not unanimous in their views. However, their observations are characterized by two common features, which I underline here.

– It is possible to ascribe the largest part of these opinions to the Peripatetic milieus or, at least, to either their influence or re-working activities. Recognizing the individual responsibilities in this process cannot be simplified such as 'Callisthenes is innocent/Alexander is guilty' or vice versa. More in detail, a positive judgement concerning Callisthenes does not necessarily imply a negative opinion concerning Alexander. Intermediate positions are not uncommon.
– The focus is always on both the identification of Alexander's divine filiation in the work of Callisthenes – sometimes erroneously interpreted as divinization – and his opposition to the attempt of forcing everybody to practice the *proskynesis*. The involvement – either real or supposed – in the conspiracy of the pages against the sovereign is usually neglected.[3]

Both the position of **Aristotle** and his reaction to the conviction of Callisthenes are difficult to understand[4]. Only a few opinions of Aristotle concerning his relative are preserved, and there are good reasons to presume that these references are later forgeries. Furthermore, their most distinctive feature is ambiguity.[5] Although these judgements are attributed to the philosopher, they seem to have been formulated with hindsight; the focus is always on the comparison between a positive feature and a negative one, *e.g*. Callisthenes was very eloquent but lacking in common sense, and he was sharp in mind but without balance. That Aristotle might have been the origin of some of these assertions cannot be completely excluded. However, to a certain extent, it seems that the ancient sources attempted to reduce the responsibility of the philosopher with respect both to Callisthenes' behaviour and, more in general, to the formation of the personality of Alexander.

[3] In short, Ptolemy and Aristobulus (*ap*. Arr. IV 14, 3) affirm that the pages confessed the involvement of Callisthenes. However, all of the other sources deny that there had been accusations against him. Plut. *Alex*. 5, 6, in particular, mentions a detailed letter by Alexander where the king himself had confirmed this situation. Cf. PRANDI 1985, 29-31 for further details on this topic.

[4] Cf. also WORTHINGTON 2014, 235 on the lack of references concerning the reaction of Aristotle. The contribution of MICROYANNAKIS 2003, 36-39 cannot be considered useful. In fact, the scholar does not investigate the information that is available to us from a chronological point of view. Moreover, the claim that there were several changes in the relationship between Aristotle and Alexander is not supported by solid evidence. The observations by KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 83-84 are more interesting, but he does not examine all the passages that I report below (cf. n. 5).

[5] Cf. Plut. *Alex*. 54, 2 ; Diog. Laer. V, 4-5 ; Iohann. Lyd. *De mens*. IV, 77.

The fact that there are not documented sources relating manifestations of grief, suffering or irritation on behalf of Aristotle may not be a fortuity. Nevertheless, the only rumour that could be considered contemporary to the events appears to state otherwise. This concerns Alexander's death by poison, that is the conspiracy concocted and executed by Antipater with the help of his sons Iola and Cassander. Plutarch (*Alex*. 77, 2), one of the authors that relate this event, reports that Aristotle was identified as one of the instigators. Independently from the truthfulness – whole or partial – of this information, what led the contemporaries to believe that Aristotle might have played a role in this conspiracy can only be his strong reaction to the conviction of Callisthenes and, consequently, the fact that the philosopher wanted the elimination of Alexander, who had been responsible for Callisthenes' death.

The position of **Theophrastus** is certainly easier to understand. The double title of one of his works, *Callisthenes e Peri penthous,*[6] is already quite meaningful, and the juxtaposition between the name and the noun stresses the challenging decision of writing about these facts. According to Cicero (*Tusc*. III 21 e V 25), Callisthenes' friend Theophrastus relates that the historian acted with wisdom and was accordingly innocent. The responsibility of his death was Alexander's, who had not been capable of managing his own success with moderation.

The testimony of **Timaeus** significantly echoes the reaction of Aristotle (which I mentioned above), Theophrastus and, in general, the Peripatetic milieu. Even though we cannot be certain whether Polybius (XII 12b) is reporting entirely what Timaeus wrote about Callisthenes, the strong critics of the Siceliot historian allow to detect elements of the tradition favourable to Callisthenes. The main points of Timaeus' negative judgments can be summarised as follows: a) Callisthenes was an adulator and far from being a philosopher, since he had endorsed the thesis of Alexander's divine nature; b) considering that Callisthenes had corrupted the mind of the sovereign, his punishment was well deserved; c) unlike those who had defended the Greek customs, such as Demosthenes and the other Athenians orators that had opposed the bestowal of divine honours on the king, Callisthenes, a so-called *philosophos*, attributed to Alexander the features of Zeus. He, therefore, paid the right penalty for this.

It is possible to recognise just as many arguments in favour of the historian from Olynthus. These are very similar to those that Cicero attributes to the work of Theophrastus: a) Callisthenes was a *philosophos*, i.e. had

[6] Diog. Laer. V, 44. Cf. Koulakiotis 2006, 84-88.

adopted the *philosophia* as the rule to live by; b) he was a true defender of Greek customs; c) he had not had any negative influence on Alexander and was, consequently, an innocent victim.

It is possible to detect comparable considerations in the account of Trogus/Justin (XII 6, 17-7, 1), perhaps even more accentuated by the epitomist's abridgment. Concerning the *persica salutatio*, the *philosophos* Callisthenes towered as an opponent of Alexander. Thus, he met with the resentment of the king, who consciously and cruelly plotted the ruin of the historian.

The accounts of **Plutarch** and **Arrian** (*Alex*. 52-55 and Arr. IV 9, 5-14, respectively) represent a sort of second stage in the Peripatetic tradition. The written version of this further phase dated back to Hermippus in the third century BC. Its origin, however, must be ascribed to what Strebo, the reader of Callisthenes, reported to Aristotle[7].

The opinion I have mentioned above, i.e. that Callisthenes was very eloquent but lacking common sense, is here attributed to the philosopher. The historian is also called *philosophos* and takes position against Alexander's orientalising and absolutistic turn. Despite this, remarks against his excessively intransigent character also appear: Callisthenes' overblown rigidity caused him to lose the favour of the sovereign and gave more credibility to the accusations of his enemies. These are called adulators, and especially *sophistai*. One of them stands out as an antagonist, that is Anaxarchus, who is said to have badly influenced the king by encouraging him to consider himself above the law.

The evident purpose of this second rereading is to demonstrate that Callisthenes was devoted to the *philosophia* and not responsible for the corruption of the character of Alexander, a charge that had to be addressed to others. Moreover, particular attention was devoted to proving that Aristotle had earlier spotted the dangerous features of Callisthenes' temperament, which could have put the historian in a hole.

Valerius Maximus (VII 2, 11), **Diogenes Laertius** (V 4-5) and **Ammian** (XVIII 3, 7) attest to a third change in the Peripatetic tradition. Traits of impulsiveness and inappropriateness now emerge in the nature of Callisthenes, particularly in episodes that invariably include disobedience to the prudent and practical advises of Aristotle. It is interesting to note the change of attitude concerning the eloquence of Callisthenes. In the judgement that Hermippus ascribes to Aristotle, this quality had been contrasted

[7] Plutarch (*Alex*. 54. 1) relates that this piece of information belongs to an oral tradition. This may suggest that he had not found anything in Theophrastus.

with the lack of wisdom. According to Diogenes Laertius, however, Aristotle identified this trait with Callisthenes' habit to speak to Alexander with excessive freedom. From the philosopher's point of view, this attitude was in contrast with his own advice of acting in a more moderate way. Although these authors do not report any judgement concerning Alexander, Aristotle appears completely exonerated from any responsibility regarding the destiny of Callisthenes.

Finally, another tradition decidedly favourable to Callisthenes appears in **Curtius Rufus** (VIII 5, 5-8 and 23), and, more briefly, in **Seneca** (*Nat. Quaest*. VI 23). Here the narration is mainly focused on Alexander rather than on Callisthenes. Neither Aristotle nor Anaxarchus play any role. No attention is paid to the ethnic and cultural context. The characters are mainly judged according to two qualities only, talent for rule and liberty. Callisthenes is still inflexible in his display of *gravitas*. This is in contrast with the adulators who live at court. The historian is nonetheless presented in a light that is entirely positive. This version is somewhat similar to that reported by **Trogus/Justin** (XII 6, 17-7, 1, cf. above) with respect to the negative judgement affecting Alexander. However, the drastic conciseness of the epitomist makes a precise comparison with the ample narration by Curtius quite difficult. It is also important to note that the mention of the word *philosophus* by Trogus/Justin and its omission by Curtius and Seneca do not speak in favour of a common source.

2.2. The point of view of Philodemus holds an interesting central place in the ancient tradition about the relationship between Callisthenes and Alexander, where the information concerning Callisthenes' involvement in the conspiracy of the pages is normally omitted[8]. The chronology of Philodemus' activity is also worthwhile to mention. In fact, during his life he had formed a sort of connection between the cultural milieus of Alexandria of Egypt and the Roman intellectual circles in the Italian peninsula. Identifying with more precision the distinctive features of his way of thinking can be useful for our understanding of the relationships between sources.

A passage from Philodemus' *De adulatione* on a fragmentary papyrus with a few lacunae found in Herculaneum (*PHerc* 1675, col. V 21-32) represents Jacoby's *testimonium* 124T21 about Callisthenes. According to the edition by Sudhaus accepted in the and now in *BJN*, the text sounds as follows:

[8] Cf. the outline concerning sources and information at the end of the article.

διὰ μὲν τὴν .....
… δ[ιὰ] δὲ τὴν .....
.... ὀργὴν ἀντιβαίν[ειν καὶ λ]οι- 25
δορεῖν, οἷος καὶ Κ[αλλισ]θέ[ν]ης
ἦν, ἀλλ᾽ οὐχ ὥς τι[νές φ]ασ[ι παρ]-
ρ[ησι]αστὴς [φ]ιλόσο[φος οὐ]δ[ὲ συν]-
τόνως φίλος. ἐν μὲν γὰρ ταῖς
ἱστορίαις ἀπεθέου τὸν Ἀλέξ- 30
ανδρον, ἀντέκο[ψε δ᾽]αὐτοῦ
ταῖς προσκυνήσεσι ....

In the section that preceded these lines, the author talked about Anaxarchus of Abdera. This was described as an adulator and opportunist, with a particular talent to work every situation in his favour. The abovementioned passage seems to contain some elements of the argumentations reported by Timaeus. Using a polemic tone Philodemus attacks the salient points of a tradition favourable to Callisthenes (τινές). The presence of the word *philosophos* is revealing since it is said that this word is suitable according to some people, but not to Philodemus. He does not blame Callisthenes for having influenced the behaviour of the king; nevertheless he , as well as Timaeus, expresses disapproval for the fact that the historian had prepared the ground for the divinisation of Alexander. The presence of a strong critical opinion concerning Anaxarchus demonstrates that he knew the story of the rivalry between the two Greeks at the court of Alexander, i.e. the second phase of the Peripatetic tradition. It is also important to pinpoint that the Epicurean writer does not seem to formulate a categorical judgement about Callisthenes. Rather the contrary, particular emphasis is placed on the inconsistency of his behaviour: in his work he was favourable to the divinisation of Alexander, in the real life he was against the *proskynesis* [9].

More recently, while reviewing the papyrological documentation concerning Philodemus, M. Capasso has proposed a new reading of this fragment[10], thus providing an interpretation that affects a salient point for the analysis of the ancient sources. The new version of the text is the following:

[9] Even though his contribution does not take into account the whole ancient tradition about Callisthenes, SIMONS 2011, 66-72 analyses some significant episodes involving both the narration of the historian and his life. The scholar maintains that it is impossible to consider him in either a completely positive or negative way.

[10] CAPASSO 2005, 48-49. The text of the papyrus is taken from this paper.

διὰ μὲν τὴν πρ[.....] . ἔ-
χειν, διὰ δὲ τὴν σ[.....κα]-
τ᾽ὀρ[γ]ὴν [ἀ]ντιβαίν[ειν καὶ λ]οι- 5
δορεῖν, οἷος καὶ Κα[λλισ]θένης
ἦν, ἀλλ᾽ οὐχ ὥς τινέ[ς] φασι [πα]ρ-
ρησιαστὴς φίλος, ὅλ[ως μ]ηδὲ σ[υν]-
τόνως φίλος. ἐν μὲν γὰρ ταῖς
[ἱ]στορία[ι]ς ἀπεθέου τὸν Ἀ[λ]έ- 30
[ξ]ανδρον, ἀντέκοπτε δ᾽αὐ[τ]οῦ
ταῖς προσκυνήσ[εσ]ι ....

With respect to the previous reading, the main difference is the absence of the word *philosophos*, which is replaced by *philos*. Such a change is quite relevant since it suggests a new interpretation of this text. The polemic of Philodemus becomes, in truth, more polite than Timaeus'. His aim seems to criticize those depicting Callisthenes as a frank and strict person. Philodemus challenged these alleged qualities and highlighted Callisthenes' nervousness and tendency to reproaching. A loyal and responsible friendship was not the origin of his frankness. Moreover, he was an incoherent person, since in his historical works he was endorsing the divine honours paid to the sovereign and in everyday life he was opposing them.

A certain affinity with the position of Timaeus seems still detectable in this reinterpretation of what Philodemus wrote. However, the references to the Peripatetic versions concerning the relationship between Callisthenes and Alexander are far less evident. In fact, the absence of the word *philosophos*, which was a significant clue of this connection, switches the context of Philodemus' judgement. The title of the work from which the fragmentary text is taken, *De adulatione*, necessarily implies the comparison between those who were adulators and those who were not at the itinerant court of the Asiatic expedition. Notwithstanding, unlike in the account of Timaeus and in the second phase of the Peripatetic tradition, the necessity of attributing the responsibility of having corrupted the mind of Alexander to either Anaxarchus or Callisthenes is not the origin of the contrast between the utilitarianism of the first and inappropriateness of the latter. The qualities called into question are rather those of an authentic and coherent *philos*, whose virtues are compared to the behaviours of the adulators. His austerity does not settle for compromises, and he does shape his writings on his existence.

A brief but meaningful passage from the *De morte* (IV, col. 33, 37-34, 15) preserved by the *PHerc* 1050 makes it possible to improve our understanding of Philodemus' opinion. In his commentary Jacoby merely refers to these lines as a parallel passage. In my study on Callisthenes (I make a

mea culpa) I did not take it into account. Capasso has the merit of having presented it again to the attention of scholars[11].

πάλιν δὴ συγγνωστὸν ἂν δόξειε[ν
εἶναι τὸ λυπεῖσθαι μέλλοντα καταστ[ρ]έ-
φειν βιαίως ὑπὸ δικαστηρίου κατακεκρι-
μένον ἢ δυνάστου, καθάπερ ὁ Παλαμή-
δης καὶ Σωκράτης καὶ Καλλισθένης.

Philodemus is accounting the situation of a wise man that has been unjustly sentenced to death. His argumentation assumes that the legally constituted tribunals as well as the absolute rulers can judge incorrectly. Three figures are quoted as examples: Palamedes, Socrates and Callisthenes. The reader was indeed supposed to know and sympathize with these characters, since what they had experienced had the function of supporting the thesis of the author.

The juxtaposition between Socrates and Callisthenes is a salient point in this passage. In fact, it demonstrates that Philodemus did not consider the historian fully responsible for his death. The use of the word *dynastes* to refer to someone who judges alone is also interesting, since it alludes to an oriental conception of power. Such a definition does not put Alexander in a favourable light since he convicted Callisthenes.

The joint re-examination of both the abovementioned papyri shows that the divergence between Philodemus and Timaeus is even more evident. Philodemus does not omit to stress some traits of Callisthenes' behaviour that could be considered harmful, such as the nerves, the lack of coherence and a not-always-sincere friendship. However, he uses the case of the historian to provide an example of a *sophos* that had been unjustly convicted, and therefore deserving the comparison with Socrates. Alexander, on the other hand, is considered a *dynastes* who makes errors that are lethal for the lives of other people.

3. Philodemus cannot, consequently, be regarded as an unoriginal transcriber of materials taken from the various versions in the Peripatetic tradition that I have examined above. On the contrary, he re-elaborated the information found in his sources in order to express his own point of view. He also presented the question in an original way. His evaluation is well structured and characterised by subtle differences in order to emphasise the positive elements.

[11] Cf. Jacoby 1930, p. 414; Capasso 2005, pp. 51-52. Cf. also the recent edition of the *De morte* by Henry 2009, pp. 78-81.

At this point, it is impossible to abstain from investigating which voice(s) from the Alexandrography influenced Philodemus. As for his knowledge of this historiographical subgenre, we can, fortunately, find some information in the *Rethorica*, where he quotes a historian of Alexander twice[12]. In the first passage concerning the style that is naturally pleasant (*Rhet*. IV 1, col. VII f. p. 151 Sudh = 137T11), he alludes to a Cleitarchean writing style. The use of this adjective, which is taken from the name of Cleitarchus, suggests that the historian of Alexander was a literary model, exactly as Isocrates and Thucydides, who are also mentioned in the passage. In the second text (*Rhet*. IV 1 col. XXI p. 180 Sudh = 137T12), Philodemus includes Cleitarchus in a list after Alcidamas and Hegesias and before a De[metrius'. This review of names, which from a literary point of view is to be regarded as Asiatic, is not subject to observations. Even though the state of preservation of Philodemus' text does not allow easy generalisations, it is, at least, possible to say that he was expressing a judgement about the author. This comment basically concerned stylistic features, which may indicate that Cleitarchus wrote his work with the purpose to induce the reader to notice not only the contents but also the form. It is necessary to postulate, however, that Philodemus had read Cleitarchus.

The scarcity of further information makes it difficult to come to certain conclusions regarding what Cleitarchus had to say about the relationships between Callisthenes and Alexander. As is known, too many details about this author are shrouded in mystery, and alleged traces of his writings are sometimes detected in later authors whose tendencies are extremely discordant. As for my personal experience, I shall stress a passage of Aelian (*NA* XVII 25 = 137F19) where Cleitarchus is said to have reported that, in the Indian forests, Alexander mistook a group of monkeys for an army in an ambush and could not conceal his fear. The historian attributed an unheroic reaction to him[13]. Despite this, Diodorus probably drew from Cleitarchus some elements to present Alexander in an uncritical perspective[14]. Owing to a lacuna in book XVII, we do not possess Diodorus' account of the incident involving Callisthenes. Consequently, a decisive piece of evidence to reconstruct the position of Cleitarchus is missing. It is, however, possible to read the section about the alleged conspiracy of Philotas. Here Diodorus (XVII 79-80) does not express judgements on the

[12] On the topic cf. Prandi 1996, pp. 14-15, and now Prandi 2016, commentary to 137T11 and 137T12 and Biographical Essay.

[13] Cf. Prandi 1996, pp. 37-41 and Prandi 2016, commentary to 137F19.

[14] Cf. Prandi 2013, pp- xvi-xxx on the presence of two sources, Cleitarchus and Duris, in book XVII of the *Bibliotheca*.

responsibilities of both Philotas, who is mostly guilty of negligence, and Alexander, who incurred an incident that is completely unrelated to his positive nature. [15] In my view, these passages could suggest that, with regard to the events involving Callisthenes, Diodorus might have found an account characterised by similar mild tones in the work of Cleitarchus. If this is correct, Philodemus himself could have read in Cleitarchus an even-tempered and sufficiently composite account, which allowed him to elaborate a balanced and strongly personal version of the facts.

[15] Cf. PRANDI 2013, pp. 131-34.

A map of ancient sources on Callisthenes, Alexander and Aristoteles				
Topic	Sources	Content/Callisthenes	Alexander	Aristoteles
Alexander's death	Plutarch (among others)	Alexander dies after having been poisoned by the sons of Antipater		Instigator, together with Antipater
Peripatetic tradition (I)	Theophrastus (Timaeus)	Callisthenes acts as a *philosophos*; he defends Greek customs; he does not exercise a bad influence on Alexander; he is an innocent victim.	Overcome by success, does not behave with moderation	
Hostile tradition	- Timaeus - Tatianus	Callisthenes is very far from philosophy; he is an adulator and endorses divine honours for Alexander; he exercises a bad influence on the king; he pays the price for this.	Justly punishes Callisthenes for having corrupted him. Badly educated by Artistotle, he repays him with the conviction of Callisthenes	
Peripatetic tradition (II)	- Hermippus - Plutarch - Arrian	Callisthenes acts as a *philosophos*; his inflexibility and unpleasantness foster calumnies; he does not flatter and corrupt Alexander; Anaxarchus, adulator and *sophistes*, has a bad influence on the king.		Expresses an ambiguous judgement regarding Callisthenes
Peripatetic tradition (III)	- Valerius Maximus - Ammian - Diogenes Laertius	Callisthenes is impulsive and inopportune when addressing Alexander; he does not follow the advice of Aristotle.		Excused from any responsibility
Favourable tradition	Trogus/Justin Curtius Rufus Seneca	Callisthenes behaves as *philosophos*.Callisthenes takes position against the *proskynesis*; he defends the liberty and fights a tyrant.	Cruelly plots the death of Callisthenes	

Bibliography

CAPASSO 2005 — M. CAPASSO, *L'intellettuale e il suo re (Filodemo,* L'Adulazione*, PHERC 1675, Col. V 21-32)*, in *Studi di Egittologia e di Papirologia* 2, 2005, 47-52.

HENRY 2009 — W. B. HENRY (ed.), *Philodemus. On Death*, Atlanta 2009.

JACOBY 1930 — F. JACOBY, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, 2B, Leiden 1930.

KOULAKIOTIS 2006 — E. KOULAKIOTIS, *Genese und Metamorphosen des Alexandermythos im Spiegel der griechischen nichthistoriographischen Überlieferung bis zum 3. Jh. n. Chr.*, (Xenia 47), Konstanz 2006.

MICROYANNAKIS 2003 — E. MICROYANNAKIS, *Aristotle and Alexander. On the Gradual Deterioration of Their Relationship*, in O. PALAGIA - S.V. TRACY (eds.), *The Macedonians in Athens*, 322-229 B.C. *Proceedings of an International Conference Held at the University of Athens* (May 24-26 2001), Oxford 2003, 37-39.

PRANDI 1985 — L. PRANDI, *Callistene. Uno storico tra Aristotele e i re macedoni*, Milano 1985.

PRANDI 1996 — L. PRANDI, *Fortuna e realtà dell'opera di Clitarco*, (Historia Einzelheft 104), Stuttgart 1996.

PRANDI 2013 — L. PRANDI, *Diodoro Siculo. Biblioteca Storica. Libro XVII. Commento storico*, Milano 2013.

PRANDI 2016 — L. PRANDI, *Kleitarchos (137)*, in I. Worthington (Ed.), *Brill's New Jacoby*, Brill Online 2016.

SIMONS 2011 — B. SIMONS, *Kallisthenes und Alexander*, in *WJA* 35, 2011, 61-82.

WORTHINGTON 2014 — I. WORTHINGTON, *By the Spear. Philip II, Alexander the Great, and the Rise and Fall of the Macedonian Empire*, Oxford 2014.

CONCLUSION

The present collection of articles originated from a conference on "Alexander's Legacy: Texts, Documents, Fortune" that was exemplarily hosted by Professors Franca Landucci and Cinzia Bearzot at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan. Although the topics discussed range widely, they are held together by two cardinal and related themes: 1) propaganda and issues of legitimization in the reigns of Alexander and his Successors, and 2) the nature of the sources about them. The contributions offer new interpretations of these themes and suggest methods of dealing with the evidence for them. The following conclusion is arranged thematically rather than in the order in which the contributions are published. It also aims to be brief rather than inclusive of the many nuances suggested in the articles.

Myths, propaganda, and legitimization occupy a central role in a number of contributions to this volume. Giuseppe Squillace's discussion in "Darius versus Darius: Portrayal of the Enemy in Alexander's Propaganda" deals with Alexander's propaganda legitimizing his kingship over Asia, which he took away from the last Achaemenid king. Alexander claimed to have won it by the spear, and repressed Darius' voice when he made him recognize Alexander as his successor. The paper ties in well with Daniel Ogden's "Seleucus, his Signet Ring and his Diadem": the contribution illustrates how the myths that validated Seleucus' monarchy were either created or appropriated from myths about other rulers who became kings, even though they had no dynastic legitimacy.

In "Antigonus Monophthalmus and Alexander's Memory," Victor Alonso Troncoso directs the discussion towards another Successor's dynasty by showing the heavy presence of Alexander in Antigonid propaganda. Antigonus Monophthalmus used or evoked Alexander's memories in order to establish and legitimize his rule while accusing other Successors of mistreating members of Alexander's family. He similarly used his relations with Philip II and Alexander to shape and legitimize his relations with the Greeks. His son Demetrius could not claim personal memories of, or shared experiences with, Alexander, so he used the latter as a model for emulation.

In "Visualizing Political Friendship, Family Ties, and Links to the Argead Past in the Time of the Successors", Sabine Müller expands the investigation of Hellenistic propaganda to include the means used by the Successors to promulgate favorable images. They presented themselves as

well connected with friends and as having a stable family in order to advertise their power and benevolent character. They employed coins or dedications to promote local friends, and advertised their relations, real of manufactured, to the Argead royal family, in order to legitimize their power. In an effort to deter rivals to their chosen heirs, they emphasized the strength of their paternal relationship with them or their bond with their mothers.

In "A 'Lawless Piety' in an Age of Transition: Demetrius the Besieger and the Political Uses of Greek Religion," Manuela Mari draws attention to the relations between religion and politics in the propaganda of foreign rulers who wished to justify and strengthen their power in Greece. This type of propaganda went back to Philip II, but the case of Antigonus and Demetrius was especially illuminating. Both established festivals in Delos which they called after themselves, and which linked them to Olympian gods, like Philip and Alexander. Even Demetrius' alleged impieties in Athens were impious only in the eyes of his local enemies. Many Athenians regarded his actions and divine honors as legitimate, because his exceptional *euergesia* towards Athens entitled him to exceptional status.

Several papers link Alexander's and other rulers' propaganda with the historiographical traditions and other literary genres about them. In "Alexander's Presence (and Absence) in Hellenistic Poetry", Silvia Barbantani investigates how Hellenistic poets dealt with the story of Alexander and with myths surrounding him. It is said that Alexander challenged contemporaries and even later generations to be his Homer. Many answered the call, and the author demonstrates the magnitude of the endeavor as well as the competition and even cooperation in attaining *kleos* between Alexander and his would-be Homers.

Unlike ancient authors and even rulers who freely mythicized Alexander, his historians had to make hard choices about what to accept or reject from their sources about the king and his campaign. In "Plutarch, Arrian and the Hydaspes: An Historiographical Approach," Timothy Howe looks at how two of our major extant sources, Arrian and Plutarch, deal with incongruities in their sources for Alexander's battle with the Indian king Porus on the River Hydaspes. On the one hand there was Ptolemy's self-glorifying description of the fighting (which recalls the theme of propaganda). On the other hand, there was a different description of the events that probably goes back to Cleitarchus, and which rightly focused on the actions of the king and his other marshals. Arrian and Plutarch's solution was to correct Ptolemy's version with Cleitarchus'. If this interpretation is correct, Arrian's use of his major source, Ptolemy, was more judicious than is usually surmised.

The story of Callisthenes, Alexander's designated historian till his re-

moval by the king, poses different historical and historiographical problems. Callisthenes is reported both to have encouraged Alexander to think that he was god and to have opposed the king's request for *proskysnesis*. In "Philodemus of Gadara on Callisthenes and Alexander (New Light from *PHerc* 1675 and 1050)", Luisa Prandi examines several traditions about Callisthenes within the Peripatetic school, some favoring the historian and others critical of him. She offers a revised text and reading of a fragment of the first-century author Philodemus, and argues that, unlike Timaeus, who portrays Callisthenes as a corruptor of the king, Philodemus' view of both men is more balanced and probably follows Cleitarchus' depictions of them.

In "Classical Sources and *Proskynesis*: History of a Misunderstanding," Federicomaria Muccioli analyzes the different ancient accounts of *proskynesis*, the ritual that Alexander wished to adopt and that Callisthenes opposed, to his cost. The Greeks were mistaken in thinking that the Persian King was a god, although he had godlike qualities. Their misconception led them to view the honors accorded to him as symptomatic of Persian servility.

The Persians and their Great King were often described by Greek authors as fond of luxury and as lacking in self-control. In "Alexander's Political Legacy in the West: Duris on Agathocles", Frances Pownall shows how the historian Duris of Samos attributed similar traits to the Macedonians and their rulers. Fragments of his work dealing with the Syracusan tyrant Agathocles reveal the same critical approach. It appears that the historian borrowed these images from his Macedonian history in order to fault Agathocles with moral deficiencies. Ironically, Agathocles linked himself closely with the Macedonian Successors.

Edward Anson's paper on "Fortress Egypt: The Abortive Invasions of 320 and 306 BC" improves our understanding of the literary sources for Perdiccas' and Antigonus' failed invasions of Egypt by actually going beyond them to the environmental conditions that affected their campaigns. He shows how Egypt was well protected by both natural and human-made defenses, and how its ruler, Ptolemy I, wisely used these assets against the invaders. Ptolemy relied on the seasonal flood and the currents of the Nile to obstruct his enemies, and benefited from the inability of both Perdiccas in 320 and Antigonus in 306 to use their fleets in support of their armies under unfavorable sailing conditions.

Finally, Marek Jan Olbricht's "Alexander the Great at Susa (324 B.C.)" examines the geographical, military, and political challenges the king faced in ruling his Asian kingdom upon his return to Persis. Alexander dealt with them through various administrative measures and by ingratiating himself with the Persians. His chief solution, however, was to create a

new military elite and to reform his army. The arrival in his camp of the Epigoni—Asian recruits trained in Macedonian-style warfare—confirmed for the Persians that Alexander was serious about his "pro-Iranian" policy. His military reforms privileged the Iranians, who became the predominant force in his army. This paper thus relates closely to the first paper summarized here, on Alexander's answer to problems of legitimacy as a foreign conqueror.

Alexander's Iranian experiment failed, if only because of his premature death. Yet the legacy that he and his successors left is almost inexhaustibly rich. The present collection suggests the fruits of investigating it through the prisms of conquest, images, perceptions, propaganda, and historical and literary traditions.