

# THE PAMPHLETEER EPHIPPUS, KING ALEXANDER AND THE PERSIAN ROYAL HUNT<sup>1</sup>

*B. B. Shefton in memoriam*<sup>2</sup>

---

*Abstract:* This paper argues that Jacoby's fragment 5 of Ehippus of Olynthus' lost pamphlet on the deaths of Hephaestion and Alexander conceals a malevolently distorted and hitherto unrecognised reference to Alexander's adoption in 324/323 BC of the traditional hunting style of the Assyrian and Achaemenid kings, namely, the use of a chariot and archery in pursuit of lions. The paper puts this startling development into the larger context of, firstly, Alexander's political and cultural Persianising, and, secondly, the rich symbolism of the royal lion hunter in the ancient near east. Finally the paper asks how far such 'misreadings' of the historical Alexander's Asian monarchy by the first generation of Greek Alexander-historians might have coloured the later ancient view of Alexander's alleged quest for deification.

---

## 1. Introduction

'... to know the emperor's image was in a very concrete sense to know the empire'.<sup>3</sup>

'From Paris to Peking, monarchs' preoccupation with dress and appearances is one of the common threads linking them across time and space. Monarchy was a system relying on emotions and senses, as well as political and military might: the right dress was, for many monarchs, indispensable to the functioning of their monarchy.'<sup>4</sup>

This paper re-evaluates a citation in the *Deipnosophists* of Athenaeus from the lost pamphlet by Ehippus of Olynthus titled *On the Death* (or *Funeral*) of *Alexander and Hephaestion*. Fifth and last in Jacoby's col-

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to my postgraduate class on the Newcastle MA Ancient History for an illuminating discussion of this Ehippan fragment in February 2012 and to the audience in London (Society for Court Studies) to whom I read a version of this paper. Particular debts are owed to Simon Hornblower, John Moles, and Christopher Tuplin for their substantive comments; I must stress that where errors remain they are my own. For additional help of various kinds thanks are due to my colleagues Livia Capponi, Xavier Guegan, and Rowland Smith. Sara Toso at British Museum Images kindly helped me to obtain the image which appears below, p. 192, as Figure 1.

<sup>2</sup> Long before I arrived in Newcastle in 1982, Brian Shefton had been giving lectures on Alexander the Great to undergraduates. He also had ideas of his own about the famous Alexander Mosaic (see below, p. 183 n. 44), ideas which he developed in talks and which he was still hoping to publish at the time of his death. With this paper I respectfully salute the memory of a great scholar and a colleague of thirty years.

<sup>3</sup> Elsner (1998) 58. I am grateful to Victoria Hughes for this reference.

<sup>4</sup> Mansel (2005) xiii.

lection of fragments of Ephippus, this citation claims to give details about Alexander the Great's alleged eccentricities of dress. Its historical interest is that these details offer by far the earliest information that we have on the matter—significant for the historian of Alexander's rulership—of the king's sartorial choices, since Ephippus was not only a contemporary of Alexander and Hephaestion but also probably present with Alexander in 324 and 323 BC. Not only that, but some of what he wrote about his two subjects seems to have derived from autopsy (as I shall argue below). The fragment has a claim to interest students of Greek historiography because it provides (once re-read along the lines proposed) new evidence for the *modus operandi* of its author, whose hostility to his subjects caused him to take kernels of apparent fact and deliberately to misrepresent them so as to present the Macedonians unfavourably to a Greek readership: what might be called a 'controlled misreading' of Alexander, one which locates its author well away from the main stream of Greek history-writing in the fourth century BC and, indeed, makes his classification as a historian problematic. The citation includes the assertion, encountered only here, that Alexander habitually cross-dressed as the goddess Artemis, often appearing thus on his chariot. I argue that what this notorious claim preserves, once one recognises the twist which Ephippus has given to a factual core, is a new item about Alexander's 'Persianising', namely, that he was in the habit, at any rate by 324 BC, of hunting—almost certainly lions—in the traditional and ritualised manner of the Achaemenid kings and their Assyrian predecessors: that is, wearing Persian royal dress, riding in a (Persian) chariot, and armed for the hunt with a (Persian) bow. This re-reading of the passage contributes new, perhaps startling, evidence for the extent of the historical Alexander's adoption of Achaemenid court-style. It also invites brief reflection on the larger historical implications of this ill-intentioned misrepresentation by a contemporary Greek writer of Alexander's monarchy in Asia.

## 2. The Passage

Athenaeus, *Deipnosophists* 12.537e–38b = Jacoby, *FGrHist* 126 F 5:

Ἐφίππος δὲ φησιν ὡς Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ τὰς ἱεράς ἐσθήτας ἐφόρει ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις, ὅτε μὲν τὴν τοῦ Ἄμμωνος πορφυρίδα καὶ περισχιδεῖς<sup>5</sup> καὶ κέρατα καθάπερ ὁ θεός, ὅτε δὲ τὴν τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος, ἣν καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρματος ἐφόρει πολλάκις, ἔχων τὴν Περσικὴν στολὴν, ὑποφαίνων ἄνωθεν τῶν ὤμων τό τε τόξον καὶ τὴν σιβύνην, ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ τὴν τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ· τὰ

<sup>5</sup> Or the dual *περισχιδῆ*: Gadaleta (2001) 112 with earlier refs.

μὲν ἄλλα σχεδὸν καὶ καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν χλαμύδα τε πορφυρᾶν καὶ χιτῶνα μεσόλευκον καὶ τὴν καυσίαν ἔχουσαν τὸ διάδημα τὸ βασιλικόν, ἐν δὲ τῇ συνουσίᾳ τὰ τε πέδιλα καὶ τὸν πέτασον ἐπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ καὶ τὸ κηρύκειον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ λεοντῆν καὶ ῥόπαλον ὡσπερ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς. τί οὖν θαυμαστὸν εἶ καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς Κόμμοδος ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ ἐπὶ τῶν ὀχημάτων παρακείμενον εἶχεν τὸ Ἡράκλειον ῥόπαλον ὑπεστρωμένης αὐτῷ λεοντῆς καὶ Ἡρακλῆς καλεῖσθαι ἤθελεν, Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Ἀριστοτελικοῦ τοσοῦτοις αὐτὸν ἀφομοιοῦντος θεοῖς, ἀτὰρ καὶ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι; ἔρρανε δὲ ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ μύρω σπουδαίῳ καὶ οἴνῳ εὐώδει τὸ δάπεδον, ἐθυμιᾶτο δὲ αὐτῷ σμύρνα καὶ τὰ ἄλλα θυμιάματα, εὐφημία τε καὶ σιγὴ κατεῖχε πάντας ὑπὸ δέους τοὺς παρόντας· ἀφόρητος γὰρ ἦν καὶ φονικός· ἐδόκει γὰρ εἶναι μελαγχολικός. ἐν Ἐκβατάνοις δὲ ποιήσας τῷ Διονύσῳ θυσίαν καὶ πάντων δαφιλωῶς ἐν τῇ θοίνῃ παρασκευασθέντων, καὶ Σατραβάτης ὁ σατράπης τοὺς στρατιώτας εἰστίασε πάντας. ἀθροισθέντων δὲ πολλῶν ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν, φησὶν ὁ Ἐφιππος, κηρύγματα ἐγένετο ὑπερήφανα καὶ τῆς Περσικῆς ὑπεροψίας αὐθαδέστερα· ἄλλων γὰρ ἄλλο τι ἀνακηρυττόντων καὶ στεφανούντων τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον, εἰς τις τῶν ὀπλοφυλάκων ὑπερπεπαικῶς πᾶσαν κολακείαν κοινωσάμενος τῷ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ ἐκέλευσε τὸν κήρυκα ἀνειπεῖν ὅτι “Γόργος ὁ ὀπλοφύλαξ Ἀλέξανδρον Ἄμμωνος υἱὸν στεφανοῖ χρυσοῖς τρισχιλίαις, καὶ ὅταν Ἀθήνας πολιορκῇ, μυρίαίς πανοπλίαις καὶ τοῖς ἴσοις καταπέλταις καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἄλλοις βέλεσιν εἰς τὸν πόλεμον ἱκανοῖς.”

The following translation (my own) is of the first section of the fragment only, concerning Alexander's dress:

Eriippus says that Alexander also used to wear the sacred vestments at his dinners: sometimes the (apparel) of Ammon, purple robe and *perischideis* [a type of shoe] and horns exactly as the god; sometimes (the apparel) of Artemis, which he also often used to wear on his chariot, dressed in the Persian garb, just showing above his shoulders the bow and the hunting-spear; and sometimes that of Hermes; on other occasions one might say, and on a daily basis, the purple chlamys and the chiton with a white middle and the *kausia* with the royal diadem; but in social intercourse the sandals, the *petasos* on his head and the herald's wand in his hand, and often also the lion's-skin and the club, like Heracles.

The following translation of the rest of the passage follows that of S. Douglas Olson in the new edition of Athenaeus in the Loeb series (whence also the Greek text above):

Why then does it come as a surprise that in our own day the emperor Commodus had Heracles' club lying beside him on his chariot, and a lion-skin stretched out beneath him, and wanted to be referred to as Heracles, given that Aristotle's student Alexander tried to make himself resemble so many gods, including Artemis? Alexander also had the ground sprinkled with expensive perfume and sweet-smelling wine, and myrrh and other fragrant substances were burned in his honor, and everyone present remained respectfully silent out of terror, because he was impossible and bloodthirsty, and appeared to be unbalanced. He made a sacrifice to Dionysus in Ecbatana, and the arrangements for the feast were all lavish, and the satrap Satrabates<sup>6</sup> hosted a dinner for all the soldiers. Large crowds gathered to watch, according to Ehippus, and arrogant proclamations were made that were even more misguided than the insolence typical of the Persians; because as various people were making this proclamation and that, and garlanding Alexander, one of the armorers, going beyond all normal flattery, with Alexander's complicity ordered the herald to announce: 'Gorgus the armorer garlands Alexander the son of Ammon with 3000 gold coins; and whenever he besieges Athens, (Gorgus promises to garland him) with 10,000 complete suits of armor, and an equal number of catapults, and with all the other missiles he needs for the war.'

The citation occurs in the twelfth book of the *Deipnosophists* which Athenaeus, as Lenfant has pointed out, devotes 'explicitly and exclusively' to the 'dissipation' (*ἡδυσπάθεια*) of 'individuals who were notorious for their addiction to luxury' (*περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τρυφῇ διαβοήτων*: 12.510b).<sup>7</sup> This larger context is negative: Athenaeus consistently presents himself as hostile to *τρυφή*. Moreover, the Macedonians as a whole are not being stigmatised in this way: the Ehippus fragment is part of a special sub-section 'concerning the excessive luxury of Alexander' (*Περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ πάνυ τρυφῆς*, 12.537d–40a). This seeming indifference of Athenaeus towards Alexander sets him apart from another Greco-Egyptian writer of much the same period, Appian of Alexandria, for whom something of a 'Macedonian identity' can be claimed from his *oeuvre*.<sup>8</sup> For this sub-section Athenaeus relied on the

<sup>6</sup> Perhaps 'Atropates': Heckel (2006) 245–6, a view going back to Berve (1926) II.348–9, no. 693; so too Gadaleta (2001) 111.

<sup>7</sup> Lenfant (2007).

<sup>8</sup> Spawforth (2006) 11–12. For the Egyptian background of Athenaeus see Thompson (2000), noting both his 'Naucratic chauvinism', his enthusiasm for Alexandria the city,

works of Ehippus (*FGrHist* FF 4–5), Nicobule (*FGrHist* 127 F 2), Chares of Mytilene (*FGrHist* 125 F 4), Polyclitus of Larissa (*FGrHist* 128 F 1), Clearchus of Soli, Phylarchus (*FGrHist* 81 F 41), and Agatharchides of Cnidus (*FGrHist* 86 F 3). A full analysis of all these fragments is not attempted here, although Ehippus, for one, certainly helped to shape a long-lasting tradition of hostility to Alexander which continues to influence modern scholarly reconstructions of Alexander's reign.<sup>9</sup> However, Ehippus can be shown to have deliberately distorted the historical Alexander's actions by means—*inter alia*—of a particular technique of which this paper re-examines one egregious example.

As to the literality of this particular quotation from Ehippus, Athenaeus incorporates the fragment not in direct speech, as he can do with his literary quotations, but in indirect speech signalled by an introductory verb (*φῆναι*) followed by *ὡς*. In line with the illuminating analysis by Payen of the quotations by Athenaeus from Chares of Mytilene, this manner of introducing the Ehippan fragment need not have imposed any grammatical transformation on the original. On the face of it, that is, fragment 5, or at any rate the first part of it down to and including the details of Alexander's (alleged) 'Heraclides' costume, can be, not a paraphrase, but a literal appropriation from Ehippus in a form which, as Payen points out, would normally be called a 'citation'.<sup>10</sup>

The Greek translated above as 'just showing above his shoulders the bow and the hunting spear' requires comment. The verb *ὑποφαίνειν* combines the preposition *ὑπό*, in the sense of 'under' or 'below', with the verb *φαίνειν* in its active sense of 'cause to appear' or 'reveal', so as to give the literal meaning 'to bring to light from under' (*LSJ*<sup>9</sup> s.v.). The translations of Lane Fox (he 'showed a bow and spear slung over his shoulders': see below, p. 181) and Olson in the new edition of the Loeb Athenaeus ('allowing his bow and quiver to be seen hanging from his shoulders') are therefore not entirely sensitive to this nuance.<sup>11</sup> The authorial choice of this particular verb is best understood as having been prompted by the impression made on a spectator at ground level of seeing Alexander pass by on a chariot, his bow and his spear concealed behind the solid sides of the vehicle except for the

---

and his interest in the Ptolemies, mainly discussed like Alexander under the head of *truphê*.

<sup>9</sup> Bosworth (1996) 24, 117.

<sup>10</sup> Payen (2007) 199–206. Payen's *caveat* applies, of course, as equally to Ehippus as to Chares (201): 'Ajoutons toutefois qu'en raison de la perte de l'original, nous n'avons pas la certitude absolue qu'il s'agisse d'une reproduction à l'identique.' That Athenaeus did alter his sources on occasion is demonstrable: see Lenfant (2007) 56–8.

<sup>11</sup> Olson (2010) 133.

tops of the weapons, visible above his shoulders. The point to emphasise here is that the passage seems to preserve an eye-witness impression.

As for the weapons, *τόξον*, an Iranian loan-word, is standard in Ancient Greek for an archer's 'bow', and 'bow' is how *τόξον* in this Ehippan passage is routinely, and correctly, understood: Pearson's translation, 'arrows', cannot stand.<sup>12</sup> Olson departs from Gulick, his predecessor as Loeb translator of Athenaeus, in rendering *σιβύνη* here as 'quiver', a sense otherwise unattested of a rare word for which the correct meanings, 'hunting spear' and more generally 'spear', are given by Liddell and Scott (*LSJ*<sup>9</sup> s.v.).<sup>13</sup> In relation to Alexander one can compare the description by Diodorus Siculus (18.26.1–28.2) of the *ἀρμάμαξα* or wheeled hearse built to convey the king's corpse from Babylon to Aegae, the two axles turning four 'Persian' wheels, each axle-end terminating in a gold lion's head holding a *σιβύνη* between its teeth (27.2), where the sense of 'hunting spear' is clear, as is a reference to Alexander's famed lion-hunting (on which see below).<sup>14</sup> In a passage which may betray Macedonian colouring, Diodorus (20.33.6) also describes as a *σιβύνη* the spear borne by the guards (the Macedonian-sounding *ὑπασπισταί*) of Agathocles, tyrant of Syracuse, in 309 BC. As for the Ehippan association of the *σιβύνη* with Artemis, it recurs in a riddling epitaph of Meleager (c. 100 BC) in which the poet represents himself on his tombstone as Meleager the hunter of the Calydonian boar, as signalled (line 1) by his *σιβύνη* or hunting spear, and his *suos derma*, 'boar's skin'; in line 9 'the double-edged attribute of the Letoan' makes this same weapon specifically a symbol of Artemis, daughter of Leto.<sup>15</sup> Late sources claimed both an Illyrian and a Macedonian origin for the word. That *σιβύνη* did indeed come into wider circulation in the fourth century BC following Macedon's rise to power is not contradicted, at any rate, by the sparse evidence for the term's use prior to the age of

<sup>12</sup> Pearson (1960) 63. Loan-word: West (2007) 21 n. 52 (I am grateful to S. Hornblower for this reference).

<sup>13</sup> Gulick (1955) 431.

<sup>14</sup> Hornblower (1981) 40–6. The original source for this Diodoran description is unknown but is often assumed (by Jacoby among others) to be Hieronymus of Cardia; at any rate, as J. Hornblower points out, its general tendency to glorify Alexander seems to rule out Ehippus himself, even if such a description would, on the face of it, fit with the title of Ehippus' work (for a different view note Hammond (1993) 153). For the spear-crunching lion as a traditional Macedonian hunting motif see the coin type of Amyntas III discussed by Briant (1991) 238–40; cf. Carney (2002) 61.

<sup>15</sup> *AP* 7.421 = Gow and Page (1965) Meleager IV.

Alexander, confined to a fragment of the comic poet Alexis, who is dated roughly 375–275 BC (Alexis fr. 126 KA = 131 Koch).<sup>16</sup>

After citing Ephippus for the costume of Alexander, the text breaks off to intrude an authorial comparison of the Heracles-imitation of Commodus with Alexander's. Then Athenaeus resumes citing Ephippus, who is used for details of Alexander's audience-holding towards the end of the reign. These are followed by a description of a festival which the king celebrated at Ecbatana (Hamadan) in Media in honour of Dionysus during his stay in this summer capital of the Achaemenid Persian kings in the autumn of 324 BC.<sup>17</sup>

Pearson rightly points out that it is unclear from Athenaeus whether the original text of Ephippus attached his digression on Alexander's divinising costumes chronologically to this halt of the court at Ecbatana, or to another context, including, as he suggests, an earlier halt such as Opis the previous summer.<sup>18</sup> More recently, in her re-edition of the fragments of Ephippus, Gadaleta has proposed renumbering them so as to reflect what she argues would have been their correct chronological order in the lost pamphlet. Reasonably enough, she bases her view in part on the title of the work, which covered the death of Hephaestion during the same halt at Ecbatana in 324 BC as well as Alexander's death in Babylon the following year. To this end she sub-divides F 5 into three fragments comprising: firstly, the Ecbatana festival (her F 1), which (so she argues) probably began the pamphlet; secondly, the details of Alexander's dress, which she also assigns to Ecbatana and the same 'clima di autocelebrazione' (her F 2); and, thirdly, the details of his audiences (her F4), which she couples with Jacoby's F 4 (her F 3), describing types of seating during Alexander's audiences in a *paradeisos*; she places both these items 'probably' in Babylonia (323 BC).<sup>19</sup> In broad terms this re-ordering is not unpersuasive (although for the purposes of this paper the numbering of the fragments in *FGrHist* is retained to avoid confusion). If accepted, F 5 would emerge from Gadaleta's analysis as a combination by Athenaeus of three disparate citations taken out of order from Ephippus. Even so, the possibility must remain that Athenaeus found the details of Alexander's dress later on in Ephippus' work, attached not to events in Ecbatana but, for example, to those of the following year. There

<sup>16</sup> The Corrector on Antip. Thess. *AP* 6.93.2: 'the *σιβύνη* is a weapon among the Macedonians similar to a spear (*δόρυ*)'. Festus p. 453 (Lindsay): 'the Illyrians call a *sybina* a weapon similar to the hunting spear (*venabulum*)'. See the discussions of *σιβύνη* by Gow and Page (1965) II.609; also Gow and Page (1968) II.45 (commenting on *AP* 6.93, a hunting poem by Antipater of Thessalonice).

<sup>17</sup> See Bosworth (1988a) 163–4.

<sup>18</sup> Pearson (1960) 65.

<sup>19</sup> Gadaleta (2001) 106–7.

must also remain an outside chance that Ehippus included material from the period preceding the halt at Ecbatana, whether he himself had been present with Alexander's army from an earlier date or whether he made use of information gathered orally about events somewhat prior to his arrival. To sum up on this point: the description of Alexander's dress seems most safely dated, on the purely textual evidence, to *c.* 324–323 BC (see also §4 below).

Scholars dispute whether the historian Ehippus, whose name is relatively rare, was the same man as 'Ehippus the son of Chalcideus', mentioned by Arrian (3.5.2) as one of two officers left behind in Egypt in 332/1 BC as 'inspectors' (ἐπίσκοποι) of the ξένοι or mercenaries.<sup>20</sup> At any rate, the fact that he is regularly described by Athenaeus as an 'Olynthian' (Ὀλύνθιος, e.g. Ath. 12.537d), and thus a citizen of a city destroyed in 348 BC by Philip II, Alexander's father, is the basis for the usual view that Ehippus was not only a contemporary of Alexander, but also a hostile witness. To these perceived grounds for his hostility to Macedon can be added the fact that he was, as well, a compatriot of Callisthenes of Olynthus, Alexander's official historian, executed by the king in 327 BC.<sup>21</sup>

The five fragments known to Jacoby convinced him, such was their 'remarkable knowledge of events' at Alexander's headquarters, that Ehippus must himself have been present at the court 'at least since autumn 324' (since F 5 mentions Ecbatana: see above).<sup>22</sup> Elsewhere I have argued that the three descriptions of Alexander giving audience in a Persian-style royal tent preserved respectively in a fragment of Phylarchus cited by Athenaeus, in Polyaeus and in Aelian, also go back to Ehippus, not least because the version of Aelian preserves a typically Ehippan judgement on Alexander: 'No one dared to approach him without good reason, as he aroused great

<sup>20</sup> Jacoby, *FGrHist* IID, 438 ('keineswegs sicher'); accepted without comment by Auger (2001) 92; flatly denied by Lane Fox (1973) 546, who suggests instead an identification '(probably)' with the Middle Comedy poet, although the *Suda* E3929 describes this Ehippus as Ἀθηναῖος. Jacoby *ibid.* claimed that the name was not rare, although a search of the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* suggests that it was: *LGPN* IV (2005), covering Macedonia and Thrace, at 140, entry for Ἐφίππος lists only the pamphleteer; *LGPN* II (1994), covering Athens and Attica, at 191, entry for Ἐφίππος lists only the comic poet and a (?related) 'Ehippus son of Ehippus', of 360–350 BC. Since the nineteenth century, Arrian's Greek has sometimes been corrected so as to turn the patronymic into an ethnic, 'Ehippus the Chalcidian', as favoured recently by Gadaleta (2001) 100–1.

<sup>21</sup> So, *i.a.*, Hammond (1993) 327, who in another context also points out (203 n. 31) that men still called themselves citizens of Olynthus a century after the city's destruction. But that Ehippus and Alexander were coevals does not seem to be seriously doubted: accepted, e.g., by the German authority on Alexander, Schachermeyer (1973) 158, as well as by Gadaleta (2001) 98–9.

<sup>22</sup> Followed by Gadaleta (2001) 101–2.



fear; his pride and good fortune had raised him to the position of tyrant'.<sup>23</sup> These passages are unspecific as to date and location. The only dated evidence for Alexander's use of a Persian-style 'state' tent in the last years of the reign concerns the mixed marriages which Alexander celebrated at Susa in spring 324 BC.<sup>24</sup> Either the audiences in question took place in the same tent while it was pitched at Susa (in which case Ephippus did indeed include material pre-dating the stop at Ecbatana: see above, pp. 175–6), or Alexander had the tent re-erected on at least one other halt in this period.

In what capacity Ephippus was with Alexander is unknown. If not in royal service, he was perhaps already among 'the visiting Greeks' such as are attested at the Susa weddings in 324 BC (οἱ παρεπιδημοῦντες Ἕλληνες) and who included, no doubt, other dispossessed refugees and exiles 'compelled to beg [*Alexander's*] favour'.<sup>25</sup> Although Ephippus gives alleged details about Alexander's audiences and dinners, it is not known how far these details were based on autopsy, rather than being gleaned from camp-gossip. That is, for all that he was a visitor to the itinerant headquarters-general, there is no reason to assume that Ephippus was a court insider. As will be argued below, when Ephippus *does* seem to have seen Alexander in person, 'dressed as Artemis', the king was not in his residential quarters but outside, on public view.

### 3. Ephippian Invective

Before focusing on the details of Alexander's costume, the purpose of Ephippus' pamphleteering must be briefly acknowledged. The pamphlet is likely to have been written for publication immediately after Alexander's

<sup>23</sup> Phylarchus, *FGrHist* 81 F 44 = Ath. 12.539d–f; Polyaeus, *Strat.* 4.3.24; Ael., *VH* 9.3. See Spawforth (2007a) 118, with grounds for rejecting the identification of Phylarchus's (ultimate) source by Jacoby (commentary to *FGrHist* 125 F 4) as Chares, although Jacoby was followed more recently by Hammond (1996) 48. The Susians in this passage granted the privilege of wearing purple by Alexander (so Phylarchus combined with Polyaeus) were assumed by Spawforth (2007a) 111 to have been civilian notables. However, the larger context, the itemising of Alexander's parade of his elite forces, makes it more likely that they were troops (cf. Arr. 3.11.3, Curt. 4.12.6, Susian soldiers at Gaugamela), although the argument of Hammond (1996) 47, that they must have been archers, is hard to follow.

<sup>24</sup> Chares *FGrHist* 125 F 4 = Ath. 538b–39a; Ael. *VH* 8.7. See Spawforth (2007a) Appendix.

<sup>25</sup> Such as Samians according to the conjecture of Heisserer (1980) 187. Greek visitors: Ael. *VH* 9.3 with Spawforth (2007a) 120. Note also Chares, *FGrHist* 125 F 4 = Ath. 538c (οἱ παρεπιδημοῦντες feasted by Alexander during the Susa weddings in the courtyard of his royal tent).

death (so Jacoby, *FGrHist* IID, 438). In 1900 Schwartz characterised it as ‘a pasquinade, not a work of history’ (‘ein Pasquill, kein Geschichtsbuch’) aiming to show that ‘the world-conqueror who wished to be worshipped as a god and his friend, whom he had declared a hero, were very wicked, blasphemous men, who were dead and buried like everyone else’; Zambrini more recently described it as ‘an anti-heroic and prosaic version’ of the deaths of its two protagonists.<sup>26</sup> With little doubt its intended readers were the many Greeks for whom Alexander was the Macedonian enemy, especially after the Exiles Decree of 324 BC, which fanned anti-Macedonian sentiment in Greece and prompted the Lamian War between Antipater and the Greeks the following year.<sup>27</sup> Schwartz’s judgement as to the historiographical quality has certainly not been overthrown, although scholars vary in what they think that they can salvage from the Ehippan detail. In my opinion Bosworth goes too far in using Ehippus to support his overblown picture of ‘a court in terror and a king lost in savage brooding’ in the last years of the reign.<sup>28</sup> On the other hand, scholars recognise that, beneath the hostile colouring, the Ehippan fragments preserve kernels of truth. Apropos our fragment, for instance, Alexander’s wearing of the horns of Ammon is corroborated art-historically—up to a point—by their appearance on Alexander’s head early on in his posthumous portraiture.<sup>29</sup> Later in the same fragment, the story of Gorgus the armourer (ὄπλοφύλαξ) crowning Alexander at Ecbatana echoes a Samian inscription recording the information that this same Gorgus had ‘spent time at Alexander’s court’ where he had ‘crowned’ the king in the camp.<sup>30</sup> Badian questioned Pearson’s view that Ehippus deliberately distorted well-attested facts, and commented specifically on the passage re-examined here:<sup>31</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Schwartz (1900) 127: ‘Ehippos schrieb, zweifellos gleich nach Alexanders Tod, ein giftiges Pamphlet zum Nachweis, dass der Weltbeherrscher, der als Gott hatte verehrt sein wollen, und sein Freund, den er zum Heroes declarirt hatte, sehr sündhafte gottestlästerliche Menschen gewesen seien, die gestorben wäre und im Grabe lägen wie andere auch’. Zambrini (2007) 218. Olson (2010) 132–3 n. 169 is mistaken when he states that the comment about Alexander’s character at Ath.12.538a ‘is not drawn from Ehippus, who was the king’s contemporary’.

<sup>27</sup> See Pearson (1960) 63–4, speculating that Ehippus came to live in Athens, one of the chief centres of anti-Macedonian unrest in 323 BC.

<sup>28</sup> Bosworth (1996) 24.

<sup>29</sup> So *ibid.*, 287 (‘they must have been a recognisable feature of his dress’), although this inference is rejected by Tarn (1948) II.354 n. 2.

<sup>30</sup> Rhodes and Osborne (2003) no. 90.

<sup>31</sup> Badian (1961) 663.

According to P(earson) there is no need to believe that [*Ehippus' account of the king's divine costumes*] is accurate or trustworthy. But is there any reason to believe that it is not? As far as our slender evidence goes, the account is confirmed; why, therefore, should we believe that Ehippus, writing shortly after the King's death about matters known to tens of thousands, made himself a laughing-stock by silly invention?

The point, that 'silly invention' would not have gone unchallenged, is an important one (see §6 below, concluding paragraph). Yet there is good reason both to disbelieve the claim that Alexander used to dress as Artemis and also to see this claim as an egregious example of precisely the *modus operandi* correctly ascribed to Ehippus by Pearson. The claim has not passed unnoticed in the modern literature on ancient transvestism and on ancient rulers who are said to have cross-dressed (otherwise mainly Roman emperors).<sup>32</sup> In regard to its authenticity, it should not be overlooked that 'effeminate male transvestism' may have been favoured in the symposia of fifth-century BC Athens, at any rate as imagined in Attic vase-painting.<sup>33</sup> On the whole, however, it is true to say that modern historians of Alexander have not dwelt on this Ehippan detail as an authentic historical tradition about Alexander: 'the notion that Alexander would dress up as the goddess Artemis ... seems ridiculous',<sup>34</sup> not least given the other evidence presenting the king as reverencing this same deity.<sup>35</sup> *Pace* Badian, on this point modern historians are surely correct, as a closer examination of the passage confirms.

Having given the king's dressing up as Ammon as his first example of Alexander's wearing the sacred vestments at his *δεῖπνα*, Ehippus then moves on to Alexander dressing up as Artemis. It is true that the text implies, in the first instance, that this dressing up as Artemis also took place at *δεῖπνα*. However, when he goes on to claim that in addition (*ἤν καί*) Alexander 'often' wore the only specific type of Artemis-dress which the text in fact details, Ehippus is writing about royal appearances which took place in a different environment: no longer in the interior setting of a banquet, but in the open air, since Alexander is said to have worn this particular Artemis-costume 'on his chariot' (*ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρματος*). There is, then, a distinction, which applies, indeed, to the whole passage concerning Alexander's dress, between what Ehippus claimed that Alexander wore at *δεῖπνα* or—

<sup>32</sup> Tondriau (1949) 43, cited by Lane Fox (1973) 546; cf. 446–447, noting that '[t]ales of royal transvestism are most of them slander'.

<sup>33</sup> Cohen (2001) 245–247. See also Lissarrague (1990) 11–13.

<sup>34</sup> Collins (2012).

<sup>35</sup> Fredricksmeyer (2003) 257 with n. 14.

presumably the same thing—‘in society’ (ἐν δὲ τῇ συνουσίᾳ), when he is said to have dressed up variously as Ammon, as Artemis (no details given), as Hermes and as Heracles, and what Ehippus claimed that Alexander wore in public—the ‘Artemis dress’ when on his chariot, and the everyday dress which, since it included headgear, presumably was also worn outside and which, since it did not involve divinising costume, is in fact out of place in an account of Alexander’s alleged wearing of ‘sacred vestments’. This ‘inside/outside’ distinction is important, since it can be claimed with more likelihood that Alexander’s outside appearances in this period of the reign were witnessed, if not by Badian’s ‘tens of thousands’, then at any rate by large numbers (see §6 below), whereas the royal δέλπνον comprised the king and an inner circle of friends who, according to another fragment of Ehippus himself, typically numbered sixty or seventy.<sup>36</sup> To return to an issue raised earlier, to have attended these dinner-parties in person, and so to have been in a position to report on them as an eye-witness, Ehippus would have had to have been a court insider, to be reckoned among the king’s friends, for which there is no evidence. To have ‘often’, indeed ‘on a daily basis’, seen the king out in the open, he merely needed to have been a camp follower—a viewpoint which certainly suits better the author’s generally hostile attitude to Alexander. To be sure, this information about Alexander’s costumes allegedly worn at δέλπνα cannot be certainly dismissed as outright invention, including the vague reference to his ‘Artemis dress’; but it perhaps is telling that the only substantiation offered for this ‘Artemis claim’ concerns royal dress worn in a quite other context. Given the larger tone of his pamphlet, an unprejudiced reading of Ehippus on the king’s divinising dress might be inclined to impute more historical actuality to the open-air costumes, and less to the allegations about what Alexander wore when in the company of his inner circle.

However, even when describing Alexander’s outdoors costumes on these two occasions, on one of them at least Ehippus is clearly not a reliable recorder of fact. This emerges from the way in which, in his description of the ‘Artemis costume’, he does not claim that Alexander wore the dress of the goddess as such: apart from his weaponry, what the king wore on his chariot was ἡ Περσικὴ στολή, ‘Persian garb’. In actual fact, this description, like that of the daily costume, is also out of place in a list of divinising outfits, since what it really refers to is a hunting costume—the case for which is set out next.

To my knowledge, so far only Lane Fox has already gone some way to identify correctly the kernel of truth which Ehippus here distorts:

<sup>36</sup> Ath. 146c–d = *FGrHist* 126 F 2.

Dressed as Artemis, [*Alexander*] wore ‘Persian dress and carried a bow and a lance’, of a Macedonian variety especially favoured for hunting. Persian dress had long been derided as effeminate by intolerant Greeks; seeing Alexander wearing it in his chariot and armed unobjectionably for hunting, Ehippus had mockingly pretended that the new divine king who dressed effeminately was trying to look like the goddess of the chase. It was only a joke, and not a very good one.<sup>37</sup>

I believe that this observation is fundamentally correct. However, Lane Fox did not elaborate on exactly how these appearances of the historical Alexander in a chariot might have evoked the culturally-embedded image of the goddess Artemis to a Greek, nor how this Ehippan description might reflect the status of Ehippus as an eye-witness to what he then went on to distort. More importantly, Lane Fox did not comment on the historical significance of Alexander in the last years of his reign going out to hunt in Persian dress from a chariot and armed with a bow. Far from either the vehicle or the weaponry being unproblematic, I argue that what Ehippus retains just enough clues to reveal is the evident fact that Alexander by this period, on occasions at least, departed from Macedonian hunting practice in favour of the Near-eastern tradition of the royal lion hunt, to which, as will be shown below, the Achaemenid kings, not least, had also been committed.

Starting with Artemis, the two attributes of this major Greek goddess with which Ehippus made play first appear in Homer: the bow (*Il.* 21.483, 490, 496) and, allusively, her chariot, to judge from the epithet *χρυσήνιος*, ‘with reins of gold’ (*Il.* 6.205); this last detail recurs in the first explicit description of her chariot in surviving Greek literature, in Callimachus (*Hymn* 3.111–2).<sup>38</sup> If one turns to the iconography of Artemis in ancient Greek art, it is at once clear that Ehippus was playing with a visual image of the goddess which must have been familiar to classical Greeks wherever Artemis was worshipped. In this well-attested iconography, Artemis the huntress could be depicted in a long garment such as a peplos, as well as a short chiton; her characteristic weapon was the bow, but she could also carry a spear; she is frequently depicted on a chariot drawn by horses or by deer, more often with Apollo, but sometimes on her own, as in a Boeotian krater of c. 430 BC. In Asia Minor in Roman-imperial times she is shown shooting with a bow from her stag-drawn chariot. By this period, but possibly much earlier, the iconography was enacted in important religious processions. At the Roman

<sup>37</sup> Lane Fox (1973) 447. In her commentary on the Ehippan passage about Alexander’s dress (her F 2), Gadalata does not discuss the Artemis claim as such and is unaware of Lane Fox: Gadalata (2001) 112–9.

<sup>38</sup> I owe these references to Fol (1984) 619.

colony of Patrae, the priestess of Artemis Laphria appeared each year in a stag-drawn chariot in the goddess' costume. At Roman Ephesus, according to the novelist Xenophon, the priestess of Artemis walked in procession, dressed in a short chiton, carrying a bow and javelins (ἄκοντες) and followed by hunting dogs.<sup>39</sup>

Resuming an earlier point, the use of the verb ὑποφαίνειν in this passage suggests that it was Ehippus himself, while following Alexander's itinerant headquarters in 324 and 323, who saw Alexander, out in public, 'often' riding past on a chariot in Persian garb on his way to the hunt, the bow and spear showing above his shoulders in a manner reminiscent of Achaemenid images of bow-bearing royal guards such as on the glazed-brick frieze (5th century BC) from Susa, or the (6th to 5th centuries BC) Persepolis reliefs.<sup>40</sup> Added to the fact that archery could have connotations of womanliness in ancient Greek culture,<sup>41</sup> the appearance of the king in this way reminded a sardonic Greek bystander of the Greek hunting goddess Artemis as imagined in his home culture's literature, art and (perhaps already at this date) religious ritual. But what had Ehippus really seen? The section closes by proposing that this passage of Ehippus should be added to the testimonia collected by Briant in 1991 for 'Les chasses d'Alexandre'.<sup>42</sup> The next section explores the proposition that Alexander, by 324 at any rate, hunted in Asia à la Perse.

#### 4. Alexander and Royal Hunts in Asia

If this reinterpretation of Ehippus is correct, the fact that Alexander, at any rate following his return to the central provinces of his empire in 325/4 BC, went hunting on a chariot and armed with a bow requires further comment. The key to understanding this description is Ehippus' observation that Alexander on these occasions wore 'the Persian apparel'. Other classical writers clarify that Alexander's well-known adoption of a version of the royal dress of Darius III included a body-garment variously called a χιτῶν μεσόλευκος (as in the passage of Ehippus cited above), or a διάλευκος χιτῶν (Diodorus; Plutarch). According to the latest study of Alexander's dress,

<sup>39</sup> Patrae: Paus. 7.18.12. Ephesus: Xen. Eph. 1.2 (ed. G. Dalmeyda, Budé). Imagery: Fol (1984) with *LIMC* II.2 (1984) 442–563, nos. 1–1450 (illustrations); note 543, nos. 1196 (Boeotian krater) and 1200–2 (Artemis hunting from a stag-drawn chariot on Greek-imperial coins of Asia Minor).

<sup>40</sup> E.g. Ghirshman (1964) figs. 190 (Louvre), 217, 219, 236.

<sup>41</sup> See Hornblower (2007) 40–2.

<sup>42</sup> Briant (1993) 269–70.

these references describe the same garment, to be understood as a purple tunic with a white middle. The historian Xenophon knew of this garment as an element of the Persian royal dress of his own day and associates it (perhaps anachronistically) with Cyrus the Great as an item considered appropriate for wearing outdoors, and specifically in the royal chariot:

After these men Cyrus himself appeared on a chariot near the gates, wearing an upright tiara, a purple tunic with a white middle (for it is not permitted for another to wear the *μεσόλευκος*), and trousers (*ἀναξυρίδες*) of dyed scarlet around his legs, and a completely purple mantle (*κάνδυσ*).<sup>43</sup>

The same garment is associated with Darius III, again on the royal chariot, by Quintus Curtius in his description of the king's review of his army before the battle of Issus in 333 BC (3.3.17–18):

Cultus regis inter omnia luxuria notabatur: purpureae tunicae medium album intextum erat, pallam auro distinctam aurei accipitres, velut rostris inter se concurrerent, adornabant et zona aurea muliebriter cinctus acinacem suspenderat, cui ex gemma vagina.

The attire of the king was noteworthy beyond all else in luxury: a purple tunic woven about with a white centre, a cloak of cloth of gold, ornamented with golden hawks, which seemed to attack each other with their beaks; from a golden belt, with which he was girt woman-fashion, he had hung a scimitar, the scabbard of which was a single gem. (Transl. J. C. Rolfe (Loeb), with adjustment)

Given Ehippus' deliberate misreading of what he had seen so as to present an Alexander feminised through dress, the interpretation proposed by Sekunda of the adverb *muliebriter* in this passage of Curtius is of interest.<sup>44</sup>

The description of the king wearing his tunic girt 'woman-fashion' ... may mean that the king, riding in his chariot, wore his tunic falling straight to the knees under his belt. This is in opposition to the com-

<sup>43</sup> Plut. *Alex.* 51.5; Diod. 17.77.5–6; Xen. *Cyr.* 8.3.13, cited by Collins (2012), an admirably clear exposition to which I am indebted.

<sup>44</sup> Sekunda (2010) 256. The same tunic is worn by Darius III on his chariot in the battle-scene depicted in the Alexander Mosaic from Pompeii: Pfrommer (1998) 59. For the contested dating of the lost Greek painting thought to underlie this mosaic see now Stewart (2003) 42–44.

mon Greek style of wearing the tunic girt up, with the belt over an ‘overfold’ bringing the tunic well above the knees to facilitate riding a horse.

This explanation, if correct, may also serve to explain the specific trigger for the way in which Ehippus, confronted by Alexander perhaps wearing his Persian tunic in the same manner, spotted an opportunity for parody.

The rest of this segment seeks to make the argument that what Ehippus saw was Alexander imitating the Persian royal hunts, in which the Great King rode in a chariot and shot at big game, and specifically lions, with his bow. The first points to establish are these: did either the chariot or the bow feature in what we know of either the military or the hunting traditions of the Macedonian court in Alexander’s day? A passage in Plutarch suggests a negative answer on both counts. Describing Alexander’s day in the first of his two speeches *De Fortuna aut Virtute Alexandri*, Plutarch says that Alexander (338d):

...ἔπαιζε δ’ ὁδοιπορῶν ἄμα καὶ μανθάνων τοξεύειν καὶ ἐπιβαίνειν ἄρματος.

...he played games while travelling, at the same time also learning to use a bow and to mount a chariot.

Plutarch here is using material which he also deployed in his *Life* of Alexander (23.2–3; for the Greek text see below):

If he were making a march which was not very urgent, he would learn, as he went along, either archery (τοξεύειν) or mounting and dismounting from a chariot (ἄρμα) that was under way.’

As proposed below, Plutarch found this information in the literary work known as the *Ephēmerides* (*Day Books*). He deploys it in the two different works, either from memory or from notes.<sup>45</sup> Both passages are in agreement that Alexander on a daily basis was *learning* archery and chariotry (in both passages the verb is *μανθάνειν*).

Apart from the Ehippan passage, no other evidence contradicts Plutarch’s implication that Alexander learnt these skills only in adulthood and (as will be seen) only late in his reign. To my knowledge there is no evidence

<sup>45</sup> Plutarch’s note-taking and use of memory: Hamilton (1999) xlix–li; xxix–xxxix on Plutarch’s two speeches on Alexander’s Fortune (xxix: no internal indications of date; usually held to be youthful works).



whatsoever to associate the Argead kings before Alexander's time with the use of chariots in *any* context, presumably because, as Anderson has observed, 'Greece, unlike Egypt or Mesopotamia, has little flat land across which chariots could be driven at speed'.<sup>46</sup> Although Philip II's army was seen by Greek contemporaries as unusual in incorporating all arms, archers included (Dem. *Or.* 9.49–50), the bow was not a characteristic weapon of the Macedonians in the age of Alexander. It had no place in the arms of either Alexander's heavy infantry or elite-cavalry. Arrian refers—the only ancient author to do so—to a specialist body of 'Macedonian archers' in the infantry line at Gaugamela, but not only were their numbers small, but the factual weight to be attached to the ethnic is debated: if not 'an incompetent marginal gloss', it may here designate, not ethnic Macedonians in the full sense, but troops recruited from Philip II's enlarged Macedonian kingdom.<sup>47</sup> The 'Tomb of Philip' at Vergina (below) produced a gilded-silver gorytus or case for a bow and arrows, their range of sizes suggesting to the excavator, Andronikos, their use in the hunt. Because Scythian goryti of this type have been found in south Russia, including a fragmentary example which probably came from the same mould as the Vergina gorytus, Andronikos has argued that the Vergina gorytus originated as booty in a Macedonian campaign against the Scythians such as that of Philip II against king Ateas in 339 BC.<sup>48</sup> In sum, a case is hard to make for including archery with the traditional weapons-training of aristocratic or royal Macedonians in the age of Alexander, of whose own arms-training we know almost nothing.<sup>49</sup>

In the hunting frieze painted on the façade of the so-called Tomb of Philip at Vergina the hunters appear either on horseback or on foot in an open, seemingly sacral, landscape with scattered trees and rocks, probably near a river, their prey comprising antelope, boar, stag, bear and lion. Apart

<sup>46</sup> Anderson (1985) 10.

<sup>47</sup> Key passages: Arr. 3.12.2 with Bosworth (1980–1995) I.302 ('It is certainly possible that no corps of Macedonian archers existed') and Hammond (1989) 168–9; Diod. 17.77.4. See too Bosworth (1988a) 259–66.

<sup>48</sup> Andronikos (1984) 180–186. For the continuing debate about the identity of the tomb's occupants see n. 52 below. Further on this gorytus: n. 91 below.

<sup>49</sup> Carney (2003) 48 rightly notes that the story of Alexander's taming of Bucephalus shows that in his early education 'Alexander must have been trained to ride well and probably began to hunt and learn to use the weapons of a cavalryman.' Whether the perception (of some ancient Greeks, some of the time) that archery was cowardly affected Greek and Macedonian attitudes to the bow as a weapon in aristocratic circles is unclear.

from hunting dogs, their weapons are javelins, spears, an axe and netting.<sup>50</sup> Famous mosaics from Pella (c. 330–300 BC) show hunting imagery broadly consonant with the Vergina frieze. In one, a pebble mosaic, two young men on foot, heroically nude, attack a lion, their weapons a spear and a sword. In the second, two young men once more, again nude and on foot, attack a cornered stag with an axe and a sword, aided by a hunting dog.<sup>51</sup> Allowing for idealisation, these scenes can probably be taken as representative of the practices of aristocratic hunting for big game in the Macedonian homeland in the later fourth century BC.<sup>52</sup> This hunting iconography from fourth-century Macedonia seems to reflect the aristocratic hunting style praised by Plato in moralising terms (*Laws* 824a–b):

Accordingly, the only kind [*of hunting*] left for all, and the best kind, is the hunting of quadrupeds with horses and dogs and the hunter's own limbs, when men hunt in person, and subdue all the creatures by means of their own running, striking and shooting—all the men, that is to say, who cultivate the courage that is divine (*ἀνδρείας τῆς θείας*). (Transl. R. G. Bury (Loeb))

Briant has argued that this style of hunting reflected Plato's knowledge of both the Macedonian and the Persian royal hunt. It is also possible, as Briant has shown, that, under Achaemenid influence, hunting practices at the Macedonian court had already embraced Persian-style hunting parks, and perhaps the lion hunt, *before* Alexander's invasion of Persia.<sup>53</sup>

<sup>50</sup> Saatsoglou-Paliadeli (2004) 66–74 (weapons; possible identification of the *σιβύνη*: 70 n. 261); 84–6 (prey); 86–91 (topography; possibly a sacred landscape). See n. 53 for modern debate about this setting.

<sup>51</sup> Pollitt (1986) 40–1 (discussion) with figs. 34–6. For the (unresolved) debate as to whether the lion-hunt scene depicts Alexander and Craterus see, e.g., Briant (1991) 224.

<sup>52</sup> For some more recent contributions to the (unresolved) debate about the identity of the occupants, and thus the date, of the 'Tomb of Philip', see Palagia (2000) 189–191; Borza (2010) 410–416; Gill (2008) with *BE* (2009) no. 314 (M. Hatzopoulos); Lane Fox (2011) 35–37.

<sup>53</sup> Briant (1991). For likely Achaemenid influence on Philip II's court style, see also Spawforth (2007a) 90–2. Achaemenid influence on the court of the Thracian kings offers a suggestive parallel, especially since Thrace after 478 BC, like Macedon, was no longer under Persian *political* control: Briant (1991) 232–6; Brosius (2011) 145. As for the Vergina hunting scene, 'the relationship with *paradeisoi* is, to say the least, controversial' (Tuplin (1996) 39); also Carney (2002) 66–67; Palagia (2000) 177 ('there is no evidence that [Persian-style] hunting parks existed in Macedonia before the death of Alexander'). Barringer (2001) 200, on the other hand, sees the setting of the scene as 'a typical Eastern game park, perhaps in Babylon'.

As for Alexander himself, '[t]he intense enthusiasm of the Macedonian elite for hunting and the central role of the king in the royal hunt' characterised the society which formed him.<sup>54</sup> His personal attachment to hunting is well documented, and in what follows certain items only are discussed. First of all the place of hunting in the description of the king's day in Plutarch's *Alexander*, already cited, must now be considered at greater length. It occurs as part of a larger digression illustrating Alexander's character, a digression which Plutarch placed after the battle of Issus and before the chronological narrative resumes with Alexander and the Persian booty at Damascus. Describing Alexander's day, Plutarch writes (*Alex.* 23.2–3):

ἐν δὲ ταῖς σχολαῖς πρῶτον μὲν ἀναστὰς καὶ θύσας τοῖς θεοῖς εὐθὺς ἡρίστα καθήμενος: ἔπειτα διημέρευε κυνηγῶν ἢ δικάζων ἢ συντάττων τι τῶν πολεμικῶν ἢ ἀναγινώσκων. εἰ δὲ ὁδὸν βαδίζοι μὴ λίαν ἐπείγουσαν, ἐμάνθανεν ἅμα πορευόμενος ἢ τοξεύειν ἢ ἐπιβαίνειν ἄρματος ἐλαυνομένου καὶ ἀποβαίνειν πολλάκις δὲ παίζων καὶ ἀλώπεκας ἐθήρευε καὶ ὄρνιθας, ὡς ἔστι λαβεῖν ἐκ τῶν ἐφημερίδων.

In his times of leisure, however, after rising and sacrificing to the gods, he immediately took breakfast sitting; then, he would spend the day in hunting, or administering justice, or arranging his military affairs, or reading. If he were making a march which was not very urgent, he would learn, as he went along, either archery or mounting and dismounting from a chariot that was under way. Often too, for diversion, he would hunt foxes or birds, as may be gathered from the *Ephemerides*. (Transl. B. Perrin (Loeb) with the translation of ἐμάνθανεν as 'learn' instead of Perrin's 'practise'.)

Plutarch certainly found the specific information about play-hunting in the work known to him as the so-called *Royal Day Books* or *Diary* (*FGrHist* 117 F 1). The nature of this work is a well-known crux in Alexander-scholarship, with Hammond among the most recent scholars to maintain the view, going back to the nineteenth century, that an official documentary record once existed of Alexander's daily 'orders, actions, dispositions, letters, negotiations and so on'.<sup>55</sup> In the form in which they were accessed by Plutarch (and Arrian), the *Day Books* has also been claimed as a 'recognized literary work', composed after Alexander's death.<sup>56</sup> More recently Bosworth has argued that Arrian

<sup>54</sup> Carney (2002).

<sup>55</sup> Hammond (1993) 200.

<sup>56</sup> Pearson (1954/55) 436.

drew on this literary work via Ptolemy, that its date is therefore relatively early, and that it was not a ‘deliberate forgery’ as such, but a daily record of Alexander’s last year or so compiled and published for political reasons by a court insider, whom Bosworth identifies as Eumenes of Cardia, Alexander’s chief secretary, independently attested as author of a work called *Ephêmerides* (Ath. 10.434b).<sup>57</sup> On this view, the *Ephêmerides*, despite being a confection, would have reflected authentic traditions about the historical Alexander c. 324–323 BC as his itinerant army-cum-court moved between the Iranian plateau and Mesopotamian plain. Although Plutarch in this passage explicitly cites the *Ephêmerides* for the information about Alexander’s play hunts only, Berve assumed that Plutarch found all these details about Alexander’s day in the same work, to which Plutarch had direct access.<sup>58</sup> If Berve’s reasonable assumption is coupled with Bosworth’s argument about authorship and context, Plutarch’s two references to Alexander’s chariotry then belong chronologically in the same phase of the reign—the last two years—as the one reference of Ehippus to Alexander on a chariot with a bow. That is, the *Ephêmerides* and Ehippus corroborate each other.<sup>59</sup>

Thus understood chronologically, this passage in Plutarch is at any rate consonant with another in which Plutarch claims that Alexander’s devotion to hunting strengthened in the latter half of the reign. According to Plutarch, after his great victories over the Persians he ‘exerted himself yet more strenuously in military and hunting expeditions (τὰ κυνηγέσια)’, supposedly so as to set an example to his increasingly soft-living Companions.<sup>60</sup> There are also testimonia to three specific hunts. One, in which a page, Hermolaus, is said to have saved Alexander during a boar hunt, is of uncertain date and, indeed, historicity.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>57</sup> Bosworth (1988b) 157–84, accepted by Zambrini (2007) 213. Hamilton (1996) 59–60; also 210–1.

<sup>58</sup> Berve (1926) I.12–13. Access: Bosworth (1988b) 158–69.

<sup>59</sup> That there was also an official diary, now lost, is still thought likely, e.g. Pearson (1954/55) 434. It is not clear that any parallel, ancient or modern, can be found for a royal diary of the scope required to provide the detail which Arrian preserves for, e.g., Alexander’s Balkan campaign in 335 BC, *pace* Hammond (1993) 198–200. Then again an ‘official record’ can be lacunose or downright misleading, as pointed out by Bosworth (1996) 33–4 (although the notoriously laconic diary of Louis XVI was above all a personal and a *hunting* diary: ‘Rien’ on July 14, 1789, essentially means ‘No hunting’); see too Baynham (2003) 6.

<sup>60</sup> Plut. *Alex.* 40.3.

<sup>61</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 4.13.2; Curt. 8.6.7. See Coppola (2010) 141–2, arguing for the ‘adoption of literary patterns’ from earlier Greek traditions about the Persian royal hunt mediated by Ctesias.

As for the other two, the same passage in Plutarch records (40.3–4), with no indication of date or location, a hunt in which Craterus came to the assistance of Alexander as he fought with a lion, along with the information that this action was later commemorated at Delphi in a bronze sculptural group commissioned from the sculptors Lysippus and Leochares depicting ‘the lion, the dogs, the king engaged with the lion’ and Craterus coming to his aid. The inscribed epigram accompanying this dedication to Apollo has been found at Delphi. It gives the dedicator as the homonymous son of Craterus, so that the monument may date from as late as the early third century BC, and specifies that the hunt in question took place ‘in the confines of the sheep-rearing Syrians’ (l. 10: οἰονόμων ἐν περάτεσσι Σύρων). According to Plutarch (ibid.), a Spartan ambassador present at this hunt ironically congratulated Alexander for ‘nobly fighting with the lion for the kingship’ (καλῶς . . . πρὸς τὸν λέοντα ἡγώνισαι περὶ τὰς βασιλείας). Willrich saw here a knowing reference by this ambassador to the letter which Alexander wrote to Darius III from the Syrian town of Marathus in 333/332 BC in which he challenged the Persian king to stand his ground and ‘fight for the kingship’ (Arr. 2.14.9: ἀγώνισαι περὶ αὐτῆς [sc. τῆς βασιλείας]). This argument then places the lion hunt in the short period after Issus. Since Arrian records a halt for the army after its departure from Marathus at Sidon in Phoenicia (2.15.6), where a παράδεισος or pleasure park of the Persian kings was located in 350 BC (Diod. 17.41.5), Willrich proposed that this was when and where the hunt in question took place. It is true, as Perdrizet pointed out, that ‘Syrians’ in Greek usage could as well mean ‘Assyrians’, that is, the inhabitants of northern Mesopotamia; equally, it could also refer to Phoenicia, as von Graeze notes. To this same hunt, finally, seems to belong an episode described by Curtius in which Lysimachus, one of the Companions, is also said to have killed a lion single-handedly (Curt. 8.1.15–16: *in Syria* in the Latin).<sup>62</sup>

This passage is important chronologically because it confirms that Alexander had indeed hunted lions in Syria before leaving Mesopotamia for the Iranian plateau at the end of 331 BC. It comes in a description by Curtius (8.1.11–9) of a later hunt, in which this time it is Lysimachus who comes to the rescue of the king, only to be repulsed by Alexander, who competitively insists that now it is his turn to kill a lion single-handedly (*uno*). The year was 329 BC and the location ‘the region of Bazaira’ or ‘Basista’ (so Diod. 17, prol. 26), in the vicinity of ancient Maracanda (Samarkhand), in turn the chief town of the Achaemenid satrapy of Sogdiana (straddling modern Uzbeki-

<sup>62</sup> Epigram: Courby (1927) 237–40 at 239, with a suggested date for the group between c. 320–275 BC. See Willrich (1899) 231–234, followed by von Graeve (1970) 136–7 and Briant (1991) 217; Perdrizet (1898; 1899). The commentary of Hamilton (1999) 107 makes a slip in implying that the ‘Syrians’ of the epigram could refer to Drangiana in central Asia.

stan and Tajikistan).<sup>63</sup> Alexander was again on foot when the lion attacked. According to Curtius, Lysimachus had intervened with his ‘hunting spear’ (*venabulum*).<sup>64</sup> After this dangerous episode the Macedonians in assembly ‘scivere gentis suae more [or morem], ne aut pedes venaretur...’: ‘voted in the manner of their people [or re-affirmed the custom of their people], that [Alexander] should not hunt on foot ...’.<sup>65</sup> Curtius explicitly sets this episode in a man-made park (8.1.11–13):

Barbarae opulentiae in illis locis haud ulla sunt maiora indicia quam magnis nemoribus saltibusque nobilium ferarum greges clusi. Spatiosas ad hoc eligunt silvas crebris perennium aquarum fontibus amoenas: muris nemora cinguntur turresque habent venantium receptacula. Quattuor continuis aetatibus intactum saltum fuisse constabat, cum Alexander cum toto exercitu ingressus agitari undique feras iussit.

There are no greater indications of the wealth of the barbarians in those regions than their herds of noble wild beasts, confined in great woods and parks (*magnis nemoribus saltibusque*). For this purpose they choose extensive forests made attractive by perennial springs; they surround the woods with walls and have towers (*turres*) as stands (*receptacula*) for the hunters. The forest was known to have been undisturbed (*intactum*) for four successive generations, when Alexander, entering it with his whole army, ordered an attack on the wild beasts from every side. (Rolfe, trs.)

This is usually taken to be a description of another hunting ‘paradise’ of the Persian kings, as at Sidon.<sup>66</sup> At ‘Bazaira’ the park had been ‘undisturbed’ for four generations, presumably meaning that no Achaemenid king had visited it for over a century, a fact which may explain the prodigious quantity of

<sup>63</sup> See Tomaschek (1897), suggesting a location in the area of the modern town of Pendžend (Pendzhikent), south-east of Samarkhand in what is now Tajikistan, an area notable, according to Tomaschek, for its plane trees.

<sup>64</sup> For *venabulum* as a term see Sestili (2010) 101–102.

<sup>65</sup> Curt. 8.1.11–19, of which 11–12 is reproduced by Kuhrt (2007) II.511–12, 21(v). On the variant reading *more/morem*, the Loeb edition by J. C. Rolfe reads *more*; N. G. L. Hammond in Hammond and Griffith (1979) 156 with n. 1 prefers *morem*. See also Briant (1991) 218–219, 222–213; Lund (1992) 6–8.

<sup>66</sup> See Tuplin (1996) noting ‘Bazaira’ (92) and making the ‘capital distinction’ between hunting and botanical *paradeisoi* (100).

game, since Alexander and his men are said to have killed 4,000 animals (Curt. 8.1.19).<sup>67</sup>

Neither here nor at Sidon do the written sources give any detail as to Alexander's appearance and weaponry while hunting in Asia. At this point, mention should be made of the evidence of the so-called Alexander-Sarcophagus, now in Istanbul. This luxurious sarcophagus, Greek work of the highest quality carved from Pentelic marble, was found in the necropolis of the Phoenician kings of Sidon, and can be dated approximately between 325 and 311 BC. Its interest for us lies in the conviction of many (but not all) art-historians that Alexander himself is depicted in the lion hunt scene on one of the two long sides, and in the fact that the scene presents easterners in Persian dress and 'Greeks' hunting together: imagery particularly suited to the historical Alexander's commitment to some kind of social incorporation of the Achaemenid Asian elites.<sup>68</sup> The prey comprises a lion and a stag; hunting dogs are used; the weapons included spears and axes. If Alexander is correctly identified as the youthful figure on horseback originally wearing a metal diadem and wielding a spear, then it is likely that the scene reflects the same royal hunt at Sidon in 332 BC as just discussed, during which there no doubt were many 'kills'. Here the focus of the scene is the mounted hunter immediately to the right of 'Alexander', dressed in Persian costume, his horse under attack from the lion. This figure no doubt represents the high-ranking person for whom the sarcophagus was commissioned, identified with considerable probability as the Phoenician prince Abdalonymus, installed by Alexander as king of Sidon after Issus. On the matter of costume, however, less can be safely adduced. The literal specificity of the depiction of the hunters' costumes to the hunt of 332 BC can hardly be assumed. In addition there is modern disagreement as to whether the sleeved chiton worn by the hunting 'Alexander' is of Macedonian type (so von Graeve) or eastern (as Palagia suggests).<sup>69</sup>

<sup>67</sup> See Briant (1991) 219 (on the credibility of the figure); also Briant (2002) 298; Kuhrt (2007) vol. II.510–4; also 806–8.

<sup>68</sup> On this point note Schefold (1968) 33 ('... das Zusammenwirken von Griechen und Orientalen zu betonen, war nur zu Lebzeiten Alexanders aktuell und wichtig').

<sup>69</sup> For the sarcophagus see von Graeve (1970) especially 85–7 (the costume of 'Alexander') and 136–8 (identification of the hunt scene); Anderson (1985) 76–78; Pollitt (1986) 38–40. Stewart (2003) 49 accepts the identification of Abdalonymus but prefers to identify his 'Greek' hunting companion as the future Demetrius I, a suggestion going back to P. Charbonneaux and rejected by Palagia (2000), who also argues (188) that the costume of 'Alexander' here is eastern: 'an Oriental-style chiton with tight-fitting sleeves and an overfall, similar to those worn by the Persians'. Briant (1991) 216 and Barringer (2001) 186 also see Alexander here.

To return to Alexander's belated mastery of the chariot and bow-and-arrow for hunting, this style of hunting was sufficiently characteristic of Persian society under the Achaemenids to be known to the Greeks earlier in the 4th century BC, as is clear from a lekythos of the (early?) 4th century BC signed by Xenophantus 'the Athenian' as potter, with unusually rich decoration in relief appliqué, paint and gilding. The central panel shows Persians labelled with authentically Persian, or at any rate eastern-sounding names, including 'Darius' and 'Cyrus'. They are hunting boar, deer and (fantastically) griffin, doing so on foot, on horseback, and in one case, from a two-horse chariot on which a single figure improbably both drives the vehicle and at the same time spears a boar; this figure is labelled 'Abrocomas', the name of an historical satrap of Achaemenid Syria at the turn of the 5th century BC (Xen. *Anab.* 1.3.20).<sup>70</sup>

However, the closest parallels for the Ehippan image of king Alexander in Persian dress, on a chariot and armed with a bow, come from Persian art itself. In particular, the image strikingly evokes a well-known scene of the royal lion hunt of king Darius I on an Achaemenid cylinder seal said to have been found in Lower Egypt and now in the British Museum:



Figure 1. Agate cylinder seal. Darius I shooting a lion. Persian, 5th–4th century BC. Said to have been found in a tomb at Thebes, Egypt. Height 3.7 cm. © Trustees of the British Museum.

The catalogue-entry from a recent exhibition at the British Museum describes the scene on this seal as follows:

<sup>70</sup> St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum Π1837.2 (St. 1790). Franks (2009) with earlier refs.



The king stands in a chariot driven towards the right, and aims a third arrow at a rampant wounded lion. The two horses are leaping over the body of a fallen lion. Above is a figure of a winged disc. The scene is flanked by palm trees, between which is a trilingual cuneiform inscription in Old Persian, Elamite and Babylonian (SDa): ‘I [am] Darius, great king’ (the word ‘great’ only occurs in Babylonian). This was probably a seal of office ...<sup>71</sup>

This image is similar to that of a seal-cylinder now in Boston which shows the Great King firing his bow into a lion-monster from a two-horse chariot.<sup>72</sup> Both belong to a larger context of chariot-hunting iconography in Achaemenid or Achaemenidising art which enjoyed an after-life in Asia until well into the Hellenistic period.<sup>73</sup> To quote Dusinberre: ‘[t]he idea of a hunt from a chariot is one with roots in the Neo-Assyrian period, including both palace reliefs [*for these see below*] and glyptic art. ... Although it disappears from palace reliefs in the Achaemenid period, this iconography is still frequently represented on the seals used by individuals and offices’.<sup>74</sup> As well as Achaemenid glyptic art, the chariot hunt is now depicted in a wall painting from Dahaneh-ye Gholaman, an excavated Achaemenid centre of the sixth and fifth centuries BC in what is today the Sistan-Baluchistan province of eastern Iran, the Achaemenid satrapy of Drangiana. According to its publisher, it offers a scene of ‘great similarity’ to the Darius seal, depicting a rider in a decorated chariot with a bow in his hand who, having thrown his lance at a wild boar, is preparing to shoot an arrow at the animal. The identity of the hunter can only be guessed at. If the assumption is correct that he was ‘an important person or authority of the Drangiana area’, then this new evidence adds to that of seals to suggest that the practice of archery-based chariot-hunting extended beyond the king to the elites of the Achaemenid empire, at any rate in certain periods and in a region such as Drangiana, where the local inhabitants (Drangae) were ‘like the Persians’ (*περσίζοντες*) according to Strabo (15.2.10). All this chariot-hunting imagery from Achaemenid

<sup>71</sup> N. Tallis in Curtis and Tallis (2005) 221 no. 398; also illustrated (e.g.) in Boardman (2000) fig. 5.9.

<sup>72</sup> Boardman (2000) fig. 5.10.

<sup>73</sup> As in the sealing of a king on a chariot lion-hunting with a bow from Artaxata (180 BC–59 AD): Khachatrian (1996) pl. 73.6.

<sup>74</sup> Dusinberre (2005) 55; as well as her two examples from the seals found at Gordion (her cat. nos. 44 and 49, reproduced in Dusinberre (2010) figs. 31–12–13), she refers to a further eighteen scenes of hunts from chariots on the seals used to seal the Persepolis Fortification tablets. I am indebted to Christopher Tuplin for these other references to Near-Eastern glyptic art.

Asia serves to corroborate the proposition of the potter Xenophantus that chariot-hunting was a practice fit for an ‘eastern’ nobleman.<sup>75</sup>

As for the classical literary sources for the Persian royal hunt, such as they are, Xenophon does not specifically link chariot-hunting with Achaemenid royalty. The young Cyrus the Great is an excellent hunter on horseback, using javelins against stag and boar, as is Cyrus the Younger, whose portrayal is more historical: the prince excelled in horsemanship, archery, and javelin throwing. According to Plutarch Artaxerxes II (405/4–359/8 BC) also hunted (badly) on horseback.<sup>76</sup> Diodorus Siculus, however, recounts an episode, dated to 385 BC, in which the same Artaxerxes was hunting lion from a royal chariot drawn this time not by two but by four horses when he came under attack from two lions simultaneously and required rescuing by a leading Persian. The considerable interest of this anecdote is that, taken with the seals discussed above, it suggests that the Achaemenid kings may have regularly hunted from a chariot when pursuing the biggest game of all, namely, lions.<sup>77</sup>

There are no later references to Persian kings hunting to my knowledge. As for the royal bow and chariot, the former, a traditional weapon of the originally pastoral and nomadic Persians, became a symbol of royal power under the Achaemenid kings, representing ‘the Iranian national arm’ and ‘salient emblem of kingship’.<sup>78</sup> In Greek literature Herodotus preserves the striking action of Darius I, who used the royal bow to attract Ahura Mazda’s attention by firing an arrow at the sky.<sup>79</sup> Passages in two Persian inscriptions which proclaim in more or less identical terms the kingly qualities of respectively Darius (set up at Naqsh-e Rostam) and his son Xerxes I (set up at Persepolis) highlight his archery skills: ‘As a bowman I am a good bowman,

<sup>75</sup> Mansur Seyyed Sajjadi (2007) esp. 146–52. The map of Achaemenid Central Asia in *CAH IV*<sup>2</sup> (1988) 166–7 conveniently shows both Dahaneh-ye Gholaman and Marakanda to the north-east. Lion-hunting from chariots was at any rate known to the elites of Achaemenid Phoenicia: see the so-called Lycian Sarcophagus from Sidon (c. 400–350 BC), showing a lion-hunt conducted from four-horsed chariots: Hitzl (1991) 178, cat. 17, with Abb. 60.

<sup>76</sup> Xen. *Cyr.* 1.4.4–15; 8.1.34–8; Xen. *Anab.* 1.9.1–6; Plut. *Artaxerxes* 6.3 (the younger Cyrus is said to have claimed that his brother Artaxerxes was unable ‘to sit his horse in a hunt’, ἐν... τοῖς κυνηγεσίους μηδὲ ἐφ’ ἵππου... καθῆσθαι).

<sup>77</sup> Diod. 15.10.3 (Artaxerxes is saved from a lion by Tiribazus); see Briant (1991) 218 for this episode.

<sup>78</sup> Stronach (1989) cited by Garrison (2010) 340. Briant (2002) 214 speculates that the bow was ‘perhaps received by the Great King during the enthronement ceremony’.

<sup>79</sup> Hdt. 5.105 and 108. See Abbott (1893) 111 (significance of the action); Nenci (1994) 314 (‘Zeus’ here as the equivalent of Ahura Mazda).

both on foot and on horseback'.<sup>80</sup> The Great King appears as an archer on the Achaemenid imperial coinage; the earliest image ('type I') is associated with Darius I and has been interpreted as functioning 'to establish Darius' legitimacy as king, his metaphorical presence wherever the coins circulate, and the prosperity of orderly rule'.<sup>81</sup>

That the later Achaemenids continued to be trained in archery, and indeed to ride in chariots, is shown by the fact that Darius III in his royal chariot was armed with a bow at both Issus and Gaugamela: so the Alexander-historians tell us, as does the Alexander Mosaic, depicting Darius III fleeing the battlefield clutching his bow in his left hand.<sup>82</sup> Significant too for the argument of this paper is that the king's bow, as well as his chariot, shield and mantle (*κάνδυσ*), were captured by Alexander after Issus (Arr. 2.11.7; Plut. *Alex.* 20.5), just as, after Gaugamela, the Persian king's 'chariot was then seized a second time, and his shield was taken a second time, and his bow and arrows too' (Arr. 3.15.5). Finally it is relevant to note Arbinas, ruler of Lycian Xanthus in the 390s BC and a Persian client, for whom a Greek court poet from Pellana in mainland Achaëa composed an honorific poem, vaunting the excellence of its subject (*inter alia*) in 'bowmanship' (*τοξοσύνη*): a form of praise into which Iranian overtones should probably be read.<sup>83</sup> It is likely, therefore, that Alexander and his entourage were aware of the symbolism of the Persian royal bow and the larger place of archery in Persian society well before the invasion of 334 BC.

### 5. Alexander's Adoption of a Persian Hunting Style

Plutarch's two passages linking Alexander's day with archery and chariotry, seemingly in the last years of the reign, can now be considered further. Taken together and at face value, these passages can be used to show that Alexander occupied himself during marches by learning how to fire a bow and how to mount and dismount a moving chariot. In the last two years of

<sup>80</sup> DNb and XPl with the translation and commentary of Kuhrt (2007) II, no. 17.

<sup>81</sup> Briant (2002) 213–214 fig. 17; Garrison (2010) esp. 337–340.

<sup>82</sup> Pfrommer (1998) 65.

<sup>83</sup> So Robert (1978) 3–48, commenting on lines 14–15 of the inscription from the Letoon now to be found in Rhodes and Osborne (2003) no. 13, where the editors point out that the list of qualities of which 'bowmanship' is one is now thought to be Greek in background, 'though among the Greeks we should expect "justice", *dikaioσύνη*, rather than "archery", *toxosύνη*'. Brosius (2011) 144 comments: 'The Arbinas inscription may be a Greek text written by a Greek, but the sentiments expressed within seem to derive from Persian culture'.

the reign he would have found the flat terrain suitable for chariotry both on the Iranian plateau and in lowland Mesopotamia to the west. Alexander was not learning how to drive a chariot as such: to get on and off one while it was moving there must have been a driver holding the reins, as in the Greek athletic contest for dismounters (*ἀποβάται*), famously depicted on the Parthenon Frieze, in which the contestants were athletes in full armour jumping on and off horse-drawn chariots which charioteers steered down a race-track, contestants sprinting the last leg of the race. Plutarch was surely put in mind of this quasi-military Greek sport when he came across the references to Alexander's chariotry, as the use of the verb *ἀποβαίνειν* makes all but certain. He offers no explanation of Alexander's activity, however, and certainly was not tempted to suggest that Alexander was engaging in Greek athletics, of which Plutarch claims, earlier in the *Life*, that the king disapproved.<sup>84</sup> On the other hand, this activity can now be pinned down geographically to the Middle East, precisely a part of the ancient world in which chariotry combined with archery had marked a distinctive style of warfare since the first half of the second millennium, and a distinctive style of regal hunting for well over three centuries at least (on Assyria see below).<sup>85</sup>

In fact, the most economical explanation of Alexander's archery- and chariotry-training is to take them together with the Ehippan passage already discussed. It might then be argued that the fragment of Ehippus in fact records precisely the same activity as that alluded to by Plutarch: as the army and court moved from halt to halt in 324–323 BC, Ehippus 'often' saw Alexander breaking out for some Persian-style chariotry- and archery-training. This interpretation might seem to be supported by the claim of Ehippus (F 5, above) that, in this period of his reign, Alexander was wearing his Persian-Macedonian costume on almost a daily basis: that is to say, it was what he now wore as a matter of course when on public view (and not campaigning), in contrast to his practice in an earlier period as recorded by Plutarch, who states that 'at first' he wore his Persianising costume only when receiving 'barbarians' (Plut. *Alex.* 45.1–4), as Diodorus (17.77.4–7) supports when he claims that Alexander wore Persianising costume 'rarely'.<sup>86</sup> On this reconstruction, it is a possibility that pretty much any public appearance of a non-military kind by Alexander in 324–323 BC may now have seen him dressed in his hybrid Persian-Macedonian apparel. While on the march in Mesopotamia and Media, this costume would then have been his

<sup>84</sup> Plut. *Alex.* 4.6. Jenkins (1994) 24–25. Generally: Decker (1996). The claim of Harporation s.v. *ἀποβάτης* that the race was practised only by Athenians and Boeotians, if correct, would not necessarily have added to its appeal for Alexander.

<sup>85</sup> West (2007) 468.

<sup>86</sup> Here I follow Gadaleta (2001) 115–116.

preferred mode of dress when visible to indigenous spectators (on whom see §6 below), as well as being what he wore in ‘routine’ court ceremonial (as opposed to extraordinary ceremonies like the Susa weddings), of which all that we hear about in our sources for this period is the royal audience (in the state tent, in a *paradeisos* ...).

On the other hand, of the activities claimed by Plutarch as taking place while Alexander was on the march, the archery- and chariotry-training are reported separately from the king’s play hunting for foxes and birds (even though, as already seen, Plutarch probably found both items in the same source, the literary *Ephémérides*). It cannot be ruled out that Alexander used a bow to hunt birds, although both the bow and the spear, and indeed the chariot itself, with the protection afforded by its sides, elevation and speed, were consonant with bigger prey than the usual targets of country sports, quite apart from the fact that royal hunts conducted in such a fashion in this part of the former Persian empire conformed to a traditional local paradigm of kingly virtue, of which more will be said shortly. To my mind, therefore, the correct historical inference from Plutarch and Ephippus combined is that, in 324 BC and 323 BC, Alexander was committed to chariot-hunting in the traditional manner of the Achaemenid king and his elites (that is, armed with a bow as well as spear). This was what Ephippus misrepresented. At the same time, Alexander also needed to practise and master—indeed, in his hyper-agonistic way, excel at—the skills in question: hence the training taken by Plutarch from the literary *Ephémérides*, training persistent enough to have been deployed as a touch of verisimilitude by the author (?Eumenes) of that work. The two activities could have been conducted simultaneously: plenty of training, and the occasional set-piece royal hunt in the near-eastern style of the Achaemenid monarchy.

If this re-reading of Ephippus is correct, it tends to confirm that the Persian royal hunt remained a living tradition in the reign of Darius III, and that Darius III himself would have hunted in the time-honoured manner from his royal chariot and with a royal bow. It would have been this kind of royal hunt that Alexander was informed about by the high-ranking Persians in his entourage and which he now sought to imitate.

## 6. What Was Alexander Hoping to Achieve?

The historical Alexander has been characterised as ‘passionately attached, almost addicted to, the thrills and spills of the chase’.<sup>87</sup> This may well have been true. Also true is the fact that we have no certain evidence that Alex-

<sup>87</sup> Cartledge (2004) 202.

ander treated hunts ‘as anything more than sport’.<sup>88</sup> Yet there were what might also be called reasons of state, certainly, for the new king of Asia to go hunting in public. According to Curtius, Alexander used to say that by assuming the dress of the Persian king ‘he was wearing the spoils of the Persians’ (Curt. 6.6.5: *spolia Persarum gestare*). The fact that Curtius reports this explanation as a saying of Alexander suggests that he found it in an earlier source.<sup>89</sup> This passage has been linked with the statement of Diodorus (17.77.5) that Alexander in 334 BC had claimed Asia as ‘spear-won land’. That is to say, to ‘own’ the costume and other property of Darius III in public was an expression of power and an assertion of Alexander’s rights as conqueror.<sup>90</sup> There must also be a strong possibility that both the chariot and the bow used by Alexander on these hunting expeditions in 324/323 BC also came from ‘the spoils of the Persians’, having formerly belonged to Darius III himself (see above). Given the ignoble (in Macedonian and Greek eyes at any rate) behaviour of Darius III at both Issus and Gaugamela, when he withdrew from the battlefield and abandoned his royal chariot, arms and even raiment, it would then be tempting to see here a competitive advertisement by the historical Alexander not only of his rights as conqueror, but also of his manly superiority in deploying the accoutrements of kingly physical prowess which Darius III, by contrast, had thrown away.<sup>91</sup>

However, Alexander’s adoption of a generally Asiatic, and particularly Achaemenid, hunting style must also be seen as part of his larger engagement with, on the one hand, Achaemenid court culture, and, on the other, the defeated Persians and other Asiatic peoples: a broad engagement, since socially it took place at the level both of the rank-and-file (notably through the recruitment of Asiatics into the army) and of the elites (through the limited practice (from 331 BC) and public proclamation (in 324 BC) of *ὁμόνοια τῆς ἀρχῆς*, joint Macedonian and Persian rule). On the whole, the reporting of this engagement in the classical literary sources is negative and moralis-

<sup>88</sup> Palagia (2000) 184.

<sup>89</sup> Lane Fox (2007) 278–9.

<sup>90</sup> Collins (2012).

<sup>91</sup> For Darius III’s battlefield withdrawals as something less ignoble see Nylander (1993). As part of an argument for identifying the regal occupant of ‘The Tomb of Philip’ at Vergina as Philip III Arrhidaeus, Palagia (2000) 191 makes the interesting suggestion that the gorytus of Scythian workmanship discussed earlier and the ‘greaves of uneven height (presumably to facilitate kneeling)’, all found in the antechamber, since they ‘suggest a royal archer and invoke the royal insignia of the Achaemenids’, might have belonged to Alexander. I leave to others to judge the likelihood that the royal archer’s paraphernalia of Darius III which fell into Alexander’s hands would have included items of Scythian workmanship.

ing. What has been said about Arrian, that he lacked insight into Alexander's motives in his 'Persianising', remains true of the ancient sources in general.<sup>92</sup> Modern research increasingly recognises the moralising stereotypes which could shape, and distort, educated Greco-Roman responses to both monarchical display and 'Asia', stereotypes to which, not the least, the Alexander-historians of imperial times, that is to say, the ancient writers who provide us with the bulk of our evidence for the historical Alexander, were committed.<sup>93</sup>

This is not the place for a full review of modern debates about Alexander's court and about his 'Persianising'.<sup>94</sup> The possibility is rarely raised in modern works that Alexander might have admired Persian customs on their own terms. Certainly Greeks of the *polis*-world could be culturally responsive to their Persian neighbours.<sup>95</sup> In more recent times, some British residents in eighteenth-century India enthusiastically adopted Indian dress and acquired long-term local partners. Although such comparanda from other periods and places must obviously be used with caution, the point still needs more emphasis than it usually receives that Alexander's cultural—as opposed to political and military—attitude to the Persians need not have been inherently adversarial (a point returned to below); after all, he is said to have 'approved of' (ἔχαλρεν) one of the Companions (Peucestas) adopting Persian dress and language—indeed, is said to have authorised it (as regards dress).<sup>96</sup> In political terms, Alexander is likely to have taken to hunting *à la Perse* by

<sup>92</sup> Romm (2010a) 382. See Spawforth (2007a) 88–89; also Gadaleta (2001) 115, noting that Alexander's adoption of Macedonian-Persian dress is taken in the (classical) historiographical tradition as the beginning of his decline into barbarian *τροφή*.

<sup>93</sup> A good example is Arrian's claim in a moralising passage about Alexander's embrace of Persian customs (*Anab.* 4.7.4) that the king even took to wearing the tiara (distinctive headgear) of the Persian king, although three books later the same author in the same work (7.29.4) states that Alexander continued to wear the *καυσία* (the traditional Macedonian hat). See Bosworth (1980–1995) II.50; Collins (2012).

<sup>94</sup> Recent discussions include Brosius (2003; 2007); Spawforth (2007a); Lane Fox (2007); Wiemer (2007); Coppola (2010).

<sup>95</sup> Miller (1997); Osborne (2011) 148–50.

<sup>96</sup> Arr. 7.6.3; cf. Arr. 6.30.2–3; Diod. 19.14.5 (authorisation), almost certainly following Hieronymus of Cardia, for whose portrayal of Peucestas see Hornblower (1981) 155–6. India: Dalrymple (2002). The title of Dalrymple's book coins the expression 'white Mughals' for the high proportion—one in three as he claims—of British men in 18th-century India who 'could learn to appreciate and wish to emulate different aspects of Indian culture, and choose to take on Indian manners and languages': *ibid.* xlvi. See Ogden (2011) 139–42 for speculation about the possible influence on Alexander's ideas of cultural fusion of his early relationship with Barsine, a great-granddaughter of Artaxerxes II.

324–323 BC not just to display himself to the former Great King’s Asian subjects as a conqueror, but also as part of a larger signalling (which I have discussed elsewhere) of his respect for Persian (and more broadly ancient near-eastern) royal traditions, albeit in a nuanced way.<sup>97</sup> As Ehippus reports in F 5, his Persianising costume combined the Persian royal chiton with his own sartorial innovation, a *καυσία* (Macedonian beret-like hat) wrapped around with the Persian royal diadem. In his parody of Alexander’s hunting Persian-style in the same fragment, Ehippus also states that the king was armed with the *σιβύνη*, a type of hunting spear which the Macedonians had brought with them from their homeland (see §2, above). What Alexander sought to advertise was his commitment to a *fusion* of Macedonian and Persian royal traditions.

In asking what the historical Alexander may or may not have been hoping to achieve here, the fact that the royal hunt was an institution in the Achaemenid Persian empire no less than in Macedon also needs emphasis. Anderson is undoubtedly right to see the scene of Darius I hunting a lion on an official seal (above) as having a symbolic meaning: the ‘mighty hunter was still the protector of his people’ from savage beasts. The archer imagery on Persian imperial coins and seals has been interpreted in the same way and, indeed, seen as ‘a conscious looking backward into earlier periods to revive a theme long associated with a role intimately linked with ancient notions of kingship’.<sup>98</sup> The iconography and practice of the hunt were much older than the Achaemenid era in the ancient Orient, where ‘lions were symbols of kingship’.<sup>99</sup> In particular, it is clear that the Persian kings ‘learned the display of the royal hunt’ from their Assyrian predecessors, whose kings traditionally confronted the lion from chariots with bows as weapons. Discussing the hunting scenes in the bas-reliefs from the North Palace at Nineveh, built by the Assyrian king Ashurbanipal (668–627 BC), Anderson also notes the fact that these hunts took place in public:<sup>100</sup>

Another royal hunt takes place in the park at Nineveh before a crowd of spectators. The four horses that will draw the king’s chariot are led between two files of foot soldiers armed with spears and huge shields. Meanwhile, the townsfolk, in hope of a good view, are hurrying up a

<sup>97</sup> Spawforth (2007a).

<sup>98</sup> Anderson (1985) 67; Garrison (2010) 356.

<sup>99</sup> Palagia (2000) 181, part of a useful discussion of Assyrian and Persian royal lion hunts.

<sup>100</sup> Anderson (1985) 63–64 and 67, discussing Panels 8–9 from Room C of the North Palace and citing Barnett (1976) 37 and pls. 5–13. The panels are on display in the British Museum.



wooded hill crowned by a small building containing a relief of a royal lion hunt ... it must not be forgotten that this display of royal prowess before the people's eyes was part of the kingly function, not merely a sport to which the public were admitted as spectators.

This particular scene is set in what has been described as 'a ritual killing ground', the ground artificially levelled and cleared and with a victim released from a cage—a precursor of the Achaemenid hunting park.<sup>101</sup> It is true that 'the degree of artificial ritualism' characteristic of the Ashurbanipal imagery cannot be matched in Achaemenid art: as noted above, hunting scenes are not a feature of royal sculptural programmes in Persia and seem confined to the minor arts. Even so, commenting on the traditional iconography of the royal hunt in the ancient East, Pollitt made an observation that is surely applicable to the Achaemenid kings: '... the hunt became a kind of gesture of royalty, something that a king was expected to do.'<sup>102</sup> Not least, since Achaemenid kings a century apart are found hunting lions from chariots, it is likely, as Palagia has claimed, that the Achaemenid monarchy consciously took up 'the hieratic lion hunts' of their Assyrian predecessors.<sup>103</sup> They did so as larger heirs of the symbolism of the lion in near-eastern monarchical ideology. Root has emphasised the role of the lion in Assyrian royal iconography as 'allegorical surrogate for military enemies and their seed' as well as 'symbol of the manly prowess of the king himself'. She also argues that the prevalence of sculptural representations of the male lion at Persepolis shows that the 'male lion's allegorical auras have, in effect, been incorporated into the entire visual program of Achaemenid Persian kingship'. Root also shows that the Apadana reliefs from Persepolis use a lioness as a parable for the absorption into the Achaemenid empire of ancient Elam, the region around Susa historically associated with lions.<sup>104</sup> This rather different kind of lion-symbolism does not directly concern us. Rather, what is hypothesised here is that in 324–323 BC, criss-crossing the Zagros mountains, then the habitat of mountain lions, and visiting the lion-stocked hunting parks of the Persian kings in what is now western Iran and southern Iraq, Alexander was sufficiently exposed to the traditions and symbolism of the royal lion hunt in this part of the former Persian empire as to recognise this activity as a means of extending his signalled embrace of aspects of

<sup>101</sup> Tuplin (1996) 83–84; 101.

<sup>102</sup> Pollitt (1986) 38.

<sup>103</sup> Palagia (2000) 181. For the view that the Achaemenid monarchy sought links with 'Assyrian royal power' under Darius I see Garrison (2010) 340.

<sup>104</sup> Root (2011) esp. 447 (quotation), 460.

Achaemenid court culture.<sup>105</sup> Given the lion's age-old symbolism in the Middle East, the intention to shock and awe his Asian subjects, as with Alexander's use of an imposing state tent and his parading of his elite-troops during court ceremonies in this period and in this part of his empire, should not be ruled out either. Like the (hypothesised) use of Darius III's bows and chariots, Alexander's lion-hunting *à la Perse* may have deliberately sought to deliver a nuanced message to local viewers.

On this question of spectacle, one can speculate that lion-hunting by Achaemenid kings may also have had the *public* character which it had—on occasion at least—for the Assyrian kings. The same could then have been true for Alexander. It is likely, on the interpretation of Ephippus offered here, that Alexander presented himself as a sight to bystanders on his way to and from the hunt in 324 and 323 BC, capitalising on the undoubted fact that his public appearances in this period of the reign drew local crowds, as Ephippus himself makes clear in F 5 (see §2, above) in referring to the 'many' who gathered 'for the spectacle' (*εἰς τὴν θέαν*) of Alexander's sacrifice and festival for Dionysus at Ecbatana. Especially when he hunted from, or near, a centre of population (?Susa; ?Ecbatana; ?Opis; ?Babylon ...), in this way Alexander would have associated himself with the multi-layered near-eastern symbolism of the royal lion-hunter before an audience of local spectators, perhaps lining the route to the hunting ground or watching the king from a vantage point, as in the Nineveh relief.<sup>106</sup> In sum on this point, the re-reading of Ephippus offered here confirms, and extends, the claim of Briant: 'Il ne fait pas de doute qu'au cours de la campagne d'Asie Alexandre a repris les traditions de la chasse royale achéménide (et plus largement moyen-orientale)'.<sup>107</sup>

When Alexander hunted in Asia he was not just engaging with the rich symbolism of the royal hero. Briant has also stressed that the Persian royal hunt was 'one of the privileged loci for aristocratic and court sociability', and by extension a site of royal elite-management in a courtly setting, in that the invitation to hunt with the king was in the royal gift.<sup>108</sup> In Alexander's

<sup>105</sup> See Root (2011) 456–7 for the possibility that 'nursing lionesses and their cubs' were used to stock Achaemenid hunting parks.

<sup>106</sup> For Ecbatana note Curt. 7.2.22: 'The residences (*deversoria*) in that region have extensive, charming, and secluded parks with groves artificially planted (*nemoribus manu constitis*); these were the special delight of both kings and satraps.' See Briant (2002) 298. It is nowhere stated that any of these was a hunting, as opposed to a botanical, park, although it seems unlikely that this favourite resort of Persian kings and satraps lacked opportunities for hunting.

<sup>107</sup> Briant (1991) 226.

<sup>108</sup> Briant (2002) 297 citing Plut. *Them.* 29.6.

case, this social role of hunting is only hinted at obliquely. On one occasion ('Bazaira') we learn, as already noted, that the vast bag, or at any rate a large part of it, was consumed there and then in an episode of festive commensality by Alexander and his fellow-hunters, said on this occasion to have been limited to the men of his army. However, the 'Alexander Sarcophagus', with its idealised depiction of Greco-Macedonians and Asiatics hunting together, including the European conqueror ('Alexander') alongside a local Asiatic ruler (?Abdalonymus), seems to evoke exactly Briant's 'aristocratic and court sociability'. That is, Alexander's hunts in Asia may have functioned politically as a site of social interaction and negotiation with the elites of the former Persian empire, providing such people with opportunities to come into direct contact with the ruler and his court in a sporting setting. As a 'tool for thinking', in this connection it is worth noting the socio-political use of hunting by an imperial Asian power of much later date, namely China's Manchu (Qing) dynasty, descended, like the Persian Achaemenids, from nomadic pastoralists. Using archival materials in Beijing, Rawski offers this description of the autumn hunts of the Qing emperors in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries:<sup>109</sup>

Requiring precise coordination and planning of movements, provisions, and shelter, the large hunts of the Kangxi and Qianlong reigns closely resembled military campaigns. The parties of imperial princes, central government ministers, banner officials and nobles of Mongol, Kazakh, and Uighur origin that hunted with [emperor Hongli at Mulan] are said on occasion to have numbered 30,000 persons.<sup>110</sup> The hunt regulations show a formalized and ritualized sequence of events, with displays of imperial archery by the emperor, his sons, and grandsons; mock battles between forces led by Manchu and Mongol nobles; presentation to the emperor of the annual Mongol tribute of the 'nine whites' (nine white camels or nine white horses); and reciprocal feasting, with Mongol ballads, dances, horse races, and wrestling as well as the emperor's presentations of silk, silver and gold to the Mongol nobles ... the imperial hunt, in which Tibetan prelates, Mongol nobles, and Muslim *begs* participated, [can be characterised] as a form of ritual activity that derived from Mongol and Manchu customs. The hunt gave lower-ranking members of the Inner Asian elite an oppor-

<sup>109</sup> Rawski (1998) 23–4.

<sup>110</sup> Mulan was the Qing dynasty's hunting preserve on the south-west edge of the Mongol plateau, 117 km. north of the dynasty's summer capital at Chingde.

tunity to come in close contact with the emperor while participating in an activity that linked the Manchus to Inner Asia.<sup>111</sup>

This elite-sociability bringing together imperial centre and subject periphery evokes something of the imperial ethos which Cannadine has labelled ‘ornamentalism’ in his perceptive analysis of the social glue which held the British empire together. In relations between rulers and ruled:<sup>112</sup>

... when, as they usually did, the British thought of the inhabitants of their empire ... in *individual* terms rather than in collective categories, they were more likely to be concerned with rank than with race, and with the appreciation of status similarities based on perceptions of affinity. From one perspective, the British may indeed have seen the peoples of their empire as alien, as other, as beneath them—to be lorded over and condescended to. But from another, they also saw them as similar, as analogous, as equal and sometimes even as *better* than they were themselves.

The fundamentally aristocratic and ranked nature of Macedonian homeland society in the fourth century BC, if not as plain to see as that of the an-

<sup>111</sup> There does not seem as yet to be a broad-based study of the hunt as a fundamental aspect of monarchy through the ages (although the Court Studies Forum sponsored a conference on more recent royal hunts at Turin in December 2011: *The Court Historian* 16.1 (2011) 121). The royal hunts at Versailles offer a suggestive parallel to Achaemenid practices. There the Grand Parc established by Louis XIV as a hunting park covered an area of 86,000 hectares and was surrounded by a wall 43 kilometres long and pierced by 24 monumental gates of identical design. At least one, the Porte de Trappes, also came to serve as a Curtius-like *receptaculum* for the royal hunting party, being furnished with a dining room and other facilities: Condamy and Lacaze (2012). To follow the royal hunt at Versailles was a privilege reserved for presented noblemen only. In the eighteenth century these presentations habitually took place at the royal hunt: presentees were entitled to a seat in a royal coach on the drive to the hunt-*rendezvous*, where the presentations took place, and then a mount provided by the Royal Stables (cf. Fleury (1929) 133). Courtiers following the royal hunt were not entitled to shoot the game, however, unless the king gave his permission. There were also special hunt costumes which Louis XIV gave favoured courtiers the right to wear (at their own expense): Mansel (2005) 55–7. Louis XV invited selected hunters to his private dinners at Versailles (on which, as an aspect of royal elite-management, see Hours (2002) 115–20); hunting was also one of the safe topics of conversation with royalty at Versailles. Generally, see my discussion in Spawforth (2010) 51–2, 132–5, 180–1. For awareness of ancient Persia at Louis XIV’s court, note the performance of Cavalli’s opera *Xerxès* before Louis XIV in 1660: Kimbell (2007) 211–213; note too Burke (1992) 197.

<sup>112</sup> Cannadine (2002) 123.

cient Persian empire, is nonetheless visible and not to be doubted.<sup>113</sup> The inherent affinity between corresponding levels in the hierarchies of the two societies helps to explain how Alexander could have conceived of the mixed marriages of Susa (324 BC) between himself and his elite-Companions on the one hand and women from elite-families of the defeated Persians on the other. I would argue that Cannadine's core concept of 'ornamentalism' is not inapposite as another 'tool for thinking' about the broader social function of Alexander's 'Persianising' court in relation to the elites of his empire:<sup>114</sup>

... ornamentalism was hierarchy made visible, immanent and actual. And since the British conceived and understood their metropolis hierarchically, it was scarcely surprising that they conceived and understood their periphery in the same way, and that chivalry and ceremony, monarchy and majesty, were the means by which this vast world was brought together, interconnected, unified and sacralised.

Alexander's court in Asia can likewise be understood as an exercise in which ceremonies and rituals—including the audience and the hunt—served, as they had done under the Achaemenid imperial system which Alexander had displaced, to build, at the socio-political level, on an inherent convergence of elite-mindsets among the different social hierarchies of Alexander's empire.<sup>115</sup> If it is correct, as argued above, that Alexander was 'learning' Persian-style archery and chariotry in the last years of the reign, it is also clear, on the analysis offered here, that his engagement with Persian royal style was, far from being the creation of one particular moment, a process, one that began after Gaugamela, one that was further stimulated by the return to the Achaemenid heartlands in 325 BC, and one that was still evolving at the time of Alexander's death: 'Alexander's court ... was a work in progress'.<sup>116</sup> On the view taken here of Alexander's audiences and hunts in 324–

<sup>113</sup> For Persian society as a society of ranks, and for the hierarchy of the Achaemenid court, see Brosius (2007). There certainly existed a Macedonian elite under Philip and Alexander, with its own internal hierarchy, although the existence of a Macedonian hereditary nobility is disputed: Hammond (1989) 54–55 ('some form of hierarchy' within the 'Companionate'). There is also slight evidence that elite-Macedonians (as opposed to the king himself) were linked into the upper-class 'friendship' networks of the classical Greek (and non-Greek) world: Diod. 17.47 (Hephaestion); 20.20.2 (Polyperchon) (refs. given by Herman (1987) 173).

<sup>114</sup> Cannadine (2002) 122.

<sup>115</sup> For the Persian king's audiences note now Brosius (2010) 141–152.

<sup>116</sup> Coppola (2010) 148.

323 BC, Weber's claim, that at the end of his life Alexander's itinerant court, symbolised by the royal tent, turned the elite of his new empire into an essentially 'closed society' (*geschlossene Gesellschaft*), deprived of chances to develop ties beyond the court circle, cannot, I think, be correct.<sup>117</sup> Returning to a point already adumbrated, how far Alexander's imperial bi-culturalism flew in the face of ancient Greek (as opposed to Macedonian) attitudes to the 'barbarian' is a more difficult question. These attitudes surely impinged less on the *Weltanschauung* of the fourth-century BC Argead court; even within a southern-Greek context, they may anyway have been more fluid and situational than commonly thought; as tropes of Greek literature, they may also have coloured unduly the ways in which Greek Alexander-historians chose to present their (Macedonian) subject.<sup>118</sup>

Returning, finally, to Badian's point about 'silly invention', another way of approaching Ehippan invective is to see the pamphleteer's tale of Alexander's 'imitation of Artemis' as a measure of the degree to which Greeks were prepared to think the worst of the king by his reign's end. Since Ehippus here sought to attack the king's memory by appealing to Greek religious sensibilities, the troubling question arises as to how far other episodes which the classical literary traditions about Alexander interpreted as bids by the king for deification originated in similar 'misreadings' of the historical Alexander's actions and aims by first-generation Greek writers on Alexander. One such candidate for a 'misreading' of this kind is Alexander's attempt in 327 BC to impose obeisance (*προσκύνησις*) on Macedonians and Greeks. Alexander's purpose on this occasion will never be known for sure, but it is certainly possible to interpret the episode as his attempt to introduce a particular item of Persian etiquette to his court, one which laid itself open (however) to Greek misinterpretation as a quest for divine honours and which duly was interpreted in this way by some Greek writers.<sup>119</sup> The larger question of whether Alexander pursued divine honours from (Macedonians and) Greeks in his lifetime cannot be entered into here, although there is certainly a striking contrast between the poor quality of the evidence that these honours were what Alexander actively sought, on the one hand, and,

<sup>117</sup> Weber (2007) 257–8.

<sup>118</sup> Gruen (2011) challenges the prevailing model of alterity in modern discussions of classical attitudes to other peoples, noting that Alexander 'eschewed racial bias against the "barbarian"' (75, part of an extended discussion of 'Xenophon and Alexander on Persia' (ch. 2)). Osborne (2011) argues that representations of fellow human beings in the visual arts of classical Athens do not readily map onto the binary classifications of classical Greek literature, including that of Greek/barbarian.

<sup>119</sup> For this episode see Spawforth (2007a) 103–5 (citing only some of the large modern literature).

on the other, the excellent evidence for ruler-cult in a Greek context as an initiative from below (from Greek *poleis*, that is). In conclusion, it remains to point out that Tarn's observation has not lost its force: 'Greece was thoroughly hostile to Alexander in life and even more so after his death; and it was Greeks, not Macedonians, who wrote the world's literature.'<sup>120</sup>

*Newcastle University*

ANTONY J. S. SPAWFORTH  
a.j.s.spawforth@ncl.ac.uk

<sup>120</sup> Tarn (1948) II.297.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, E., ed. (1893) *Herodotus Books V and VI* (Oxford).
- Anderson, J. K. (1985) *Hunting in the Ancient World* (Berkeley).
- Andronikos, M. (1984) *Vergina: The Royal Tombs* (Athens).
- Auberger, J. (2001) *Historiens d'Alexandre* (Paris).
- Badian, E. (1961) Review of Pearson (1960), *Gnomon* 33: 660–7.
- Barnett, R. D. (1976) *Sculptures from the North Palace of Ashurbanipal of Assyria (668–627 BC)* (London).
- Barringer, J. M. (2001) *The Hunt in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore and London).
- Baynham, E. (2003) 'The Ancient Evidence for Alexander the Great', in Roisman (2003) 3–29
- Berve, H. (1926) *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, 2 vols. (Munich).
- Boardman, J. (2000) *Persia and the West: An Archaeological Investigation of the Genesis of Achaemenid Art* (London).
- Borza, E. (2010) 'Appendix Q: The Royal Macedonian Tombs at Aigeai', in Romm (2010b) 410–6.
- Bosworth, A. B. B. (1980–1995) *Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*, 2 vols. to date (Oxford).
- (1988a) *Conquest and Empire: the Reign of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge).
- (1988b) *From Arrian to Alexander: Studies in Historical Interpretation* (Oxford).
- (1996) *Alexander and the East: The Tragedy of Triumph* (Oxford).
- Briant, P. (1991) 'Chasses royales macédoniennes et chasses royales perses: le thème de la chasse au lion sur *La Chasse de Vergina*', *DHA* 17: 211–55.
- (1993) 'Les chasses d'Alexandre', in *Ancient Macedonia V* (Papers Read at the Fifth International Symposium Held in Thessaloniki, October 10–15, 1989) (Thessaloniki) I.267–77.
- (2002) *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*. Translated by P. T. Daniels. (Winona Lake).
- Brosius, M. (2003) 'Alexander and the Persians', in Roisman (2003) 169–93.
- (2007) 'Court and Court Ceremonies in Achaemenid Persia', in Spawforth (2007b) 16–57.
- (2010) 'The Royal Audience Scene Reconsidered', in Curtis and Simpson (2010) 141–52.
- (2011) 'Keeping up with the Persians: Between Cultural Identity and Persianization in the Achaemenid Period', in E. Gruen, ed., *Cultural Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Los Angeles) 135–49.
- Burke, P. (1992) *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* (New Haven and London).
- Cannadine, D. (2002) *Ornamentalism: How the British Saw their Empire* (London).



- Carney, E. (2002) 'Hunting and the Macedonian Elite: Sharing the Rivalry of the Chase (Arrian 4.13.1)', in D. Ogden, ed., *The Hellenistic World: New Perspectives* (Swansea) 59–80.
- (2003) 'Elite Education and High Culture in Macedon', in W. Heckel and L. A. Tritle, edd., *Crossroads of History: The Age of Alexander* (Claremont, CA) 47–63.
- Cartledge, P. (2004) *Alexander the Great: The Hunt for a New Past* (London).
- Cohen, B. (2001) 'Ethnic Identity in Democratic Athens and the Visual Vocabulary of Male Costume', in I. Malkin, ed., *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Washington, D.C.) 235–74.
- Collins, A. W. (2012) 'The Royal Costume and Insignia of Alexander the Great', *AJPh* 133: in press.
- Condamy, L. and J. Lacaze (2012) 'Pour les plaisirs du roi: les métamorphoses de la porte de Trappe', *Versalia: Revue de la Société des Amis de Versailles* 15: 71–100.
- Coppola, A. (2010) 'Alexander's Court', in B. Jacobs and R. Rollinger, edd., *Der Achämenidenhof: The Achaemenid Court (Akten des 2. Internationalen Kolloquiums zum Thema 'Vorderasien im Spannungsfeld klassischer und altorientalischer Überlieferungen' Landgut Castelen bei Basel, 23.–25. Mai 2007)* (Classica et Orientalia Bd. 2; Wiesbaden) 139–48.
- Courby, M. F. (1927) *Fouilles de Delphes II: La Terrasse du Temple* (Paris).
- Curtis, J. and N. Tallis, edd. (2005) *Forgotten Empire: The World of Ancient Persia* (London).
- Curtis, J. and St. J. Simpson, edd. (2010) *The World of Achaemenid Persia: History, Art and Society in Iran and the Ancient Near East* (Proceedings of a conference at the British Museum 29th September–1st October 2005) (London).
- Dalrymple, W. (2002) *White Mughals: Love and Betrayal in Eighteenth-Century India* (London).
- Decker, W. (1996) 'Apobates', *Der Neue Pauly* I.848.
- Dusinberre, E. R. M. (2005) *Gordion Seals and Sealings: Individuals and Society* (Gordion Special Studies III; Philadelphia).
- (2010) 'Anatolian Crossroads: Achaemenid Seals from Sardis and Gordion', in Curtis and Simpson (2010) 323–35.
- Elsner, J. (1998) *Imperial Rome and Christian Triumph* (Oxford).
- Fol, A. (1984) 'Artemis,' *LIMC* II.1: 618–774.
- Fleury, Vicomte (1929) *Les derniers jours de Versailles*<sup>3</sup> (Paris).
- Franks, H. M. (2009) 'Hunting the *Eschata*: An Imagined Persian Empire on the Lekythos of Xenophantos', *Hesperia* 78: 455–80.
- Fredricksmeier, E. (2003) 'Alexander's Religion and Divinity', in Roisman (2003) 253–78.

- Gadaleta, A. P. (2001) 'Efippo storico di Alessandro: Testimonianze e frammenti', *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Università degli Studi Bari* 44: 97–144.
- Garrison, M. (2010) 'Archers at Persepolis: The Emergence of Royal Ideology at the Heart of Empire', in Curtis and Simpson (2010) 337–59.
- Ghirshman, R. (1964) *Persia: From the Origins to Alexander the Great* Translated by S. Gilbert and J. Emmons (London).
- Gill, D. (2008) 'Inscribed Silver Plate from Tomb II at Vergina', *Hesperia* 77: 335–58.
- Gow, A. S. F. and D. L. Page, edd. (1965) *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols. (Cambridge).
- (1968) *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip and some Contemporary Epigrams*, 2 vols. (Cambridge).
- Gruen, E. (2011) *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity* (Princeton and Oxford).
- Gulick, C. B. (1955) *Athenaeus: The Deipnosophists* (Loeb Classical Library; London and Cambridge, Mass.) vol. V.
- Hamilton, J. R. (1999) *Plutarch: Alexander*<sup>2</sup> (Swansea).
- Hammond, N. G. L. (1989) *The Macedonian State: Origins, Institutions, and History* (Oxford).
- (1993) *Sources for Alexander the Great: An Analysis of Plutarch's Life and Arrian's Anabasis* (Cambridge).
- (1996) 'Some Passages in Polyaeus' Stratagems Concerning Alexander', *GRBS* 37: 23–53.
- and G. T. Griffith (1979) *A History of Macedonia*, vol. 2 (Oxford).
- Heckel, W. (2006) *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander the Great* (Malden, Mass. and Oxford).
- Heisserer, A. J. (1980) *Alexander the Great and the Greeks: the Epigraphic Evidence* (Norman).
- Herman, G. (1987) *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City* (Cambridge).
- Hitzl, I. (1991) *Die griechischen Sarkophage der archaischen und klassischen Zeit* (Jönsered).
- Hornblower, J. (1981) *Hieronymus of Cardia* (Oxford).
- Hornblower, S. (2007) 'Warfare in Ancient Literature: the Paradox of War', in P. Sabin, H. van Wees, and M. Whitby, edd., *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare*, 2 vols. (Cambridge) I.22–53.
- Hours, B. (2002) *Louis XV et sa cour* (Paris).
- Jenkins, I. (1994) *The Parthenon Frieze* (London).
- Khachatrian, Z. (1996) 'The Archives of Sealings found at Artashat (Artaxata)', in M.-F. Boussac and A. Invernizi edd., *Archives et sceaux du monde hellénistique* (BCH suppl. 29; Paris) 365–70.

- Kimbell, D. (2007) 'Operatic Variations on an Episode at the Hellespont', in E. Bridges, E. Hall, and P. J. Rhodes, edd., *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars. Antiquity to the Third Millennium* (Oxford) 201–30.
- Kuhrt, A. (2007) *The Persian Empire: A Corpus of Sources from the Achaemenid Period*, 2 vols. (London).
- Lane Fox, R. (1973) *Alexander the Great* (London).
- (2007) 'Alexander the Great: "Last of the Achaemenids"?'', in Tuplin (2007) 267–311.
- (2011) 'Macedon, c. 650–336 BC', in A. Kottaridi and S. Walker, edd., *Heracles to Alexander the Great: Treasures from the Royal Capital of Macedon, a Hellenic Kingdom in the Age of Democracy* (Oxford) 25–38.
- Lenfant, D. (2007) 'On Persian *truphê* in Athenaeus', in Tuplin (2007) 51–65.
- Lissarrague, F. (1990) *The Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet: Images of Wine and Ritual*. Translated by A. Szegedy-Maszak (Princeton).
- Lund, H. (1992) *Lysimachus: A Study in Hellenistic Kingship* (London and New York).
- Mansel, P. (2005) *Dressed to Rule: Royal and Court Costume from Louis XIV to Elizabeth II* (New Haven and London).
- Mansur Seyyed Sajjadi, S. (2007) 'Wall Painting from Dahaneh-ye Gholaman (Sistan)', in A. Ivantchik and V. Licheli edd., *Achaemenid Culture and Local Traditions in Anatolia, Southern Caucasus and Iran: New Discoveries* (Leiden and Boston) 129–54.
- Miller, M. C. (1997) *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century BC: A Study in Cultural Receptivity* (Cambridge).
- Nenci, G. ed. (1994) *Erodoto: Le Storie. Libro V* (Turin).
- Nylander, C. (1993) 'Darius III—the Coward King: Point and Counterpoint', in J. Carlsen, B. Due, O. Steen Due, and B. Poulsen edd., *Alexander the Great: Reality and Myth* (Analecta Romana Instituti Danici Suppl. 20; Rome) 145–60.
- Ogden, D. (2011) *Alexander the Great: Myth, Genesis and Sexuality* (Exeter).
- Olson, S. Douglas (2010) *Athenaeus: The Learned Banqueters, Books 12–13.594b* (Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, Mass.) vol. VI.
- Osborne, R. (2011) *The History Written on the Classical Greek Body* (Cambridge).
- Palagia, O. (2000) 'Hephaestion's Pyre and the Royal Hunt of Alexander', in A. B. B. Bosworth and E. J. Baynham, edd., *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction* (Oxford) 167–206.
- Payen, P. (2007) 'Les fragments de Charès de Mytilène chez Athénée', in D. Lenfant ed., *Athénée et les fragments d'historiens (Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (16–18 juin 2005))* (Paris) 191–214.
- Pearson, L. (1954/55) 'The Diary and Letters of Alexander the Great', *Historia* 3: 429–55.

- (1960) *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great* (Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association 20; New York).
- Perdrizet, P. (1898) ‘La Venatio Alexandri à Delphes’, *BCH* 22: 566–9.
- (1899) ‘Venatio Alexandri’, *JHS* 19: 273–9.
- Pfrommer, M. (1998) *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie und Komposition des Alexandersmosaiks auf antiquarischer Grundlage* (Aegyptiaca Treverensia 8; Mainz).
- Pollitt, J. J. (1986) *Art in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge).
- Rawski, E. (1998) *The Last Emperors: A Social History of Qing Imperial Institutions* (Berkeley).
- Rhodes, P. J. and R. Osborne (2003) *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404–323 BC* (Oxford).
- Robert, L. (1978) ‘Les conquêtes du dynaste lycien Arbinas’, *JSt*: 3–48 = *Opera Minora Selecta VII* (1990) 381–426.
- Roisman, J., ed. (2003) *Brill’s Companion to Alexander the Great* (Leiden and Boston).
- Romm, J. (2010a) ‘Appendix K: Alexander’s Policy of Perso-Macedonian Fusion’, in Romm (2010b) 380–7.
- , ed. (2010b) *The Landmark Arrian: the Campaigns of Alexander. A New Translation by Pamela Mensch with Maps, Annotations, Appendices and Encyclopedic Index* (New York).
- Root, M. C. (2011) ‘Elam in the Imperial Imagination from Nineveh to Persepolis’, in J. Alvarez-Mon and M. B. Garrison, edd., *Elam and Persia* (Winona Lake) 419–74.
- Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, Chr. (2004) *Bergina: O taphos tou Philippou. Ê Toichographia me to kunêgi* (Athens).
- Schachermeyer, F. (1973) *Alexander der Grosse: Das Problem seiner Persönlichkeit und seines Wirkens* (Vienna).
- Schefold, K. (1968) *Der Alexander-Sarkophag* (Berlin).
- Schwartz, E. (1900) ‘Kallisthenes Hellenika’, *Hermes* 35: 106–30.
- Sekunda, N. V. (2010) ‘Changes in Achaemenid Royal Dress’, in Curtis and Simpson (2010) 255–72.
- Sestili, A. (2010) *Lucio Flavio Arriano, Il Cinegetico: Trattati sulla caccia* (Turin).
- Spawforth, A. (2006) “‘Macedonian times’”: Hellenistic memories in the provinces of the Roman Near East’, in D. Konstan and S. Said, edd., *Greeks on Greekness: Viewing the Greek Past under the Roman Empire* (Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society suppl. 29; Cambridge) 1–26.
- (2007a) ‘The court of Alexander the Great between Europe and Asia’, in Spawforth (2007b) 82–120.
- , ed. (2007b) *The Court and Court Society in Ancient Monarchies* (Cambridge).
- Spawforth, T. (2010) *Versailles: A Biography of a Palace*, revised ed. (New York).

- Stewart, A. (2003) 'Alexander in Greek and Roman Art', in Roisman (2003) 31–66.
- Stronach, D. (1989) 'Early Achaemenid Coinage: Perspectives from the Homeland', *Iranica Antiqua* 24: 255–79.
- Tarn, W. W. (1948) *Alexander the Great*, 2 vols. (Cambridge).
- Thompson, D. (2000) 'Athenaeus in his Egyptian context', in D. Braund and J. Wilkins edd., *Athenaeus and his World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire* (Exeter) 77–84.
- Tomaschek, W. (1897) 'Basista', *RE* III.1.178.
- Tondriau, J. (1949) 'Alexandre le Grand assimilé à différentes divinités', *Revue de Philologie* 23: 41–52.
- Tuplin, C. (1996) 'The Parks and Gardens of the Achaemenid Empire', in id., *Achaemenid Studies* (*Historia Einzelschriften* 99; Stuttgart) 80–131.
- , ed. (2007) *Persian Responses: Political and Cultural Interaction with(in) the Achaemenid Empire* (Swansea).
- von Graeve, V. (1970) *Der Alexandersarkophag und seine Werkstatt* (Istanbuler Forschungen no. 28; Berlin).
- Weber, G. (2007) 'Der Hof Alexanders des Grossen als soziales System', *Saeculum* 58: 229–64.
- West, M. L. (2007) *Indo-European Poetry and Myth* (Oxford).
- Wiemer, H.-U. (2007) 'Alexander—der letzte Achämenide? Eroberungspolitik, lokale Eliten und altorientalische Traditionen im Jahre 323', *Historische Zeitschrift* 284: 281–309.
- Willrich, H. (1899) 'Der Alexandersarkophag von Sidon', *Hermes* 34: 231–50.
- Zambrini, A. (2007) 'The Historians of Alexander the Great', in J. Marincola ed., *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, 2 vols. (Malden, Mass. and Oxford) I.210–220