

## 1 | The search for the ‘great man’

### 1.1 Who ‘owns’ history?

In 352 BC, an Athenian man named Euthycles went to court to prosecute a charge of *graphê paranomôn*, or the proposing of an illegal governmental decree. Like many citizens of his day, he engaged a *logographos*, a speechwriter, and the arguments that he delivered at the trial were therefore composed by Demosthenes. Since the case centered upon the award of potentially undeserved privileges to a mercenary who was at best only a dubious friend of Athens,<sup>1</sup> Demosthenes scripted for his speaker a penetrating reading of the attitude of the Athenian *dêmos* towards the roles of eminent individuals in the motion of history:

οὐδ’ ἔστ’ οὐδεις ὅστις ἂν εἴποι τὴν ἐν Σαλαμίῳ ναυμαχίαν Θεμιστοκλέους, ἀλλ’ Ἀθηναίων, οὐδὲ τὴν Μαραθῶνι μάχην Μιλτιάδου, ἀλλὰ τῆς πόλεως. νῦν δ’ ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, πολλοὶ τοῦτο λέγουσιν, ὡς Κέρκυραν εἴλε Τιμόθεος καὶ τὴν μόραν κατέκοψεν Ἴφικράτης καὶ τὴν περὶ Νάξου ἐνίκα ναυμαχίαν Χαβρίας· δοκεῖτε γὰρ αὐτοὶ τῶν ἔργων τούτων παραχωρεῖν τῶν τιμῶν ταῖς ὑπερβολαῖς αἷς δεδῶκατ’ ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς ἐκάστῳ τούτων. (D. 23.198)

There is no one who would claim that the naval battle at Salamis was the possession of Themistocles; rather, it was that of the Athenians. Nor [would anyone claim] that the battle of Marathon was the possession of Miltiades; rather, it was that of the polis. But now, men of Athens, many people say just this: that Timotheus took Corcyra, that Iphicrates massacred a Spartan division, that Chabrias won the naval battle at Naxos. You yourselves, then, seem to concede ownership of these deeds through the excesses of honors that you have given for them to each of these men.

Demosthenes’ condemnation is not merely a semantic one. Instead, he is posing very serious questions about both popular sentiment and popular

<sup>1</sup> For more detailed information on the historical context, including ancient citations and a description of the major arguments of D. 23 (the prosecution speech), see Sealey 1993: 130–1; cf. also the introduction to D. 23 in Vince 1935.

government. Does the Athenian *dêmos* now depend, whether functionally or cognitively, upon its leaders in ways that it once did not? Who ultimately creates the history of Athens, the group or the individual?

In this section of the speech against Aristocrates, Demosthenes draws his images from the familiar tropes of Marathon and Salamis.<sup>2</sup> Reaching back to the glorious victories of the Persian Wars, he claims that the Athenians conceptualize their past very differently from the way that they view their present. The *dêmos*, though it may believe that it was once the chief agent of its own history, now looks in its critical moments to the direction of important individuals instead. These men, whether political leaders, military commanders, or even foreign potentates, have therefore become de facto indispensable – with the result that (for Demosthenes) the efficacy of the democracy is compromised. Read in this context, the issues at hand become emblematic of much larger questions not only about the operation of the Athenian government, but about the very mindset of the Athenian people.

How did the Athenians arrive at this point? As Demosthenes' examples suggest, the process has had a long gestation. As early as the end of the sixth century BC, a discernible debate is underway at Athens over the ownership of pivotal historical moments. This symbolic 'conversation,' manifested in literature, epigraphy, monuments, art, and even popular song, questions the role of the Tyrannicides (as opposed to the roles of the Spartans, the Alcmeonids, or the Athenian populace)<sup>3</sup> in the establishment of the Athenian democracy. It represents a first point of entry into an extended dialogue that reveals changing perceptions, throughout the classical period, of the roles of individuals and groups in the motion of history.

These changes are of particular interest because they are not confined to the literary sphere. Tracing the 'rise of the individual' in Greek literature has long been a rich and productive pursuit in modern scholarship on ancient biography and ancient characterization.<sup>4</sup> Such work has shown that Greek authors in general, despite differences in geographical origin, political affiliation, or literary genre, appear over time to have focused with increasing intensity upon eminent men. The extent to which this

<sup>2</sup> On the use of these battles as traditional themes in oratory, see Nouhaud 1982: 147–61.

<sup>3</sup> For a reading of the relationship between the agency of the *dêmos* and that of Cleisthenes in the 'Athenian Revolution,' see Ober 1996a: 32–52.

<sup>4</sup> For varied approaches, e.g. Edwards and Swain 1997; Gill 1996; Bulloch et al. 1993; Pelling 1990; Gentili and Cerri 1988; Momigliano 1971; Dihle 1956; Misch 1950; Stuart 1928; Leo 1901; Bruns 1896; the latter two works remain influential and are still frequently cited. A brief retrospective of work on this general topic during the first half of the twentieth century appears in Homeyer 1962.

choice is representative – or formative – of wider popular thought, however, has been less frequently explored. It may be plausible, for example, to try to access broader sentiment by suggesting that Demosthenes would not select examples or craft generalizations wholly unlikely to resonate with the Athenian citizen body. But such an argument necessarily remains incomplete, because it is still dependent upon the content of the literature alone.

A similar problem is evident in the years intervening between the Tyrannicides and Demosthenes' own day. Close readings of the texts of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon do reveal that the kinds of questions Demosthenes poses about perceptions of historical agency were energetically examined in historiography during the fifth and earlier fourth centuries. The historical writers, however, focus most significantly upon members of the socio-political elite, while the experiences of the more ordinary people, or even of those just outside the upper echelon of political or military power, receive much less attention. The perceptions of the members of Demosthenes' audience (and of the members of the *dêmos* before them), therefore, must be sought in other media.

Particularly at Athens, commemorative efforts from the classical period support more comprehensive interpretations of popular sentiment. The accumulated activities of non-elites,<sup>5</sup> which permit the study of the spread of ideas on a wider scale, emerge from a comparatively abundant body of material evidence. Funerary monuments reveal how Athenians thought about individuals, about their roles in the community, and about the value and consequences of their actions. The commemoration of a life with a tombstone was a visible, memory-making act: Athenian burial plots were located along the sides of the main roads entering and exiting the city, so travelers and citizens alike passed by the monuments daily. In this context, a tombstone represents the deliberate choices of those who erected it. It not only indicates how the dedicators believed that the dedicatee should be remembered by his community, but also reveals how the dedicators interpreted, and perhaps also challenged, that community's cultural dictates and expectations. In contrast, public inscriptions express the official position of the state regarding the historical contributions and the memorialization of both groups and individuals – and the public and private viewpoints do not always align. Indeed, it is where they compete, or even conflict, that the richest and most complex readings emerge.

<sup>5</sup> I am influenced in my thoughts about 'elites' and 'non-elites,' and in my use of associated terminology, by Ober 1989.

This material evidence suggests that members of the wider Athenian populace were also thinking about the historical roles of individuals and groups in the course of the fifth and fourth centuries BC. Although they were doing so under terms that differed from those of the historiographers, traces of the same issues emerge in funerary iconography and epitaphs, and in the language of public commemoration. Over time, the Athenians seem to acknowledge in their own monuments not only the fundamental dependence – whether perceived or real – of the *dêmos* upon eminent individuals, but also a growing gap between those individuals who are positioned to 'make history' and those who are not. The literary and popular discourse about individual historical agency becomes so well developed, in fact, that those acquainted with its priorities can deliberately present themselves as exemplars.

To what extent can what is true for Athens be applied to the rest of the Greek world?<sup>6</sup> Admittedly, Athens does supply a dominant proportion of Greek funerary and epigraphical remains,<sup>7</sup> particularly from the classical period. Athenian intellectual influences and historical experiences also played an important role in the development of historiography.<sup>8</sup> But Athens itself was still a Greek polis, and many of its cultural priorities and civic behaviors were therefore held in common with other Greeks.<sup>9</sup> Access to popular discourse outside of Athens is sometimes affected by more limited corpora of localized evidence, but the self-presentation and reception of some well-known non-Athenians, such as Lysander<sup>10</sup> and Agesilaus of Sparta, Epaminondas of Thebes, and Philip II of Macedon, suggest that some of the same issues about individual and group historical agency that were under discussion at Athens were also receiving consideration elsewhere.

Tracing the development of the eminent individual in Greek thought down to the later fourth century will therefore contextualize the sentiments of Demosthenes quoted at the opening of this chapter. But it will also help to illuminate the remarkable reception of Alexander 'the Great' by showing

<sup>6</sup> On Athenocentrism in modern classical scholarship, see e.g. the references collected by Hedrick 1999: 390 n. 11; an example of a recent methodological discussion is Vlassopoulos 2007.

<sup>7</sup> See e.g. Morris 1987 and Hedrick 1999, respectively.

<sup>8</sup> E.g. Seager 2001; Hornblower 1995; Murray 1972. Thomas 2000 highlights many of the non-Athenian influences upon Herodotus, but Fowler 2003; Moles 2002; Blösel 2001; Forsdyke 2001; Raaflaub 1987; et al. explore Herodotus' interest in Athens.

<sup>9</sup> As C. Morgan 2003: 5–6 suggests, the publications of the Copenhagen Polis Centre provide an important way of helping to contextualize Athens within a much larger world of other Greek city-states. A partial bibliography of Polis Centre materials, compiled by F. Naerebout, can be found at <http://www.teachtext.net/bn/cpc/> (last accessed September 10, 2011).

<sup>10</sup> I remain indebted to M. Flower for initially connecting the career of Lysander to my wider argument.

that his effect is deeply rooted in well over a century of ancient Greek experience and imagination. The magnitude of his impact, ironically, is perhaps most vividly displayed at the point where his image passed beyond his own control: at his death.

## 1.2 The alchemy of Alexander

Whether it was malaria, or alcohol poisoning, or even strychnine, Alexander was dying in Babylon.<sup>11</sup> The feverish, weakened king had been sinking for several days. Now he asked his senior generals to remain in attendance at the Babylonian palace, and his lesser officers to keep vigil outside. The *Ephemerides*, the 'royal diaries',<sup>12</sup> assert that shortly thereafter the king lost his ability to speak,<sup>13</sup> and so it is perhaps at this point that the following anecdote must be understood:

ἐπειδὴ τὸ ζῆν ἀπέγνω, περιελόμενος τὸν δακτύλιον, ἔδωκε Περδίκκᾳ. τῶν δὲ φίλων ἐπερωτώντων, Τίτι τὴν βασιλείαν ἀπολείπεις; εἶπεν, Τῷ κρατίστῳ, καὶ προσεφθέγγαστο, ταύτην τελευταίαν φωνὴν προέμενος, ὅτι μέγαν ἀγῶνα αὐτῷ ἐπιτάφιον συστήσονται πάντες οἱ πρωτεύοντες τῶν φίλων. οὗτος μὲν οὖν τὸν προειρημένον τρόπον ἐτελεύτησε. (D.S. 17.117.3–5)

When he had abandoned hope of survival, then, removing his ring, he gave it to Perdikkas. His Companions asked him, "To whom are you bequeathing the empire?" and he said, "To the strongest." And he made his final utterance by saying that all those who were foremost amongst his Companions would engage in a great funerary contest on his behalf. And in this way he ended his life.

Diodorus, the earliest extant continuous account of the life and campaigns of Alexander, has this story of the ring in common with both Curtius and Justin,<sup>14</sup> the other members of the Alexander 'Vulgate' tradition.<sup>15</sup> The other

<sup>11</sup> Bosworth 1988b: 173, with references (esp. n. 460); see also Green 1991: 476–7.

<sup>12</sup> *FGrH* 117; also Robinson 1932. Bosworth 1971: 117–23 argues that the *Ephemerides* were assembled in the months following Alexander's death in order to thwart rumors of poisoning. *Contra*: Hammond 1989.

<sup>13</sup> *FGrH* 117 F 3a–b.

<sup>14</sup> 'Curtius' is here taken to be [Quintus] Curtius Rufus (first century AD), on whom see e.g. Kraus and Woodman 1997: 84–7. On the identity of Marcus Iunian[us] Justinus, the epitomizer of the lost *Philippica* of Pompeius Trogus, see Develin's introduction to Yardley 1994, where it is noted that 'Justin' may have been active in the late second century AD, or may have written as late as c. AD 395.

<sup>15</sup> The passing of the ring is mentioned in these sources at D.S. 17.117.3–4, 18.2.4; Curt. 10.5.4, 10.6.4; Just. 12.15.12–13 (these represent only slight changes from the Perdikkas-related

two extant Alexander historians, Arrian<sup>16</sup> and Plutarch, omit the ring, likely because they are less immediately interested in the *Diadochoi*, the military leaders, court officials, and personal friends who became the immediate 'Successors' of Alexander.<sup>17</sup> All of the Vulgate writers, however, do provide some treatment of the wars of the *Diadochoi*, and the ring anecdote therefore helps them to explain the political ambitions of Perdiccas and the vengeful jealousy of Ptolemy.<sup>18</sup> Whether or not there ever really *was* a ring,<sup>19</sup> then, a major segment of the historiographic tradition has employed it as a strong symbolic link between the fact of Alexander's death and its historical consequences.

Other 'Alexander objects' achieved similar status in the historical accounts. The lack of a clear successor meant that a vicious struggle ensued amongst the *Diadochoi* almost immediately upon the loss of their king, and the historians focus their accounts of the opening conflicts around the personal effects – and even the body – of Alexander himself.

At the 'settlement' taken by the *Diadochoi* at Babylon shortly after Alexander's death, Perdiccas is said to have sought regency over Alexander's unborn child by his Bactrian wife Rhoxane.<sup>20</sup> In Curtius' sketch, the initial

references collected by Bosworth 1971: 128 n. 7, who also adds *Metz Epitome* 112). The 'Vulgate' is likely derived primarily from the account of Cleitarchus (scanty fragments at *FGrH* 137), who probably wrote c. 310 BC (Baynham 2003: 10 n. 31). The Vulgate category also traditionally includes the *Metz Epitome*, save for its last section, the independent *Liber de morte testamentumque Alexandri*: see Baynham 2003 esp. 10–11, 15–16 for a discussion of all of these texts and their transmission.

<sup>16</sup> On Lucius Flavius Arrianus (early second century AD) and his work, see Bosworth 1980. Arrian, like Diodorus, mentions the bequest of the empire τῶ κραιτίστῳ and the expectation of a μέγαν ἐπιτάφιον ἄγωνα (Arr. 7.26.3).

<sup>17</sup> Both Arrian and Plutarch conclude their accounts almost immediately upon Alexander's death and reserve discussion of later events for other projects. Plutarch's coverage of the *Diadochoi* and the subsequent Hellenistic dynasties is contained in other *Lives* (see esp. *Eum.*, *Phoc.*, *Demetr.*). Arrian's fragmentary *Ta meta tou Alexandrou* ("Events after Alexander" = *Succ.*) is accessible in two major editions, *FGrH* 156 and Roos and Wirth 2002. Bosworth 2002: 22 n. 55 offers some reasons to prefer the latter.

<sup>18</sup> Bosworth 1971: 128 n. 7 suggests that Arrian may have omitted the ring because Ptolemy, one of Arrian's favored literary sources, did the same, given that the story would have reflected badly upon Ptolemy's own aspirations for legitimate power; see also Roisman 1984: 374–5 and n. 10, who agrees and collects references to this interpretation. Hammond 1989: 159–60 holds that Arrian did not himself trust the authenticity of the ring anecdote.

<sup>19</sup> The anecdote's relationship to historical reality is debated: see Bosworth 1971 with Hammond 1989.

<sup>20</sup> See Bosworth 1993 on this phase of the 'Settlement of Babylon.' The long negotiations and their immediate aftermath are treated in detail amongst the major sources only in Curtius (10.6.1–10.8), which poses particular problems of bias (e.g. Bosworth 1971: 128 on the potential influence of Roman themes in Curtius' account). For additional analysis of both text and historical events, see Errington 1970 and Schachermeyr 1970.

negotiations are 'attended' by Alexander's former royal insignia: his *regia sella*, "royal seat," or "throne," is brought in, decorated with his *diadema vestisque* . . . *cum armis*, "crown, robe, and arms," and Perdikkas adds the ring to the display (Curt. 10.6.4). Ptolemy, while disagreeing with Perdikkas' larger proposals, argues that the throne itself should be used as a physical and symbolic nexus around which future political meetings should take place (Curt. 10.6.15).<sup>21</sup> As the settlement discussions continue, Meleager, a phalanx commander in Alexander's army, begins to agitate against Perdikkas (Curt. 10.6.20–4). A faction supports the accession of Arrhidaeus, Alexander's half-brother by their mutual father Philip II. Arrhidaeus is fetched and saluted by the military mob as king 'Philip' (Curt. 10.7.6–7), and, as tensions mount, he, too, is forced to enter into the competition of Alexander symbols:

Cesserat ex contione Arrhidaeus, principum auctoritate conterritus, et, abeunte illo, conticuerat magis quam elanguerat militaris favor. Itaque revocatus vestem fratris (eam ipsam, quae in sella posita fuerat) induitur. Et Meleager, thorace sumpto, capit arma, novi regis satelles. Sequitur phalanx, hastis clipeos quatiens, expletura se sanguine illorum, qui adfectaverant nihil ad ipsos pertinens regnum. In eadem domo familiaque imperii vires remansuras esse gaudebant: hereditarium imperium stirpem regiam vindicaturam: adsuetos esse nomen ipsum colere venerarique nec quemquam id capere nisi genitum, ut regnaret. (Curt. 10.7.13–15)

Arrhidaeus had withdrawn from the session in terror at the strength of the leaders, and with his departure the good will of the troops had not slackened, but rather grown quiet. And so [Arrhidaeus] was summoned back and dressed himself in his brother's robe (the very one that had been laid on the throne). And Meleager, clad in his thorax, took up his arms as a companion to the new king. The phalanx followed, striking their shields with their spears, ready to glut themselves on the blood of those who had attempted to control royal power that bore no connection to them. They were overjoyed that the imperial authority would remain in the same clan and house; that kingly lineage would justify hereditary reign; and that they were already used to revering and paying homage to that very name, and no one took it unless he were born for sovereignty.

<sup>21</sup> Eumenes, who inherited Alexander's elite military unit of *Argyaspides* ("Silver Shields"), was also said to have convened their leaders in front of a vacant royal throne graced by the royal insignia to emphasize that they were still under the symbolic command of the long-deceased Alexander: see Stewart 1993: 216 n. 75; Smith 1988: 37 n. 50, both with ancient references.

The robe of Alexander thus serves different symbolic functions for each of its interpreters. For Arrhidaeus, it is the visible sign of the royal power that his supporters claim as his birthright. It is also a guarantee of his safety: his perceived right to assume the robe makes him valuable to a volatile and potentially violent military mob (see also Curt. 10.7.1–7). For Meleager, the robe is the mark of a metaphorical ascent into the elite ranks of the king's *Sômatophylakes*, "Bodyguards," as evidenced by his assumption of the ceremonial and protective role of armed escort. For the soldiers, the robe makes Arrhidaeus, for the moment, interchangeable with Alexander: the phalanx even forms up behind him as if ready for battle. The ensuing action is perhaps predictable: *igitur Perdicca territus conclave, in quo Alexandri corpus iacebat, obser[v]ari iubet*, "and so Perdiccas, frightened, commanded that the chamber where Alexander's corpse lay should be locked" (Curt. 10.7.16).<sup>22</sup> With the most potent 'Alexander objects' now divided amongst several individuals, the struggle for Alexander *himself* began.

After the defeat and death of Meleager at the hands of Perdiccas, the assignment of the Macedonian kingship to Arrhidaeus and the infant Alexander IV with Perdiccas as regent, and the division of the Eastern conquests into a series of satrapies to be governed by the *Diadochoi* and others, armed conflict temporarily cooled.<sup>23</sup> At last, probably late in the year 322 or early in 321,<sup>24</sup> attention could be paid to Alexander's belated funeral. The body, which had been kept at Babylon, was placed in a richly decorated golden sarcophagus set on a golden wagon.<sup>25</sup> The destination of the elaborate funeral cortege, accompanied by ceremonial military units with cavalry and elephants, was to be the Egyptian oracle of Ammon at Siwah that had established Alexander's 'divine' connections during his lifetime.<sup>26</sup> No sooner had the spectacular procession, escorted by Arrhidaeus, reached Damascus, however, than it was met by Ptolemy, now satrap of Egypt and accompanied by an army. Diodorus provides the most detailed account of the events that followed,<sup>27</sup> recording that Ptolemy, under the guise of

<sup>22</sup> There is a textual problem at the word *obser[v]ari* (see Lucarini 2009 *ad loc.*); I have followed Rolfe 1946 in translating *obserari* here.

<sup>23</sup> See Bosworth 2002: 54–63 for a narrative of this period.

<sup>24</sup> The year 322: e.g. Bosworth 2002: 12; the year 321: e.g. Errington 1970: 64.

<sup>25</sup> The assemblage is described in detail at D.S. 18.26.3–28.1.

<sup>26</sup> Relevant references and bibliography are collected by e.g. Bosworth 2002: 13 n. 30; Stewart 1993: 221, 369, 374, (both citing D.S. 18.3.5; Curt. 10.5.4; Just. 12.15.7, 13.4.6), Stewart further noting that the latter two authors represent this location as Alexander's own choice.

<sup>27</sup> D.S. 18.28.2–6; cf. the narrative account of Erskine 2002: 167–71, citing (169 n. 26, as do Bosworth 2002: 13 n. 31 and Stewart 1993: 221 n. 88) Badian 1968.



honoring the dead king, brought Alexander's body to Alexandria instead, where it was placed in a magnificent precinct and celebrated with games. In return, Ptolemy is said to have received the devotion of his people and the blessings of the gods.<sup>28</sup>

The standoff had surely been risky, but Ptolemy's bid for the body of Alexander was a spectacular success. By hijacking the funerary cortege, he gained control of a unique work of art – the sarcophagus itself – and of an elaborate procession whose display value would guarantee both an audience for his newly acquired authority and a long, glorious memory of the results of his daring act.<sup>29</sup> Additionally, the triumphal quality of the procession may have suggested to viewers that Alexander himself was approving Ptolemy and deliberately moving to Alexandria.<sup>30</sup> The results, in Diodorus' reading, were incontestable: the honors that Alexander 'paid' to Ptolemy, and that Ptolemy returned, were understood by the public as signs of the gods' favorable disposition towards the new satrap and of Ptolemy's personal worthiness to rule.<sup>31</sup>

Such arrangements accorded poorly with the plans of Perdiccas, who had now lost control of a most important sign of his legitimacy,<sup>32</sup> and so he set out against Ptolemy.<sup>33</sup> There can be little doubt that, had he been successful on his Egyptian expedition, the first piece of booty he would have seized would have been the gold-enshrined body of Alexander. But Perdiccas did not survive the campaign: after a series of unsuccessful operations, he was assassinated by his own troops.<sup>34</sup> The long wars that followed<sup>35</sup> could not unseat Ptolemy, and in 304, his power secure, he took for himself in Egypt the title of 'King.'<sup>36</sup> Blessed with a fertile and wealthy country, protected from without by comparative geographic isolation and from within by a Hellenized aristocracy, the dynasty Ptolemy founded with the help of his precious prize ultimately endured unbroken far beyond the lifespans of

<sup>28</sup> D.S. 18.28.4–6.    <sup>29</sup> Kuttner 1999: 102.    <sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>31</sup> Erskine 2002: 173–4 reaches a similar conclusion.    <sup>32</sup> See e.g. Erskine 2002: 170–1.

<sup>33</sup> See Badian 1968: 186–9 on the possibility that Arrhidaeus was cooperating with Ptolemy by this point.

<sup>34</sup> In 320 BC.

<sup>35</sup> The most extensive continuous ancient account of the wars of the *Diadochoi* is D.S. books 18–20, probably substantially dependent upon the (lost) history of Hieronymus of Cardia (*FGrH* 154; see Hornblower 1981), the latter an acquaintance of Alexander's former secretary Eumenes. Useful surveys of the era include Bosworth 2002; Green 1990: 3–134.

<sup>36</sup> Ptolemy was not alone in the timing of his decision to formally accept a crown. On the 'Year of the Kings' between 306 and 304, see, amongst the works cited by Bosworth 2002: 246–7, esp. Gruen 1985; Müller 1973: 78–107; and add Ritter 1965: 79–108 (dealing particularly with the assumption of the highly symbolic diadem).

the other Hellenistic kingdoms. Its last queen, Cleopatra VII, was finally defeated by Caius Iulius Caesar Octavianus, the future Roman emperor Augustus, at the battle of Actium in 31 BC.

Never before in Greek history had an individual been treated quite like this, and the phenomenon therefore begs some explanation. It has sometimes been claimed that Alexander, and even his father, Philip II, demonstrated through their conquests that one man could change the known world. In this view, the Hellenistic Greek historians and artists – and their Roman heirs – who depict 'great men' are subscribing to a new vision of history, one that was born in the later fourth century BC of the mating of large-scale political changes with larger-than-life personalities.<sup>37</sup> Filtered through the interests of Renaissance humanism, what came to be seen as the ancient 'great man' paradigm helped to lay foundations for historical and political thought in the early modern West,<sup>38</sup> and Alexander remained of central interest for both positive and negative reasons.<sup>39</sup> Modern discussions, too, frequently invoke the same selections of ancient individuals in thinking about 'great men' (the preferred examples from Greco-Roman antiquity being Alexander and Julius Caesar), but they do not always reflect in more detail upon the earlier political and social factors that provided the necessary and sufficient conditions for this 'greatness.'

The Greek historical writers of the Hellenistic and Roman eras, however, saw themselves as heirs to an intellectual inheritance that began, in many cases, with Herodotus.<sup>40</sup> They also owed significant debts to rhetoric, ethnography, genealogy, and even travel literature stretching back into the

<sup>37</sup> On such readings explicitly of Alexander e.g. the references collected by Fredricksmeier 1982: 86.

<sup>38</sup> Southgate 2001: 30–61 *passim*, esp. 40–1 on Plutarch's biographies as literary, historical, and moral exempla. For more on Plutarch's *Lives* during the Renaissance, see e.g. Pade 2007; for a more detailed treatment of the reception of the past (including the ancient past) in the Renaissance era, see Hampton 1990; on the relationship of Renaissance concepts of 'great men' to ancient biographical interests, see Joost-Gaugier 1982.

<sup>39</sup> A bibliographic sketch can only provide points of entry on this subject. Beginning from antiquity, a useful survey of Alexander's *Nachleben* in the Hellenistic period is Errington 1975; on the Roman period, see Wirth 1975, in the same volume; on the art works, see Stewart 1993 and Bieber 1964. On the *Alexander Romance* and its effects upon the later literary reception of Alexander, see Cary 1956; on Alexander in the Middle Ages, see Aerts, Hermans, and Visser 1978. For a more general survey stretching from the Hellenistic period through medieval Islam, see di Vita and Alfano 1995: 153–91, and for one on Alexander legends, see Stoneman 2008; on a particular Renaissance treatment of Alexander (in Italian verse), e.g. Tordi 2004; on the early modern era, e.g. Brauer 1980 (focusing specifically on England, but with broader bibliographic references as well).

<sup>40</sup> E.g. Flower 1997 *passim*; Marincola 1997 *passim*; Christ 1993; Gray 1986; Fornara 1983a *passim*; Murray 1972; Bruce 1970; Connor 1968; Pearson 1960; Keller 1910–11.