

INTRODUCTION

Daniel Ogden

This volume presents the latest wisdom on Alexander the Great and his contexts as fostered principally in ‘the Alexander équipe’, by which I mean the loose association of leading Alexander scholars that has spoken and conferred at an informal chain of conferences first inspired by a meeting organized in Newcastle (New South Wales) by Brian Bosworth and Elizabeth Baynham in 1997. The chain was then given the head of steam to continue by a pair of meetings organized by Waldemar Heckel in Calgary in 2002 and 2005. Since then, there have been meetings in Otago (2007, organized by Pat Wheatley), Clemson (2008, organized by Elizabeth Carney), La Coruña (2010, organized by Victor Alonso Troncoso), Grahamstown (2011, organized by Philip Bosman), Sydney (2013, organized by John Walsh and Elizabeth Baynham), Salt Lake City (2014, organized by Lindsay Adams), Milan (2015, organized by Franca Landucci-Gattinoni) and Edmonton (2018, organized by Frances Pownall). The links between these extraordinarily constructive meetings have, as I say, not been formal: they consist principally in collective memory and self-consciousness. The only individual scholar to have attended all of them is the distinguished professor Pownall; the respective groups of speakers are connected otherwise by what Wittgenstein would have called a ‘family resemblance’ – a strong but, of course, a gradually evolving one.¹ The views expressed here represent, accordingly, the latest state of understanding on the part of an experienced community of scholars.

¹ The Salt Lake City conference has not been published. The others have been published as, respectively: Bosworth and Baynham 2000; Heckel and Tritle 2003; Heckel, Tritle and Wheatley 2007; Wheatley and Hannah 2009; Carney and Ogden 2010; Alonso Troncoso and Anson 2013; Bosman 2014; Walsh and Baynham 2021; Bearzot and Landucci Gattinoni 2016; Pownall, Asirvatham and Müller 2022.

DANIEL OGDEN

SOME VISIONS OF ALEXANDER

Everyone uses him as a projection of their own private truth, their own dreams and aspirations, fears and power-fantasies. Each country, each generation, sees him in a different light. Every individual biographer, myself included, inevitably puts as much of himself, his own background and convictions, into that Protean figure as he does of whatever historical truth he can extract from the evidence.

Green 1974: 480

Perhaps there is something in this, but a related phenomenon that certainly can be identified is the tendency for critics to interpret and explain the visions of Alexander espoused by his modern biographers in the light of what they think they know about the biographers' personal background and context.

The first modern – in the sense of critical – history of Alexander's campaign is that of Gustav Droysen's *Geschichte Alexanders des Grossen*, published in 1833. This strongly Arrian-centred account (there are large tracts of paraphrase) was written with great drive and at great pace, with the result that errors of haste are sometimes apparent. The remarkable Droysen – who, inter alia, served as tutor to the young Felix Mendelssohn – was influenced by Luther and the Hegelian notion of synthesis, and so understood Alexander as God's instrument in the merging of the Greeks and the peoples of the Near East, together with that of their respective religions, a fusion from which Christianity and the salvation of the human race were destined to emerge. It was Droysen, indeed, in his sequel-history *Geschichte des Hellenismus* (1836–1843) that established the now standard use of the terms 'Hellenism' and 'Hellenistic' to describe the expanded Greek world created by Alexander. These terms derived from ancient Greek words (*hellēnismos*, *hellēnistēs*) originally developed in antiquity to express the access of the Jews to Greek language and culture – the more immediate fusion from which Christianity was indeed to be born.² For Droysen,

² The publication history of Droysen's works can confuse: the *Geschichte Alexanders des Grossen* was initially published as a stand-alone history in Berlin in 1833. He followed this up with a two-volume history on the early Hellenistic period, published in Hamburg in 1836 and 1843 respectively, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*; of these the first volume was devoted to the Diadochi or Successors, the second to the Epigoni. Half a century later Droysen published much revised editions of both works in a consolidated form in Gotha (1877–1878), with the Alexander history now brought under the *Geschichte des Hellenismus* aegis and presented as its first volume, and the volumes on the Diadochi and the Epigoni now being rebranded as vols ii and iii respectively. This new edition, both in its revisions and indeed in its very repackaging strengthened Droysen's claim about the relationship between Alexander and 'Hellenism'. The revised version of *Geschichte Alexanders* incorporated into the new *Hellenismus* has recently been translated into

INTRODUCTION

accordingly, ‘the Hellenistic period ended not with Augustus but with Jesus’.³ As to the king himself, Droysen saw Alexander as a superman on the Aristotelian model, a man who is himself the embodiment of law.⁴ Critics of Droysen’s work have found in his grand narrative trajectory a projection of his own historical circumstances, and his work towards the unification of Germany under the Prussian monarchy and in the promotion of German culture. Thus, Badian tells us how Droysen ‘saw God’s purpose in history, and Alexander’s semi-barbarian kingdom on the fringes of the fragmented Greek world was a model for the role that he hoped the semi-Livonian kingdom [of Prussia] on the eastern marches of the fragmented German world was destined to play in uniting the nation and spreading its superior Kultur’.⁵

In 1926 Helmut Berve published his two-volume *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*. This marked a new stage in Alexander scholarship less because Berve enunciated a distinctive conceptualization of Alexander in himself (his focus was rather the organization of Alexander’s army and the administration of his empire), than because the introduction of the prosopographical method of itself entailed a shift away from a vision of the king as an untrammelled actor to a vision of him rather as enmeshed, as the node of an expansive network of competing interests and agendas. The work also marked a step-change in the level of philology brought to the study of Alexander. The second volume constitutes a vast prosopographical register of all those individuals that came into contact with the king, 883 individuals in numbered entries. This register at once became an indispensable tool for further study. Its fundamental role is recognized in a quartet of English-language publications by the great Alexander-prosopographer of our own age, Waldemar Heckel, which have updated it and advanced it in its various aspects. In his *Marshals of Alexander’s Empire* (1992), Heckel developed more detailed and discursive entries for the most prominent members of Alexander’s army. In 2016 he revised and republished the text as *Alexander’s Marshals: A Study of the Makedonian Aristocracy and the Politics of Military Leadership*, narrowing further the range of individuals treated, but giving updated, enhanced and more relaxed treatments to those that remained. This pair of volumes was complemented by his *Who’s Who in the Age of Alexander the Great: Prosopography of Alexander’s Empire* (2006), which

English: Droysen 2012. Droysen was a persistent source of fascination for Bosworth, who frequently returned to his work and his legacy; see Bosworth 2003: 186–193, 2006, 2009, 2012.

³ Bosworth 2012: xix. ⁴ Aristotle *Politics* 1284a; cf. Bosworth 2009: 3, 2012: xvi.

⁵ Badian 1974; cf. Green 1974: 482–483.

DANIEL OGDEN

more directly represented an updated version of Berve's broader register, albeit with slightly fewer entries, *c.* 820, these unnumbered.⁶ In 2021, Heckel published a further expanded version of this book in turn to incorporate all individuals coming into contact with Alexander's Successors also, down to the end of the fourth century, *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander and His Successors: From Chaironeia to Ipsos (338–301 BC)*: this volume now contains 1,279 entries, once again numbered, as Berve's had been.⁷ The reputation of Berve's study survives on the basis of its profound philology, and by virtue of the fact that (in contrast to the case of Schachermeyr) its publication preceded its author's engagement with Nazism.⁸

After a distinguished academic career (he was a pioneer in papyrology) Ulrich Wilcken published his *Alexander der Grosse* in 1931 at the age of sixty-nine; it was an immediate success and translated into English the following year.⁹ Wilcken's image of Alexander shows the continuing influence of Droysen, but is more nuanced. He has Alexander set on the conquest of a universal empire, driven by a fervid mysticism and self-confidence, but pragmatic nonetheless. In his own summary, he describes Alexander as 'a personality of quite unique genius, a marvellous mixture of demonic passion and sober clearness of judgement' and as an 'iron-willed man of action' with a 'firm belief in his mission', but he also credits him with 'a non-rational element . . . his "longing" for the undiscovered and the mysterious' and a 'simple piety', whilst balancing all this with the assertion that he was 'a realist in policy if anyone ever was'.¹⁰

In his two-volume *Alexander the Great* of 1948 (after beginnings in 1927) the independent British scholar William Tarn took it as his mission to excise the negative aspects of Alexander's portrayal in the ancient tradition, which he ascribed to the hostility of the Peripatetics, and to restore to history an Alexander that was all-but flawless: a gentleman, a military

⁶ *Pace* Heckel himself, who denies (2006: viii) that his work is an English equivalent of 'the master's', or even a 'Son of Berve'. Unlike its predecessor, this volume also contains helpful (if necessarily skeletal) entries for Alexander himself and his father Philip.

⁷ Heckel's frustration at not being able to take his biographies all the way down to Ipsus in the first *Who's Who* was apparent: Heckel 2006: vii.

⁸ Another important technical advance in Alexander Studies was made in 1927–1930, shortly after Berve's first publication, with the appearance of volumes ii.B and ii.D of Felix Jacoby's monumental *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (FGH)*. However, since the collection of these fragments does not in itself entail a vision of Alexander as such, we shall say no more of it here.

⁹ For Wilcken's career see Borza 1967: xix–xxi, who explains that personal information is hard to come by. In contrast to Berve and Schachermeyr, there is no suggestion of Nazi sympathies on Wilcken's part (he lived until 1944).

¹⁰ The quotations are derived from Wilcken 1932: 239; cf. Ferguson 1932; Larsen 1932; Robinson 1932; Borza 1967: xxi.

INTRODUCTION

genius, albeit one uninterested in conquest for its own sake, an enlightened monarch, a philosopher-king, a paragon of self-restraint and sexual continence, a messianic promoter of the ‘Brotherhood of Man’ or ‘Unity of Mankind’ (this being the greater purpose of his empire), and a Jesus avant-la-lettre: the teleology latent in Droysen’s project moves centre-stage.¹¹ The tales of his drunkenness, cruelty, mistresses and homosexuality are accordingly pushed aside.¹² In Tarn’s case too critics have found an Alexander scholar to be projecting himself, or the ideals of the environment to which he belonged, into his portrait of the king. Welles refers to Tarn’s ‘gentlemanly and sporting Alexander . . . with the extreme views toward life and death and honor, and temperance in love and wine which are associated with the English gentry’.¹³ Badian implicitly interprets Tarn’s approach to Alexander as determined by the English-public-school culture of his day, characterizing Tarn’s king as follows: ‘moderate and scholarly in his habits and interests, he sought conquest, strictly according to the code of Arnold of Rugby, only to bring nations together in harmony and brotherhood’.¹⁴ Green, on the other hand, more charitably and more persuasively, sees Tarn’s conception of Alexander as forged in the light of enthusiasm for the League of Nations, which was in its heyday in the early 1920s.¹⁵

Fritz Schachermeyr’s large-scale biography of Alexander, first published in 1949 (and then again in a more heavily annotated edition in 1973), was admired for its strong geographical foundations and its detailed treatment of individual episodes in the king’s life, to which it brought many new observations. The armature over which

¹¹ Tarn 1927, 1948. Bosworth 2019: 78 [1983]: ‘. . . conceived in isolation without exposure to serious academic criticism, and most of the traits of his characterisation of Alexander, for all their strong delineation, are in flat contradiction of the consensus of the ancient sources. All too often its basis is emotional intuition, and the source material becomes an embarrassment, to be explained away or selectively expurgated.’ (Bosworth’s review of Tarn’s *Alexander* – first printed on the occasion of the book’s belated republication in Australia, and now accessibly reprinted in the journal *Karanos* – is essential reading for an insight into the man’s character and context.) Borza 1967: xiv–xv: ‘Tarn took the basic Droysen conception of Alexander as world-mover and added to it the dimension of a new social philosophy.’ For a more sympathetic assessment of Tarn’s work in the round see Todd 1964.

¹² As I have noted elsewhere (Ogden 2011a: 3–4), while Tarn’s determination to eliminate all traces of Alexander’s homosexual behaviour from the tradition may in some ways seem old-fashioned and suitably Victorian (Tarn was born in 1869), his fixation on his sexuality as in some way a vital determinant of the man – hence the importance of ‘straighten[ing] the matter out’ (1948: ii, 319) – also marks Tarn out as curiously modern.

¹³ Welles 1951: 433, cited with approval by Borza 1967: xv. Whilst Tarn was born in London and spent his earlier career as a lawyer there, he almost certainly identified as Scottish: he married a Scottish wife (Flora MacDonald), retired to a highland estate near Inverness to pursue his academic writing, and wrote a Skye-set fairytale (*The Treasure of the Isle of Mist*, 1919) for his sick daughter, who went on, as Otta Swire, to become an expert on the island’s folklore (publishing *Skye: The Island and its Legends*, 1952).

¹⁴ Badian 1974. ¹⁵ Green 1974: 483–486.

DANIEL OGDEN

Schachermeyr pastes these treatments is a distinctive one. He confers upon Alexander, to whom he characteristically refers as ‘the Titan’, a striking arc of character development: a genius with unlimited military ability, he was driven mad by his own success to the extent that he came to believe himself possessed of magical abilities and capable of the impossible.¹⁶ The portrait is all the more compelling for being delivered in a prose style at once lapidary and emotive, with Bosworth remarking that Schachermeyr’s king is ‘the most galvanic and evocative Alexander of all time’.¹⁷ Not all have been swept along to the same degree. In a review published shortly after the book’s appearance, Brown observes that the hypothesis of a ‘mad’ Alexander conveniently allows for the endorsement of just about every story preserved of him in the source tradition, however contradictory, without discrimination.¹⁸ Once again, the critics have found in Schachermeyr’s Alexander a projection of his own circumstances, the scholar having aligned himself with the Nazis until the end of the war. Welles characterizes Schachermeyr’s conception of Alexander as ‘impossible before Hitler and World War II’.¹⁹ Burn, writing in 1951, characterizes his Alexander as ‘a ruthless, mystical-minded Führer’, who ‘behaves like a young Nazi let loose in the Alps’. He finds Schachermeyr’s disavowals of dictatorship, at the top and tail of his work, cosmetic, and considers that the intervening contents could have been published ten years previously.²⁰ Bosworth describes Schachermeyr’s Alexander as ‘an emanation of frightening power, conceived during the dark days of the Third Reich . . . He was capable of impulsive acts of generosity or of savage blood lust . . . Above all the wish to dominate was paramount . . . Alexander had a burning desire for world empire . . .’²¹

In an extensive series of articles beginning in 1958,²² Ernst Badian brought a renewed and philological attention to the detail of the Alexander sources and their *Quellenforschung*, in explicit opposition to Tarn’s project and methods. Badian’s Alexander was the polar opposite of Tarn’s idealized figure. He had no interest in culture, philosophy, brotherhood or the promotion of these; he was a pragmatist, an ultra-realist; his motivations were above all military success in itself and, in the

¹⁶ Cf. in particular Schachermeyr 1949: 477. ¹⁷ Bosworth 2019: 86–88 [1983], 1988a: xii.

¹⁸ Brown 1951: 75.

¹⁹ Welles 1951: 434; cf. Borza 1967: xvii. Schachermeyr had retained his chair in Graz under the Nazis, producing observations on race of sort acceptable to the regime in his *Indogermanen und Orient* of 1944. He was accordingly ejected from it at the end of the war.

²⁰ Burn 1951: 101–102. ²¹ Bosworth 2019: 86–88 [1983].

²² Badian 1958a, 1958c; Badian’s principal works on Alexander (27 of them) are collected in the posthumous Badian 2012.

INTRODUCTION

first instance, financial profit (he had inherited an empty treasury from his father); the individual choices he made (and Badian admired Alexander for his ruthless decisiveness at least) served these ends, and to a cynical degree. Beyond this, Badian's own conception of Alexander and his development did retain a slight reminiscence of Schachermeyr's arc: he was initially an inventive and energetic military and political leader, but he ended up distancing himself from the Macedonian nobility upon which he depended as he evolved into an oriental despot and withdrew 'into a tragic isolation, plagued by insecurity and loneliness'.²³

Still a popular starting-point for those interested in Alexander today, Robin Lane Fox's 1973 biography *Alexander the Great* is written with pace and verve. It is to be regretted that the evidence and telegraphic argumentation supporting its many striking and independent insights is submerged in the most rebarbative and intractable variety of annotation known to Alexander scholarship. The book is noteworthy for combining a post-Badian rejection of Tarn's work ('persistently mistaken both in method and in evidence'), with a distinctively Tarnian romanticism in its approach to the king, for all that Lane Fox sees Alexander as a more sinister figure.²⁴ In Lane Fox's case too, the critics have turned to projectionism, and suggested that his image of Alexander as an effortlessly self-confident, dashing leader of men is influenced by the paradigms the author assimilated in the cloisters of Eton and Oxford, institutions admittedly advertised prominently on his fly-leaf. Badian: 'The only real interest in this book is in the light it casts on the author's personality and (like so many books on ancient history)

²³ The quotation is Bosworth's encapsulation (2019: 89 [1983]) of Badian's 1962 piece, 'Alexander the Great and the loneliness of power.' Corey Brennan is currently working on (the refugee) Badian's unexpectedly charitable attitude towards Schachermeyr and his work. Badian always rejected the idea of writing a biography of the king himself, and he offered synoptic views on Alexander only in this 1962 article and in a 1958 summary of the king's career drafted for a popular audience and published in *History Today* (1958b). Unfortunately, he chose to withhold the latter piece from his 2012 retrospective. See Borza at Badian 2012: xvi–xviii on both pieces and, for a characterization of Borza's conceptualization of Alexander, 1967: xvii–xviii.

I take this opportunity to add a note on the notorious riot at the heart of which Professor Badian, Dr Kate Mortensen and I found ourselves in Thessaloniki in 2002. I supplied an account of this at Ogden 2011a: 2–3, but withheld a detail it seemed unfair and possibly unsafe to print whilst the professor remained alive. When we had finally been extracted from the baying crowd of self-proclaimed 'nationalists', shaken myself, I asked the frail 77-year-old, with concern, whether he was in any distress: 'Not at all', he replied with a twinkle in his eye, 'I've been persecuted by far better fascists than these.' I have since learned (from Borza at Badian 2012: xvii) that he subsequently professed that the episode reminded him of his experience of Kristallnacht – the same underlying comparison, but disturbingly less disjunctive. Perhaps the joke and the twinkle were for my sake.

²⁴ Cf. Bosworth 2019: 92 [1983].

DANIEL OGDEN

on the values of the environment and the society in which it was written.²⁵

The most profound and philological Alexander scholar of the modern age has been Brian Bosworth, whom Badian took under his wing.²⁶ Bosworth published the first volume of his commentary on Arrian (covering Books i–iii) in 1980²⁷ and then in 1988 published both a detailed monograph of the king and a technical work on the historiographical principles that must underpin work on the Alexander tradition.²⁸ He insisted that his monograph was not a biography of Alexander: such a thing would be ‘impossible to achieve ... Alexander the man will always elude us, thanks to the distorting filter of ancient (and modern) judgements and our grossly inefficient documentation’.²⁹ But, despite himself, synoptic views of Alexander and his character peeped out here and there. In Milns’ encapsulation, Bosworth sees the character of Alexander as ‘vainglorious; imperious; self-willed and autocratic; resentful and unforgiving when thwarted ... ; and utterly ruthless in his treatment of real or imagined enemies ... an altogether unlikeable and distasteful personality’.³⁰

Having completed our brief review, let us return to the point at which we began this Introduction.³¹ A notorious review by James Davidson of Bosworth’s and Baynham’s proceedings from the pivotal and inspirational 1997 conference opens with the following paragraphs:

²⁵ Badian 1974; cf. Briscoe 1976: 234. Whatever value one accords this as a hermeneutic approach to Lane Fox’s Alexander (I do not myself find it convincing), I cannot forebear to note that it is leadership qualities acquired at Eton and Oxford that have, over the last decade, brought catastrophe upon my country.

²⁶ Professor Bosworth once sympathized with me for the dismal trajectory of my academic career: it was a pity that I had never had a Badian, he observed. It must be conceded, however, that while Badian did indeed aid some, he also attempted to destroy the careers of others – including some of those recognized as the Alexander scholars of the first rank today.

²⁷ Bosworth 1980b. The second volume (covering Books iv–v) appeared in 1995. Bosworth died before he could complete the third and final volume. The work is now being completed by the capable hands of Professors Elizabeth Baynham and Pat Wheatley.

²⁸ Bosworth 1988a, 1988b. ²⁹ Bosworth 1988a: 5.

³⁰ Milns 1992. In 1987 an Oxford Ancient History don declared to me that one could encompass all one needed to know about Alexander by reading the work only of scholars whose names began with B, namely Berve, Badian, Brunt and Bosworth. Brunt – translator of the Arrian Loeb, with its admittedly useful appendices – was doubtless added to the list primarily for reasons of that university’s narcissism. He was, however, Bosworth’s tutor and held in a degree of respect by him, receiving conspicuous acknowledgement in his major books.

³¹ Among the lesser accounts of Alexander over the course of the era reviewed, we may single out above all O’Brien’s 1992 book, *Alexander the Great: The Invisible Enemy*. This, at least, has a distinctive take on the king, viewing his career consistently as it does through the lens of his alcoholism. Other keys to Alexander’s personality have been found in an Oedipus complex (Thomas 1995) and in paranoia (Worthington 1999). For a most helpful and all-but exhaustive review of Alexander scholarship between the years 1916 and 2015, see Molina Marin 2018.

INTRODUCTION

For those suffering from millennial panic about the current state of history – all those Postmodernists on the non-fiction bestseller lists, all those fact-deniers occupying important professorial chairs, all those poor students who know what Marie Antoinette had for breakfast but not how she died – Classics departments all over the country are offering courses of therapy: Alexander the Great.

In Alexanderland scholarship remains largely untouched by the influences which have transformed history and classics since 1945. Some great beasts, having wandered in, can still be found here decades later, well beyond reach of the forces of evolution. Secluded behind the high, impassable peaks of prosopography, military history and, above all, Quellenforschung, Alexander historians do what Alexander historians have done for more than a hundred years: try to discover the facts about Alexander the Great between his accession to the throne of Macedon in October 336 and his death in Babylon on the evening of 10 June 323 BC; what really happened on the expedition, what really happened during the three big battles against the Persians, what really happened during the march into India and back again, what happened to Alexander, what happened at Court.

(Davidson 2001: 7)

Since this review, a number of scholars have appropriated, rehearsed and indeed misused the term ‘Alexanderland’ for a glib dismissal of the work of the *équipe*. They are wrong to do so.

The effect of Alexander’s campaign on the history of the world, not merely the western world, cannot be overstated. If we lay aside the teleology, Droysen was right. Were it not for the Hellenistic world that Alexander created – despite himself, no doubt! – by integrating the indigenous cultures of the Middle East with that of Greece (and Macedon), there would have been no Roman Empire as we know it (the emperors – to whom in turn we owe the popes – effectively constituting the last and greatest of the Hellenistic dynasties); there would have been no Christianity (a synthesis of, *inter alia*, Jesus’ apocalyptic Judaism and Paul’s Hellenism) – with all that that entails (including no Islam); accordingly, there would have been no Byzantium; and, accordingly again, there would have been no Italian Renaissance – with, yet again, all that that entails. In the light of this, it is the critical first duty

DANIEL OGDEN

of the ancient historian to pin down, as closely as possible, every fact (if I may be permitted the reach for such a tastelessly old-fashioned concept) about Alexander, his campaign and its context. And it is his critical second duty to understand the relationships between these facts, in other words, how and why it all happened. This is not to underestimate the pesky slipperiness of facts, nor to deny that as often as not ‘as closely as possible’ may not be very close at all. Yes, indeed, there are many other kinds of history one can pursue on the theme of Alexander the Great, including those with more modern flavours, but these must ever remain of no better than tertiary and derivative import (I write, guiltily, as being myself primarily a practitioner of matters of tertiary and derivative import).

But it is as true today as it was a hundred years ago that there is no better – indeed no alternative – way to approach *the facts*, the *truth*, that chill wind, of Alexander, than by the philological methods of, precisely, ‘prosopography, military history and, above all, Quellenforschung’. *There is nothing else to put in their place*. It is implied in the remainder of Davidson’s review that the exercise of these philological techniques, after more than a century of vigorous application, now moves in ever narrower and more footling circles of *s’entendre parler*; that the *équipe* is doing nothing more than idly rearranging the bibelots on the mantle-pieces of Alexander’s palace, back and forth; that we stand on the soldiers of the nineteenth-century giants of philology in cheerleader-pyramids of ever more diminutive homunculi. Well, so what if all that were true? The exercise would remain primary and essential, nonetheless. Knowledge survives only in its exercise and manipulation: it asphyxiates in closed books. But in every generation, whatever else they want to do with the information, people will always want and deserve to know what Alexander actually did, to return to the source, and will need scholars able to teach them how to do this.

Davidson does not really offer a positive articulation of what he sees as the alternative to Alexanderland, the non-Alexanderland approach to Alexander. He does, however, express regret that love and sex in particular are absent from the utopia, and he laments a failure to accommodate new finds within it. It was hardly true that love and sex had been ignored, even at the time he wrote. Indeed, they had formed the focus of one of the pair of 1958 articles by Badian considered the starting-point of the new rigour in Alexander Studies, ‘The eunuch Bagoas’ (admittedly, Badian’s approach to such matters is hardly Davidson’s). Of the ‘earth-shattering new finds’ he begs to have imported to Alexanderland, these are inevitably going to be few and far