

The Ancient History Bulletin

VOLUME THIRTY-ONE: 2017

NUMBERS 1-2

Edited by:

Edward Anson ✦ Michael Fronda ✦ David Hollander
Timothy Howe ✦ Joseph Roisman ✦ John Vanderspoel
Pat Wheatley ✦ Sabine Müller



ISSN 0835-3638

ANCIENT HISTORY BULLETIN

Volume 31 (2017) Numbers 1-2

Edited by:

Edward Anson, Michael Fronda, David
Hollander, Sabine Müller, Joseph Roisman, John
Vanderspoel, Pat Wheatley

Senior Editor: Timothy Howe

Assistant Editor: Charlotte Dunn

Editorial correspondents

Elizabeth Baynham, Hugh Bowden, Franca
Landucci Gattinoni, Alexander Meeus, Kurt
Raaflaub, P.J. Rhodes, Robert Rollinger, Victor
Alonso Troncoso



Contents of volume thirty-one

Numbers 1-2

- 1 Paul Johnstono, *Rumor, Rage, and Reversal:
Tragic Patterns in Polybius' Account of Agathocles at Alexandria*
- 21 Frances Pownall, *Dionysius I and the Creation of a New-Style Macedonian Monarchy*
- 39 Christopher Kegerreis, *Setting a Royal Pace:
Achaemenid Kingship and the Origin of Alexander the Great's Bematistai*
- 65 Waldemar Heckel, *Dareios III's Military Reforms Before Gaugamela and the Alexander Mosaic:
A Note*

NOTES TO CONTRIBUTORS AND SUBSCRIBERS

The Ancient History Bulletin was founded in 1987 by Waldemar Heckel, Brian Lavelle, and John Vanderspoel. The board of editorial correspondents consists of Elizabeth Baynham (University of Newcastle), Hugh Bowden (Kings College, London), Franca Landucci Gattinoni (Università Cattolica, Milan), Alexander Meeus (University of Leuven), Kurt Raaflaub (Brown University), P.J. Rhodes (Durham University), Robert Rollinger (Universität Innsbruck), Victor Alonso Troncoso (Universidade da Coruña)

AHB is currently edited by: Timothy Howe (Senior Editor: howe@stolaf.edu), Edward Anson, Michael Fronda, David Hollander, Sabine Müller, Joseph Roisman, John Vanderspoel and Pat Wheatley.

AHB promotes scholarly discussion in Ancient History and ancillary fields (such as epigraphy, papyrology, and numismatics) by publishing articles and notes on any aspect of the ancient world from the Near East to Late Antiquity. Submitted articles should normally be in English, but the journal will consider contributions in French, German, Italian or Spanish.

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

AHB adheres to the usual North American editorial policies in the submission and acceptance of articles but imposes no House Style. Authors are, however, asked to use the abbreviations of *L'Année philologique* (A^{Ph}) for journals, and of the *Thesaurus linguae latinae* (TLL) for Latin authors. Please send submissions to the editor most closely identified with your field of enquiry or, in case of doubt, to Timothy Howe (howe@stolaf.edu). Articles must be submitted in electronic format, preferably generated by MS Word. Greek font or other special characters must convert such to Unicode and should be accompanied by a PDF version. Authors will receive PDF offprints of their contributions. Copyright is retained by the author. Books for reviews and enquiries concerning book reviews should be directed to Joseph Roisman (jsroisma@colby.edu).

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

The subscription rate for individual and institutional subscribers is USD 25.00. Detailed instructions about subscriptions and access to digital content can be found on the AHB website: <http://ancienthistorybulletin.org>

PAYMENT

Payment may be made via the subscription portal on the AHB website:

<http://www.ancienthistorybulletin.org/subscribed-users-area/membership-levels/>

Cover image courtesy of The Nickle Arts Museum, University of Calgary

Dionysius I and the Creation of a New-Style Macedonian Monarchy

Frances Pownall

A powerful autocratic ruler hailing from the periphery of the Greek world aspiring to conquer a large multi-ethnic empire begins to remodel the traditional idea of monarchy and adopts some aspects of court culture and display that appear to have been inspired by the Achaemenid Persians.¹ While one might naturally assume that this is a description of Alexander the Great, or perhaps his father Philip II of Macedon, this description could apply equally well to Dionysius I of Syracuse, whose creation of a new-style monarchy in Sicily served as an important but rarely acknowledged precursor to the royal self-fashioning of both Philip and Alexander. Of course, it is by now impossible to deny the importance of the influence of the Achaemenids upon Philip II and (especially) Alexander, particularly in terms of their incorporation of carefully selected elements of Persian royal ideology and court ceremonial, as has been widely demonstrated in recent scholarship.² Nevertheless, as I shall argue, there are some important aspects of the royal self-fashioning of both Philip and Alexander that appear to have been modelled upon precedents inaugurated by Dionysius I: the wearing of purple, the donning of ornate festal clothing previously reserved for athletic victors and performers on the stage, the adoption of the diadem, self-fashioning as the god Dionysus, and engaging in artistic performances themselves.³ I shall conclude by offering some suggestions as to why Dionysius' influence upon Philip and Alexander's ideology of kingship and court ceremonial has attracted less scholarly attention than the Achaemenid models.

I begin with the scholarly context into which I offer this contribution. I find convincing the thesis of N. G. L. Hammond and especially Ernst Fredericksmeier (recently endorsed by Robin Lane Fox) that Alexander did not simply take over the Achaemenid kingship wholesale upon his defeat of Persia, but instead proclaimed himself to be the King of Asia, "a unique creation of Alexander himself" (as Fredericksmeier puts it).⁴ Secondly, as Dietmar Kienast

¹ A preliminary version of this article was presented in October 2014 at *Alexander the Great and Monarchy: Background, Context and Legacy*, Salt Lake City, Utah; I thank the audience on that occasion for their helpful feedback and comments and W. Lindsay Adams for the kind invitation to a stimulating international symposium. I am grateful to Tim Howe and Pat Wheatley for encouraging me to submit this piece to *AHB*, as well as the journal's anonymous referees for their useful suggestions. This research was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

² See e.g. Kienast 1973; Bosworth 1980; Fredericksmeier 2000; Brosius 2003; Lane Fox 2007; Spawforth 2007; Weber 2009; Briant 2010: 101–138 (cf. Briant 2002: 875–76); Coppola 2010; Olbrycht 2010: 355–368; Müller 2014: 224–242. There remains, however, no consensus as to the degree or extent of Achaemenid influence on either Philip or Alexander.

³ As I have argued elsewhere in a complementary piece (Pownall forthcoming), Dionysius' justification of his own imperialism through panhellenic rhetoric and liberation propaganda served as an important, but also rarely acknowledged, model for the legitimization strategies adopted by both Philip and Alexander.

⁴ Hammond 1986; Fredericksmeier 2000 (quotation on 165); Lane Fox 2007.

originally argued,⁵ reprised by both Ernst Badian and Fredericksmeier (with an additional emphasis on Philip's alleged attempt to obtain divine honours to establish a theocratic basis for his monarchy),⁶ the use of Persia as a model for Macedonian kingship did not originate with Alexander, but rather with Philip, who successfully transformed his own kingship into an absolute monarchy and sought to institutionalize it for his successors. Finally, Marta Sordi and Lionel Sanders have conceded the possibility of Sicilian influence, but in somewhat limited ways.⁷ This view has not attracted much scholarly attention, possibly because Sordi's "Sicilian connection" is largely based on the shaky foundation that the speaker in Curtius who offers arguments in favour of *proskynesis* (8.5.10; cf. 8.5.8) during Alexander's ultimately unsuccessful attempt to impose the Persian custom upon his Greek and Macedonian courtiers is the obscure Cleon of Sicily,⁸ while Sanders, like Fredericksmeier, reads rather too much into the question of the alleged attempts at divine honours on the parts of both Philip and Dionysius. The jury is still out on Alexander's divine aspirations,⁹ much less Philip's,¹⁰ and the case for Dionysius rests on a single reference in a late author to a statue which may have depicted him as the god Dionysus (Dio Chrys. Or. 37.21), for which there is another explanation, as I shall demonstrate below. Furthermore, the efforts which have traditionally been understood as attempts at divine honours for all three rulers are better explained as part of their royal self-fashioning and court ceremonial.

It is best therefore to leave the question of divine honours entirely out of the equation, and to focus instead on aspects of Dionysius' royal ideology and self-presentation which appear to have served as models for Philip and Alexander. I shall begin with the most obvious outer sign of a monarch, the wearing of purple, which conveyed both elite status and magnificent display. According to the third-century pamphleteer, Baton of Sinope (*FGrH* 268 F 4 = Athen. 6.251f), Dionysius customarily wore purple:

καὶ αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν Ἱερώνυμον ἀνέπεισεν διάδημά τε ἀναλαβεῖν καὶ τὴν πορφύραν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην πᾶσαν διασκευὴν ἣν ἐφόρει Διονύσιος ὁ τύραννος.

⁵ Kienast 1973. Cf. Spawforth 2007 who observes (2) that "two striking characteristics of Alexander's reign, his interest in the appearances of power and his imitation of the Persian royal court, can be situated on a larger trajectory rooted in his father's 'Macedonian revolution'."

⁶ Badian 1996; Fredericksmeier 2000.

⁷ Sordi 1983 (*proskynesis*); Sanders 1991: 283–285 (ruler cult); cf. however Sanders 1990: 124–134, which considers other possible areas of influence, but does not address self-fashioning or royal ideology.

⁸ Cleon is replaced in Arrian's version (4.10.6) by Callisthenes' usual opponent Anaxarchus (cf. Plut. *Alex.* 52.2–5), which suggests that the speaker in both versions is intended simply to serve as a straw man; cf. Bosworth 1995: 78.

⁹ Although the scholarly pendulum has recently swung in the direction of accepting that Alexander did claim to be divine (see e.g. Edmunds 1971; Fredericksmeier 2003; Worthington 2003: 273–283), the question is in dire need of reassessment in the wake of two recent articles (Bowden 2013; Pownall 2014) that demonstrate from different angles that Alexander's attempt to introduce *proskynesis* implied only the imposition of Persian court ceremonial rather than any kind of recognition that he was a living god.

¹⁰ Baynham 1994 and Worthington 2008: 200–201 and 228–233 (both with earlier bibliography) have convincingly refuted the claim that Philip sought divine honours.

He [a parasite named Sosis] also persuaded Hieronymus to put on a diadem and purple and all the rest of the fancy attire which the tyrant Dionysius used to wear.¹¹

Dionysius' use of purple is confirmed by one of his staunchest supporters, the historian Philistus, who held a high position in Dionysius' court and was married to the daughter of his brother, Leptines.¹² Plutarch (*Tim.* 15.10 = *FGrH* 556 F 60), who is generally uncharitable towards Philistus on account of his bitter personal enmity with Dion as well as Plato himself,¹³ comments rather unkindly upon what he considered the excessive lamentation of Philistus (in comparison with the criticisms of Diogenes the Cynic on the *joie de vivre* and luxury that Dionysius II continued to experience during his own periods of exile) on behalf of Leptines' daughters (one of whom was, of course, his wife) for the reversal of fortune they suffered during their exile from Syracuse:

ὥστε μοι παραβάλλοντι τούτοις τὰς Φιλίστου φωνάς, ἃς ἀφήσι περὶ τῶν Λεπτίνου θυγατέρων ὀλοφυρόμενος, ὡς ἐκ μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν τῶν τῆς τυραννίδος εἰς ταπεινὴν ἀφιγμένων δίαίτα, φαίνεσθαι θρήνους γυναικὸς ἀλαβάστους καὶ πορφύρας καὶ χρυσία ποθοῦσης.

Therefore, when I compare these (i.e., the comments of Diogenes to Dionysius II) to the words of Philistus, which he emitted in lamentation on behalf of the daughters of Leptines, because after experiencing the great benefits of tyranny they had arrived at a humble way of life, they appear to be the wailing of a woman who yearns for her alabaster, purple, and gold.

Similarly, in another context, Plutarch (*Pel.* 34.1 = *FGrH* 556 F 40b) comments scathingly upon Philistus' theatrical description of Dionysius' funeral:

ἐκείνων δὲ τῶν ταφῶν οὐ δοκοῦσιν ἕτεραι λαμπρότεραι γενέσθαι τοῖς τὸ λαμπρὸν οὐκ ἐκ ἐλέφαντι καὶ χρυσῶι καὶ πορφύραις εἶναι νομίζουσιν, ὥσπερ Φίλιστος ὕμνων καὶ θαυμάζων τὴν Διονυσίου ταφὴν οἶον τραγωιδίας μεγάλης τῆς τυραννίδος ἐξόδιον θεατρικὸν γενομένην.

His funeral rites (i.e., Pelopidas') do not seem ever to have been surpassed in splendour, at least for those who believe that true splendour does not lie in ivory, gold, or purple; thus Philistus in admiration sings the praises of the funeral of Dionysius as if it were a finale in the theatre to the great tragedy of his tyranny.

¹¹ Hieronymus was the grandson of Gelon II. Baton's avowed hatred of tyrants is manifested in his authorship of numerous treatises denouncing various autocrats, including possibly a larger work on the Syracusan tyrants; see Christesen 2011: Commentary to *BNJ* 268 F 4 and Biographical Essay. All translations are my own.

¹² Philistus is generally (although not uniformly) positive towards Dionysius I (Pownall 2013: Biographical Essay to *BNJ* 556 and Pownall 2017, both with earlier bibliography), whose favour he wished to regain after he was exiled, possibly for collusion with Leptines in the dynastic marriage with his daughter, which was arranged behind the tyrant's back; see Sabattini 1989: 54–57 and Caven 1990: 169–175.

¹³ On Plutarch's portrayal of Philistus, see Mossé 2006 and Pownall 2017: 65–66.

Plutarch (*Pel.* 34.2) immediately segues to an equally scathing denunciation of Alexander's equally over-the-top funeral for Hephaestion, commenting that this kind of excess does not connote respect or honour, but represents rather a "display of barbarian pretension, luxury, and boastfulness" (ὄγκου δὲ βαρβαρικοῦ καὶ τρυφῆς καὶ ἀλαζονείας ἐπίδειξις).

There is ample evidence in the sources for Alexander's wearing of purple as well as the use of purple for display, through which he, like Dionysius, advertised the wealth and sumptuousness of his court. Purple was the only colour-fast dye in antiquity and was correspondingly both expensive and exclusive; to the Greeks, it symbolized both luxury and tyranny.¹⁴ Ephippus of Olynthus (*FGrH* 126 F 5), a contemporary of Alexander,¹⁵ comments that at banquets Alexander donned sacred vestments, including the purple robe of Ammon, while for everyday use he customarily wore a purple *chlamys* (the traditional Macedonian military cloak) and a *chiton* interwoven with white (χλαμύδα τε πορφυρᾶν καὶ χιτῶνα μεσόλευκον).¹⁶ Xenophon (*Cyr.* 8.3.13) specifies that the colour of the *chiton mesoleukon* was indeed purple, and notes that only the Persian king was permitted to wear it.¹⁷ Both Diodorus (17.77.5) and Plutarch (*Alex.* 51.3) refer to Alexander's donning of the *chiton mesoleukon* in a context that clearly indicates that it is a Persian garment.¹⁸ Similarly, Curtius (6.6.4) claims that Alexander put on a purple diadem interwoven with white (*purpureum diadema distinctum albo*). Alexander not only began to wear purple attire himself, apparently not just for ceremonial or formal occasions, but also distributed purple garments to his courtiers.¹⁹ Alexander's wearing of purple fits in with his well-attested adoption of oriental attire, although as Andrew Collins has recently observed,²⁰ his use of Persian royal garments and insignia was selective; that is, he created a new royal costume composed of both Macedonian and Persian elements that symbolized his personal autocracy and elevated him (as well as his court) above his subjects through luxury and display.

The evidence, however, for Philip's use of purple and/or Persian royal garments is certainly much more tenuous. For what it is worth, the bones of the woman buried in Tomb II at the royal necropolis in Vergina were wrapped in purple and gold cloth,²¹ and there are

¹⁴ Reinhold 1970.

¹⁵ As Spawforth (2012: 170) comments, Ephippus offers "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."

¹⁶ As Spawforth (2012) demonstrates, Ephippus' assertion slightly later in this passage that Alexander habitually cross-dressed as the goddess Artemis in fact represents a deliberate misrepresentation, intended for his Greek audience, of the king's adoption of Persian royal dress and weaponry for the hunt, which should be viewed as part of his larger adaptation of certain aspects of Achaemenid court culture.

¹⁷ On the *chiton mesoleukon*, see Collins 2012: 387–388.

¹⁸ Cf. Metz *Epitome* 2: *deditque et diadema et tunicam mesoleucum et caduceum zonam<que> Persiarum ceteraque ornamenta regia omnia, quae Darius habebat* ("and then he adopted the diadem, the *chiton mesoleukon*, the sceptre, the belt, and all the other royal Persian regalia, which Darius used to possess").

¹⁹ Diodorus 17.77.6: καὶ τοὺς ἑταίρους περιπορφύριοις στόλας . . . περιέθηκε ("and he distributed to his Companions robes with purple borders"); Justin 12.3.9: *amicos quoque suos longam vestem auratam purpureamque sumere iubet* ("and he ordered his friends to put on long gold and purple tunics"); Curtius (6.6.7) and the Metz *Epitome* (2) claim that Alexander compelled his friends and the cavalry to wear Persian dress but do not specify the colour purple. Athenaeus (12.540a) says that Alexander wrote to the Ionian cities, especially the Chians, to send fabric because he wanted his Companions to wear sea-purple robes; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 11a.

²⁰ Collins 2012; cf. Bosworth 1980: esp. 6.

²¹ Borza and Palagia 2007: 106 n. 154.

traces of purple dye found in the tomb attributed to Philip's mother Eurydice.²² But as neither of these tombs can incontrovertibly be dated as yet to the period before Alexander's conquests,²³ we cannot conclude with any certainty that Philip also used purple for display.

But there is evidence that Philip, as his son was to do later, also deliberately employed costume (if not necessarily a purple one), to showcase his power and serve as a visible as well as a symbolic differentiation between himself and his subjects. The best example of Philip's pageantry is also his last, the fateful day of the wedding feast of his daughter Cleopatra. As Diodorus attests (16.93.1), Philip wore a white cloak (*leukon himation*) when he entered into the theatre in the ancient Macedonian capital. Unfortunately, Diodorus does not provide any further description of this garment, but the fact that he mentions it in a context of elaborate and theatrical pageantry suggests that it is something more than an ordinary cloak. This scene is one of immense tragicity, containing the foreshadowing of Philip's own death by a typically ambiguous Pythian oracle (Diod. Sic. 16.91.2–3; cf. 92.4), other (similar) omens (Diod. Sic. 16.92.2–3), and a performance by the tragic actor Neoptolemus, who recited some well-chosen verses (probably from Aeschylus) to the effect that death would overtake the mighty (Diod. Sic. 16.92.3). It seems likely, therefore, that Philip's white cloak was similar to the long robe (ξυστίς), which Duris of Samos criticizes Dionysius for wearing (*FGrH* 76 F 14 = Athen. 12.535e):

Δοῦρις δ' ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῶν Ἱστοριῶν, Πausανίας μὲν, φησὶν, ὁ τῶν Σπαρτιατῶν βασιλεὺς καταθέμενος τὸν πάτριον τρίβωνα τὴν Περσικὴν ἐνεδύετο στολήν. ὁ δὲ Σικελίας τύραννος Διονύσιος ξυστίδα καὶ χρυσοῦν στέφανον ἐπὶ περόνῃ μετελάμβανε τραγικόν. Ἀλέξανδρος δ' ὡς τῆς Ἀσίας ἐκυρίευσεν, ἠΠερσικαῖς ἐχρῆτο στολαῖς.

In the twenty-second book of his *Histories*, Duris says: “Pausanias, the king of the Spartans, laid aside the traditional threadbare cloak and began to wear Persian attire. Dionysius, the tyrant of Sicily, took up the robe and the gold crown fastened with a pin in the manner of tragic actors. When Alexander had gained control of Asia, he began to wear Persian attire.

According to L-S-J, the ξυστίς is a “robe of rich and soft material reaching to the feet,” worn by aristocratic Greek women, great men as a robe of state (especially victorious charioteers in their triumphal procession), and tragic heroes on the stage. Clearly, then, it was a garment with connotations of luxury, effeminacy, and display; in short, the very kind of garment generally associated with Persia as well as the theatre and performative culture in general.²⁴ The fact that Duris sandwiches Dionysius' wearing of this festal garment in between Pausanias' adoption of Persian attire and Alexander's suggests that the model is once again a Persian one, which was adopted by Dionysius first.

²² Carney 2010: 48–49.

²³ It is not necessary for my arguments to go into this controversy, but recent summaries of the opposing positions on Tomb II can be found in Borza and Palagia 2007 and Lane Fox 2011.

²⁴ Cf. Alföldi 1955: 44 and Collins 2012: 391.

Duris' reference to the gold crown worn by tragic actors brings us to another symbol of kingship, in which again Dionysius serves as an important precursor to Alexander—the wearing of the diadem, which became an integral part of Alexander's royal attire and eventually served as the exclusive royal insignia of the Hellenistic kings.²⁵ While the wearing of the diadem is widely associated with Alexander, its precise significance has been debated, particularly because, while attested for the Persians, it does not appear to have carried the same exclusive ideological implications of kingship that it later contained for Alexander and his Successors. As a result, several different schools of thought have arisen, positing non-Persian origins for Alexander's diadem. Andreas Alföldi argued that the origin of Alexander's diadem is actually a Greek one, the fillet or headband (ταινία) awarded to the victor in athletic contests.²⁶ Based on a passage in Diodorus (4.4.4), attributing the invention of the diadem to the god Dionysus as a means to prevent the headaches attendant upon the excessive consumption of wine,²⁷ Fredericksmeier proposed that Alexander adopted the diadem as a symbol associated with Dionysus, an important deity to the Macedonian kings as well as his precursor in the conquest of the east.²⁸ Most recently, Andrew Collins has suggested that Alexander deliberately chose a symbol that was not exclusive to the royal insignia of the Persian kings in order to emphasize that his rule was an entirely new one, and not simply a continuation of the former Achaemenid monarchy with himself replacing Darius on the throne.²⁹

In my opinion, however, these previous interpretations of the non-Persian origin of Alexander's diadem are not mutually exclusive,³⁰ especially if the symbolic association of Dionysus with the conquest of Asia is removed from the equation for, as has been noted,³¹ Diodorus' aetiology for the invention of the diadem has nothing to do with the deity's eastern campaigns. Dionysus does not preside over athletic contests, to be sure, but there is another agonistic sphere in which his role is central, that of the theatre. Dramatic contests were held in Athens at the Lenaea and the City Dionysia, both festivals in honour of Dionysus as god of wine and fertility, and the victorious playwrights were awarded crowns; for what it is worth, the

²⁵ For a recent overview of current scholarship, see the essays in the edited volume of Lichtenberger et al. 2012.

²⁶ Alföldi 1985.

²⁷ Diod. Sic. 4.4.4: πρὸς δὲ τὰς ἐκ τοῦ πλεονάζοντος οἴνου κεφαλαλγίας τοῖς πίνουσι γινομένας διαδεδέσθαι λέγουσιν αὐτὸν μίτρα τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἃφ' ἧς αἰτίας καὶ μιτρηφόρον ὀνομάζεσθαι ἀπὸ δὲ ταύτης τῆς μίτρας ὕστερον παρὰ τοῖς βασιλεῦσι καταδειχθῆναι τὸ διάδημά φασι ("They say that in order to prevent the headaches which arise from the excessive consumption of wine he placed a band (*mitra*) around his head, which was the reason he was called *Mitrephorus*. From this *mitra*, they say, the diadem was later introduced for kings"). Cf. Plin. *HN* 7.191.

²⁸ Fredericksmeier 1997; cf. Smith 1988: 37–38.

²⁹ Collins 2012: esp. 383–385.

³⁰ Pace Olbrycht (2014: esp. 181, 182, 185), who argues against any Greek cultural and agonistic interpretations of Alexander's assumption of the diadem, on the grounds that these would have had no relevance to his new Iranian subjects. But as Alexander's effort to impose *proskynesis* upon his Greek and Macedonian courtiers demonstrates, he was attempting to introduce court ceremonial that was a blend of eastern and western elements precisely in order to symbolize a new kind of Macedonian rule after his conquest of Asia.

³¹ By e.g. Collins 2012: 381–382.

City Dionysia also became the venue after 409 where gold crowns were presented to foreign benefactors.³²

Furthermore, no one has adequately considered the significance in this connection of the fact that Dionysius I preceded Alexander in the donning of the diadem. According to Philistus (FGrH 556 F 57a = Cic. Div. 1.39):

Dionysii mater, eius qui Syracosiorum tyrannus fuit . . . cum praegnans hunc ipsum Dionysium alvo contineret, somniavit se peperisse satyriscum. huic interpretes portentorum . . . responderunt, ut ait Philistus, eum, quem illa peperisset, clarissimum Graeciae diuturna cum fortuna fore.

The mother of that Dionysius who became tyrant of the Syracusans, when she was pregnant with this very Dionysius, dreamed that she had given birth to a baby satyr. The interpreters of portents . . . predicted, as Philistus says, that the child to whom she had given birth would be the most illustrious man in Greece and would enjoy lasting good fortune.

This sort of prophetic dream foreshadowing the birth of a great hero-to-be is a very common motif in the biographical tradition, and it is not surprising that Philistus, who was personally involved in Dionysius' rise to power (FGrH 556 T 3), circulated a prophecy designed to justify his seizure of power in Syracuse.³³ What is more unusual is the portent of a satyr-child. As has been suggested by both Brian Caven and Sian Lewis,³⁴ the satyr portent suggests a clear connection with Dionysius' namesake, the god Dionysus, who was traditionally accompanied by a retinue of satyrs. For Dionysius, though, the satyr also serves a more specific purpose, to highlight the god's association with drama (most obviously, in the satyr plays performed at the City Dionysia in Athens).³⁵

It is no coincidence that Dionysius himself is attested to have entertained literary and performative ambitions as grandiose as his political and military ones, culminating (both literally and metaphorically) with his victory in the dramatic contests at the Lenaea in Athens.³⁶ Although the anecdotal tradition testifies that his poetry was ridiculed by his fellow Greeks,³⁷ it is likely that contemporary intellectual attitudes towards autocratic rule are at least as much responsible for Dionysius' later reputation as a mediocre dramatist as his alleged lack of literary talent.³⁸ In fact, the extant fragments of his poetry suggest that Dionysius composed his tragedies (whatever their literary merits may have been) precisely in order to

³² On this innovation, see e.g. Shear 2011: 141–145.

³³ Pownall 2013: Commentary to BNJ 556 F 57a; Pownall 2017: 66.

³⁴ Caven 1990: 19–20; Lewis 2000: 101–103.

³⁵ Cf. Pownall 2013: Commentary to BNJ 556 F 57a; Pownall 2017: 66–67.

³⁶ Diodorus (15.74.1–4) alleges that during his victory celebrations Dionysius, in a display of stereotypically tyrannical excess, drank himself to death. For what it is worth, Dionysius and his sons are attested to have been awarded crowns by the Athenian people (presumably at the City Dionysia, as noted above); Rhodes and Osborne 2003: no. 33.26–30.

³⁷ The evidence has been collected by Sanders 1987: 19–20 and Duncan 2012: 138–141.

³⁸ Caven 1990: 240–241; Monoson 2012; cf. Pownall 2017: 66–67.

portray himself as a wise and just ruler based on the tradition of the idealized monarch in fifth-century Attic drama.³⁹ Thus, his literary efforts were not simply the self-deluded artistic pretensions of a talentless autocrat playing up to his fawning courtiers and flatterers, as the *topos* in the literary tradition would have it,⁴⁰ but an important and deliberate aspect of Dionysius' construction of his own royal image. It is almost certainly in this literary and theatrical context that Dionysius had himself portrayed with the attributes of Dionysus on a statue erected in Syracuse, if we can believe Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 37.2), thereby transforming himself into the living embodiment of the god of the theatre.

There is no reason to doubt the statements in the sources (which occur in festal and theatrical contexts, as we have seen) that Dionysius donned the diadem, which in its similarity to the victor's crown in the dramatic contests was inoffensive to his fellow Greeks as well as an attribute associated with the god Dionysus. What better symbol to confirm his status as a victor on the tragic stage and consummate performer *par excellence*, and simultaneously to reinforce his connection with the god for whom he was named?

It seems likely that Alexander was motivated by similar considerations, and deliberately chose the diadem, the wearing of purple, and the donning of festal clothing previously reserved for victors, tragic actors on the stage, and Persians precisely because Dionysius had done so. Both Philip and Alexander are attested to have engaged in artistic performances themselves. Plutarch reprises a story no fewer than four times in his *Moralia* that Philip considered himself enough of a musician to correct a kithara-player at a dinner party and discuss with him the playing of the instrument, to which he received the retort that it was not worthy of a king to have better knowledge of it than a kithara-player.⁴¹ Although the subtext of the anecdote is that the "artistic king" is an inappropriate ruler, whose musical aspirations shade into implications of decadence and tyranny,⁴² a nugget of historical truth almost certainly underlies it. Philip is attested to have made a number of cultural innovations at the Macedonian court, including divorcing theatre from its festival context and introducing dramatic performances into the private context of the symposium.⁴³ Theatre and performance culture evidently played an integral part of Philip's refashioning of the Argead monarchy.

In another context, Plutarch (*Dem.* 20.3) alludes in equally disapproving terms to Philip's own artistic and performative talents:

παραυτικά μὲν οὖν ὁ Φίλιππος ἐπὶ τῇ νίκῃ διὰ τὴν χαρὰν ἐξυβρίσας, καὶ κωμάσας ἐπὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς μεθύων, ἦδε τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ Δημοσθένους ψηφίσματος πρὸς πόδα διαιρῶν καὶ ὑποκρούων.

Immediately afterwards (i.e., Chaeronea) Philip was exceedingly hubristic in the joy arising from his victory, and after going on a drunken revel in front of the corpses,

³⁹ So Duncan 2012; cf. Sanders 1990–1991: 114–116, who observes that Dionysius composed his poetry for specific propaganda objectives.

⁴⁰ On the *topos* of the artistic king in general, see Müller 2017.

⁴¹ Plut. *Mor.* 67f; 179b; 334c–d; 634c–d.

⁴² Cf. Müller 2017.

⁴³ Csapo 2010: 172–178; cf. Moloney 2014: 240–245.

recited the beginning of the decree made by Demosthenes, putting it into metre and marking off the rhythm.

Even though the anecdote is a negative one, designed to illustrate Philip's excess and lack of self-control (both attributes of the stereotypical tyrant),⁴⁴ Plutarch's allegation that he mocked Demosthenes by versifying one of his decrees suggests he did not consider it implausible that Philip had the literary expertise to do so.

Whatever the truth may be of the supposedly unrestrained and riotous nature of Macedonian symposia as they are portrayed by the Greek sources,⁴⁵ there does appear to have been an expectation, as in Greek symposia, of musical entertainment. The key difference, however, is that Philip himself performs, which automatically renders Macedonian symposia uncivilized, decadent, and even dangerous,⁴⁶ as this excerpt from Theopompus demonstrates (FGrH 115 F 162 = Athen. 6.260b–c):

εἰδὼς ὁ Φίλιππος ἀκολάστους ὄντας καὶ περὶ τὸν βίον ἀσελγεῖς συνουσίας αὐτῶν κατεσκεύαζε καὶ πάντα τρόπον ἀρέσκειν αὐτοῖς ἐπειρᾶτο καὶ ὀρχούμενος καὶ κωμᾶζων καὶ πᾶσαν ἀκολασίαν ὑπομένων. . . πλείους τε τῶν Θετταλῶν τῶν αὐτῷ πλησιασάντων ἥρει μᾶλλον ἐν ταῖς συνουσίαις ἢ ταῖς δωρεαῖς.

Because Philip knew that the Thessalians were licentious and decadent in their lifestyle, he prepared drinking parties for them and attempted to please them in every way by dancing, reveling, and submitting to every kind of licentious act . . . he won over most of the Thessalians who approached him more by drinking parties than by bribes.

Again, the source is a hostile one,⁴⁷ but there is almost certainly some truth to Philip's own artistic and performative aspirations, which were most likely, as with Dionysius, tied to his self-fashioning as something more than a *primus inter pares*, a ruler who surpassed his court not only in his military prowess and drinking ability, but in his artistic talent as well. It is surely significant that immediately after his citation of this passage, Athenaeus (6.260c) claims that Dionysius of Sicily behaved similarly to Philip, in that he enjoyed associating with those who enjoyed getting drunk and making merry, citing Theopompus again for the similarity between Philip and Dionysius in their choice of depraved and debauched companions.⁴⁸

These sorts of anecdotes could be fluid, however, adapted to suit whatever rhetorical or moralizing purpose the occasion called for. Despite his own willingness to perform, Philip is

⁴⁴ By Plutarch's time, the anecdote of Philip's (alleged) drunken hubris after Chaeronea had become a *topos*, the precise details of which could be altered by the source to suit the narrative circumstances at hand; see Pownall 2010: 56–59.

⁴⁵ On Macedonian symposia, see Carney 2007; on their (mis)representation in the Greek sources, see Pownall 2010. On the misrepresentation of Macedonia in the Greek sources in general, see Müller 2015.

⁴⁶ Cf. Müller 2017: 256–257.

⁴⁷ On Theopompus' attitude to Philip, see Shrimpton 1991: 146–180 and Flower 1994: 98–115.

⁴⁸ Athen. 6.260–261b = FGrH 115 F 225b (the lengthy and notorious description of the depravity of Philip's companions) and F 134. As Sanders (1995) has observed, the decline and fall of the Dionysian tyranny offered Theopompus a blueprint for Philip's own moral and political failure.

alleged to have criticized the young Alexander for his skill at playing the kithara, for much the same reasoning as the unnamed harp player, that it was not worthy of a king (Plut. *Per.* 1.5).⁴⁹ Nevertheless, Philip is attested elsewhere to have encouraged Alexander's music performances, for Aeschines (1.167–168) accuses Demosthenes of directing “shameful suspicions” (αἰσχρὰς ὑποψίας) against Alexander, by insinuating that he was casting aspersions on another youth in the verses to which he accompanied himself with the kithara at a banquet at which Philip was entertaining the Athenian embassy. As Sabine Müller has observed,⁵⁰ the most natural interpretation of Philip's motives is that he “wanted to prove the ‘Greekness’ of his house by showing off with his artistically skilled son who was ten or eleven years old at this time.” The artistic and performative abilities of the royal family, associated particularly with the symposium,⁵¹ are therefore part and parcel of Philip's ongoing re-styling of the Argead monarchy.

Not surprisingly, Alexander's musical and artistic ambitions are well attested. Alexander was familiar enough with the works of Euripides to quote from the playwright verbatim,⁵² and at his final banquet was said to performed a scene from the *Andromeda* from memory (Nikoboule *FGrH* 127 F 2 = Athenaeus 12.537d-e):

Νικοβούλῃ δέ φησιν ὅτι παρὰ τὸ δεῖπνον πάντες οἱ ἀγωνισταὶ ἐσπούδαζον τέρπειν τὸν βασιλέα· καὶ ὅτι ἐν τῷ τελευταίῳ δείπνῳ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἐπεισόδιόν τι μνημονεύσας ἐκ τῆς Εὐριπίδου Ἀνδρομέδας ἠγωνίσατο καὶ τὸν ἄκρατον προθύμως προπίνων καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἠνάγκαζεν.

Nikoboule says that all the rival competitors were eager to entertain the king during the banquet; she also says that at his final banquet Alexander himself performed a scene from Euripides' *Andromache* from memory as if he were participating in a competition, and enthusiastically began to drain cups of unmixed wine, forcing the others to do so too.

What is interesting in this passage is the competitive element; Alexander is not just reciting the scene from the *Andromeda*, but performing it as if he were competing on the stage. Furthermore, Nikoboule, who appears to have been present at Alexander's court,⁵³ associates Alexander's competitive performance on the stage with his efforts to out-drink his fellow

⁴⁹ There is a similar anecdote in Aelian (*VH* 3.32) according to which, when Alexander asked his teacher what would happen if he plucked the wrong string of the kithara, the response was that it did not matter, because he was going to be king. Musical discussions between Philip and Alexander seem to have become somewhat of a *topos* in antiquity, for Dio Chrysostom (3.28–31) narrates a conversation in which Alexander defended the playing of the kithara or the lyre, but only in accompaniment to “appropriate” material, such as hymns in honour of the gods or poetry praising the deeds of brave men (Stesichorus, Pindar, or Homer).

⁵⁰ Müller 2017: 254.

⁵¹ So Carney 2003: 49: “the Macedonian symposium, critical in so many ways to the functioning of the Macedonian court, had already become the venue for Alexander's display of his educational and cultural accomplishments.”

⁵² Alexander's quotations of Euripides: Plut. *Alex.* 10.7 (*Medea*); 53.3 (unidentified fragment); 53.4 (*Bacchae*); Arr. *Anab.* 7.16.5 (unidentified fragment).

⁵³ So Sheridan 2012: Biographical Essay to *BNJ* 127 (with earlier bibliography).

symposiasts. As Elizabeth Carney and I have demonstrated,⁵⁴ the competitive element of Macedonian royal symposia permitted the king simultaneously to integrate the elite and to demonstrate his superiority to them, thereby legitimizing his authority.⁵⁵ It is clear that in the competitive atmosphere of the Macedonian royal symposia of both Philip and Alexander dramatic performance served a similar function.⁵⁶

Alexander, it seems, continued the tradition inaugurated by Philip of sponsoring competitions and performances to celebrate private and secular events,⁵⁷ and performing at them to demonstrate to his court his own power and authority. But he went beyond Philip by, like Dionysius, identifying himself with Dionysus explicitly. This can be seen in Alexander's commissioning of the satyr-play *Agen* satirizing his disgraced former treasurer Harpalus which was performed at the Dionysia held on the banks of the Hydaspes.⁵⁸ While only two fragments are extant,⁵⁹ it seems likely that the title character *Agen* (i.e., "Leader" of the chorus of satyrs), representing Alexander himself, punished the Harpalus character.⁶⁰ More importantly, however, Alexander's commissioning of the *Agen* served as another way to strengthen his identification with Dionysus, the leader of the satyrs as well as patron god of the theatre, as part of the continuing remodeling of his royal image.⁶¹

As we have seen, both Philip and Alexander adopted crucial elements of their royal self-fashioning which are strikingly similar to aspects of court ceremonial (many of which derive from the Achaemenid Persians) practiced by Dionysius I. But what evidence is there for a direct connection? This is a particularly important consideration, given that Dionysius is not the first Greek accused of Persianizing, which connoted *inter alia* the use of the colour purple and the wearing of extravagant clothing (especially in a theatrical style). The Spartan regent Pausanias was said to have begun to sport Persian attire when he installed himself as tyrant of Byzantium.⁶² Similarly, according to some later traditions Alcibiades decked his ship out with purple sails when he returned to Athens from exile, to the musical accompaniment of the

⁵⁴ Carney 2007; Pownall 2010.

⁵⁵ The hunt served a similar function; cf. Carney 2002.

⁵⁶ Cf. Moloney 2014: 248: "public spectacle [was] used to affirm local political and social hierarchies; with these festive occasions serving as a means to reinforce the relationship between king and court and helping to establish and maintain bonds between the wider nobility and the Argead royal family."

⁵⁷ Le Guen 2014: 270.

⁵⁸ Athenaeus (2.50f; 13.586d; 13.595e) attributes the authorship of the play to either Python of Catana or Byzantium or to Alexander himself. Alexander's own authorship is *prima facie* unlikely, and his name is likely to have been attached to the play because he commissioned it; Le Guen 2014: 168 and Kotlińska-Toma 2015: 115.

⁵⁹ Athen. 13.595f–596b (F 1 and F 2 in Kotlińska-Toma 2015).

⁶⁰ On the *Agen*, see Le Guen 2014: esp. 261–263, 267–268, 271–274 and Kotlińska-Toma 2015: 115–123 (both with earlier bibliography).

⁶¹ Bosworth (1996) has argued that Alexander's association with Dionysus increased as his campaign proceeded eastwards; as noted above, however, this association should be read as part of Alexander's royal self-fashioning, rather than any putative desire to emulate and surpass the deity's military conquest of the east, especially because the connection with Dionysus and the theatre almost certainly goes back to Philip, and therefore represents the ongoing refashioning of the Argead monarchy long before the expedition to India. For the ways in which the Alexander historians employ Dionysus as part of their portrayal of Alexander and his monarchic ideology, see Koulakiotis 2017.

⁶² Thuc. 1.130.1; Duris *FGrH* 76 F 14; Nep. *Paus.* 3.2.

pipes-player Chrysogonus (who had been victorious in the Pythian competitions) and the famous tragic actor Callippides, both of whom were wearing the *xustis* as well as the rest of the ornate finery required for public performance;⁶³ in another tradition, Alcibiades is said to have been showered by the adoring crowd with gold crowns and fillets (*coronis aureis taeniisque*).⁶⁴ While some of the more grandiose theatrical details may have been retrojected into these narratives from the self-fashioning of contemporary rulers,⁶⁵ it is telling that later sources thought it appropriate to apply them to Pausanias and Alcibiades, who at least to some extent aspired to rule over overseas empires. But Dionysius was the first Greek ruler successfully to acquire a large multi-ethnic empire, positioning himself as the defender of Greek freedom against the barbarian Carthaginians to justify his seizure of autocratic power in Syracuse in 406, the consolidation of his control over the Greek and indigenous populations of Sicily, and eventually his territorial expansion abroad into Magna Graecia as well as the Adriatic and Tyrrhenian coasts.⁶⁶ Dionysius' creation of a new type of truly international monarchy therefore would have served as a logical model for both Philip and Alexander.

There is evidence in the anecdotal tradition that Philip took a particular interest in Dionysius, including his self-presentation as the artistic king. It is chronologically unlikely that the two ever met face-to-face, for Dionysius died in 367, almost a decade before Philip ascended to the Macedonian throne. It is possible, however, that Philip could have sought first-hand information on Dionysius I from his son and successor, Dionysius II, who spent the last period of his life as a private citizen in Corinth, following his expulsion from Syracuse by Timoleon in 345/4.⁶⁷ According to Plutarch (*Tim.* 15.7), Philip asked Dionysius II in a symposiastic context how his father had any spare time in which to compose lyric poetry and tragedy, to which the pithy response was that he did so while other rulers were busy drinking. Aelian (*VH* 12.60) records a similar conversation between the two in which Philip inquired from Dionysius why he had not succeeded in maintaining the powerful empire which he had inherited from his father (the reply was that he had not inherited his father's good fortune). Leaving aside the rhetorical and moralizing tropes imbued in these anecdotes, it was considered at least plausible to the later tradition that Philip was interested in the secret to the spectacular success of Dionysius I, including his self-fashioning as monarch. It is also perhaps

⁶³ Duris *FGrH* 76 F 70 = Plut. *Alc.* 32.2; Athen. 12.535d (based on Duris, although he is not cited by name). While Diodorus (13.68.3) does not mention purple sails, he does say that the ships in Alcibiades' fleet were decorated with gilded spoils and garlands.

⁶⁴ Nep. *Alc.* 6.3, who comments that this had only happened before in the case of Olympic victors. Plutarch (*Alc.* 33) transfers the bestowing of gold crowns to an official edict of the Assembly.

⁶⁵ Xenophon (*Hell.* 1.4.12) does not mention any decoration of Alcibiades' ships or any of the other theatrical elements that appear in later sources, although the focus of his narrative is on his hesitation as he returned to Athens and the reaction of the crowd; for this reason, Plutarch (*Alc.* 32.3) argues that Duris' narrative of Alcibiades' return is ahistorical, and it is certainly possible that it was contaminated by the Successors' emulation of the theatrical self-fashioning of Philip and (especially) Alexander; cf. Duris *FGrH* 76 F 12 and 14.

⁶⁶ On Dionysius' consolidation of power in Sicily and acquisition of a large overseas empire, see Caven 1990 and Roisman 2017: 227–273. On his use of panhellenic rhetoric and liberation propaganda to legitimize his extensive territorial expansion, see Pownall forthcoming.

⁶⁷ Dionysius II did not enjoy the same success as his talented father, having previously been defeated by Dion, who replaced him in power in Syracuse for almost a decade (he passed this earlier period of exile in Epizephyrian Locri). On Dionysius II, see Muccioli 1999.

worth noting here that Philip appears to have introduced the performance of mimes (a genre imported from Syracuse) into Macedonian royal symposia.⁶⁸

As for Alexander, there is a tradition found in Plutarch (*Alex.* 8.3) that when he was on campaign in Asia, the books that he requested from the infamous Harpalus were the Sicilian history of Philistus, a selection of the tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, and the dithyrambic poems of Telestes and Philoxenus. It is not surprising that Alexander would have requested a copy of the historical work detailing Dionysius' creation and administration of the greatest empire of the Greek world of his time.⁶⁹ Nor is it surprising that Alexander asked for the works of the three great Attic tragedians, which were regularly performed at the Macedonian court, where Euripides enjoyed a special prominence,⁷⁰ as we have seen. It is worth noting in this connection also that Aeschylus is attested to have spent time at the court of the Deinomenid tyrant Hieron of Syracuse.⁷¹ The only other authors that Alexander requested are dithyrambic poets, that is, poets who donned ornate festal garb (most famously perhaps in the Arion story of Herodotus) to perform poetry in honour of Dionysus.⁷² Significantly, both of them have Sicilian connections. Telestes, who came from the Sicilian city of Selinus, was one of the major figures in the late fifth-century cultural revolution known as the "New Music."⁷³ Philoxenus of Cythera, another composer associated with the New Music, was one of the literati at the court of Dionysius I who benefited from the tyrant's patronage until he, like Philistus, fell from favour and was banished.⁷⁴ The emphasis in the volumes requested by Alexander on Dionysius I, his divine namesake, and performative culture suggests that the young conqueror was not interested only in his Syracusan predecessor's acquisition of a large overseas empire, but his self-fashioning as a ruler as well.

In this respect, it is almost certainly no coincidence that Alexander seems to have borrowed Dionysius' unusual portent of a satyr, adapting it to fit the requirements of his own propaganda. During his lengthy siege of Tyre, which he eventually captured by building a causeway to connect the island city with the mainland, Alexander is said to have had a prophetic dream according to which a satyr teased him for some time, skipping just out of range, and finally permitted itself to be caught.⁷⁵ The soothsayers duly interpreted the dream as foretelling the surrender of Tyre, based on the etymology of the word satyr. Like Dionysius,

⁶⁸ Cf. Csapo 2010: 173.

⁶⁹ On the particular importance of Philistus in this list, see Brown 1967; Sanders 1990–1991: 130–131; Sekunda 2009.

⁷⁰ On Euripides' connections with the Macedonian court, see Moloney 2014: 234–240; Müller 2016: 97–100 and 173–175 (both with earlier bibliography).

⁷¹ On Aeschylus' sojourn in Sicily, see e.g. Boshier 2012; Morgan 2015: esp. 96–105.

⁷² When faced with death at the hands of Corinthian pirates, Arion, to whom Herodotus (1.23) attributes the invention of the dithyramb, "donned all of his festal clothing and took up his kithara" (τὸν δὲ ἐνδύοντα τε πᾶσαν τὴν σκευὴν καὶ λαβόντα τὴν κιθάρην), and performed for them (Hdt. 1.24.5).

⁷³ On Telestes' musical innovations, see LeVen 2014: 14–15; 83–86; 103–112; 167–172

⁷⁴ On Philoxenus' (apparently lengthy) sojourn at Dionysius' court, see Sanders 1987: 15–21; Duncan 2012: 138–141; Fongoni 2014: 15–18; cf. LeVen 2014: 113–149, who illustrates how the anecdotes about Philoxenus at the tyrant's court (issues of historicity aside) tell a larger story of the reception of the New Music artists at later points in antiquity.

⁷⁵ Plut. *Alex.* 24.5; cf. Artem. 4.24.

Alexander is clearly claiming divine support to legitimize his rule. The appearance of a satyr portent in this particular context underlines Alexander's inspiration from Dionysius, whose success in the siege of the Carthaginian city of Motye in western Sicily, located (like Tyre) on an island off the coast, was due to his own revolutionary construction of a causeway (Diod. Sic. 14.48.3). But Alexander, never content to be under anyone else's shadow, seems to have engaged in some one-upmanship with his illustrious predecessor, boasting that he had "liberated" a colossal statue of Apollo from Tyre that the Carthaginians had plundered from Gela, after Dionysius was unable to prevent them from capturing the city in 403.⁷⁶

As I have shown, there is no doubt that Dionysius I of Syracuse adopted some aspects of the Persian model of kingship, which he carefully modified with Greek theatrical and agonistic traditions to suit his own needs. In other words, he both served for Philip and Alexander as an intermediary for Achaemenid practices and court ceremonial and as a direct source on how to adapt them to make them acceptable to their Greek subjects. Thus it cannot be denied that Dionysius I exercised a direct influence on both Philip and Alexander's spectacular transformation of the Macedonian court into "a venue for international display of royal style,"⁷⁷ with the kings themselves firmly dominating the elite through competitive rivalry, be it drinking, hunting, or as I have argued performing.

Returning to the question with which we began, why is it that the Sicilian models of royal self-fashioning have not received the same amount of attention as the Persian ones? Part of the problem is the pervasive downplaying, in both ancient and modern scholarship, of the history of Sicily and the Greek West.⁷⁸ Furthermore, the Greek sources' general tendency deliberately and willfully to misrepresent the royal self-fashioning of Dionysius as well as Philip and Alexander in trivializing moralistic terms as "evidence" of the decadent and over-the-top "oriental" excess of their courts have obscured the new models of monarchy and royal self-fashioning which all three rulers inaugurated. More specifically, however, I believe that the apologetic tradition on Alexander has led us down the wrong path by insisting that his so-called orientalism occurred only after his conquest of Persia, at which point elite opposition crystallized around the figure of Philip, who was held up as the archetype of what a proper Macedonian ruler should be, a tendency which Sabine Müller has called "the Philip myth."⁷⁹ These separate but complementary tendencies have given rise to the popular misconception that Alexander gave little or no thought to his ruling ideology until he became "corrupted" by the very barbarians that he had conquered. This viewpoint not only strips from Alexander the conscious and thoughtful attention he had given to a new style of court and ruling ideology from the very beginning of his campaigns, but also denies any credit in Alexander's self-fashioning either to Philip or to Dionysius of Syracuse, who was their only real predecessor in the Greek world as the ruler of a large multi-ethnic empire. It is time to look west, as well as

⁷⁶ Diod. Sic. 13.108.4, who cites Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F 106 for the statement that Alexander "liberated" the statue from Tyre on the very same day and hour as it had originally been seized from Gela. Leaving aside the suspiciously neat synchronism, which appears to have come from Timaeus (who was especially fond of this device; see Feeney 2007: 47–52 and Baron 2013: 110–111, both with earlier bibliography), the rest of the anecdote appears to be derived from Alexander's very effective propaganda machine.

⁷⁷ Carney 2007: 131.

⁷⁸ Cf. Dench 2003.

⁷⁹ Müller 2010: 30.

east, as a source of inspiration for the creation of a new-style Macedonian monarchy by Philip and Alexander.

FRANCES POWNALL
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Bibliography

- Alföldi, A. 1955. "Gewaltherrscher und Theaterkönig," in K. Weitzmann (ed.), *Late Classical and Medieval Studies in Honor of Albert Mathias Friend, Jr.* Princeton. 15–55.
- 1985. "Diadem und Kranz," in A. Alföldi, *Caesar in 44 v. Chr. I: Studien zu Caesars Monarchie und ihren Wurzeln.* Bonn. 105–131.
- Badian, E. 1996. "Alexander the Great Between Two Thrones and Heaven," in A. Small (ed.), *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity*, JRS Supplement 17: 11–26; repr. in E. Badian, 2012. *Collected Papers on Alexander the Great.* London and New York. 363–385.
- Baron, C. A. 2013. *Timaeus of Tauromenium and Hellenistic Historiography.* Cambridge.
- Baynham, E. 1994. "The Question of Macedonian Divine Honours for Philip II," *Mediterranean Archaeology* 7: 35–43.
- Borza, E. N. and O. Palagia. 2011. "The Chronology of the Macedonian Royal Tombs at Vergina," *JDAI* 122: 81–125.
- Bosworth, A. B. 1980. "Alexander and the Iranians," *JHS* 100: 1–21.
- 1995. *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander.* Vol. 2. Oxford.
- 1996. "Alexander, Euripides, and Dionysos: The Motivation for Apotheosis," in R. W. Wallace and E. M. Harris (eds.), *Transitions to Empire.* Norman, OK and London. 140–166.
- Bosher, K. 2012. "Hieron's Aeschylus," in K. Bosher (ed.), *Theater Outside Athens: Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy.* Cambridge. 97–111.
- Bowden, H. 2013. "On Kissing and Making up: Court Protocol and Historiography in Alexander the Great's 'Experiment with Proskynesis'," *BICS* 56: 55–77.
- Briant, P. 2002. *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire.* Tr. P. T. Daniels. Winona Lake, IN.
- 2010. *Alexander the Great and his Empire.* Tr. A. Kuhrt. Princeton and Oxford.
- Brosius, M. 2003. "Alexander and the Persians," in J. Roisman (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great.* Leiden and Boston. 169–193.
- Brown, T. S. 1967. "Alexander's Book Order (Plut. Alex. 8)," *Historia* 16: 359–368.
- 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.* London and Swansea. 59–80.

- 2003. “Elite Education and High Culture in Macedonia,” in W. Heckel and L. A. Tritle (eds.), *Crossroads of History: The Age of Alexander*. Claremont, CA. 47–63.
- 2007. “Symposia and the Macedonian Elite: The Unmixed Life,” *Syllecta Classica* 18: 129–180.
- 2010. “Putting Women in Their Place: Women in Public under Philip II and Alexander III and the Last Argeads,” in E. Carney and D. Ogden (eds.), *Philip II and Alexander the Great: Father and Son, Lives and Afterlives*. Oxford and New York. 43–53.
- Caven, B. 1990. *Dionysius I: War-Lord of Sicily*. New Haven and London.
- Christesen, P. 2011. “Baton of Sinope (268),” in I. Worthington (ed.), *Brill’s New Jacoby* (on-line).
- Collins, A.W. 2012. “The Royal Costume and Insignia of Alexander the Great,” *AJP* 133: 371–402.
- Coppola, A. 2010. “Alexander’s Court,” in B. Jacobs and R. Rollinger (eds.), *Der Achämenidenhof / The Achaemenid Court*. Wiesbaden. 139–152.
- Csapo, E. 2010. *Actors and Icons of the Ancient Theater*, Oxford and Malden, MA.
- Dench, E. 2003. “Beyond Greeks and Barbarians: Italy and Sicily in the Hellenistic Age,” in A. Erskine (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Malden, MA and Oxford. 294–310.
- Duncan, A. 2012. “A Theseus outside Athens: Dionysius I of Syracuse and Tragic Self-Presentation,” in K. Bosher (ed.), *Theater Outside Athens: Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy*. Cambridge. 137–155.
- Edmunds, L. 1971. “The Religiosity of Alexander,” *GRBS* 12: 363–391.
- Feeney, D. 2007. *Caesar’s Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. Berkeley.
- Flower, M. A. 1994. *Theopompus of Chios: History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century BC*. Oxford and New York.
- Fongoni, A. 2014. *Philoxeni Cytherii Testimonia et Fragmenta*. Pisa and Rome.
- Fredericksmeier, E. 1997. “The Origin of Alexander’s Royal Insignia,” *TAPA* 127: 97–109.
- 2000. “Alexander the Great and the Kingship of Asia,” in A. B. Bosworth and E. J. Baynham (eds.), *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*. Oxford and New York. 136–166.
- 2003. “Alexander’s Religion and Divinity,” in J. Roisman (ed.), *Brill’s Companion to Alexander the Great*. Leiden and Boston. 231–278.
- Hammond, N. G. L. 1986. “The Kingdom of Asia and the Persian Throne.” *Antichthon* 20: 73–85.
- Kienast, D. 1973. *Philip II. von Makedonien und das Reich der Achaimeniden*. Munich.
- Kotlińska-Toma, A. 2015. *Hellenistic Tragedy: Texts, Translations and a Critical Survey*. London.
- Koulakiotis, E. 2017. “Plutarch’s *Alexander*, Dionysos and the metaphysics of power,” in T. Howe, S. Müller, and R. Stoneman (eds.), *Ancient Historiography on War & Empire*. Oxford and Philadelphia. 226–249.
- Lane Fox, R. 2007. “Alexander the Great: ‘Last of the Achaemenids?’” in C. Tuplin (ed.), *Persian Responses: Political and Cultural Interaction with(in) the Achaemenid Empire*. Swansea. 267–311.
- 2011. “Introduction: Dating the Royal Tombs at Vergina,” in R. J. Lane Fox (ed.), *Brill’s Companion to Ancient Macedonia*. Leiden and Boston. 1–34.

- Le Guen, B. 2014. "Theatre, Religion, and Politics at Alexander's Travelling Royal Court," in E. Csapo et al. (eds.), *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B.C.* Berlin and Boston. 249–274.
- LeVen, P. A. 2014. *The Many-Headed Muse: Tradition and Innovation in late Classical Greek Lyric Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Lewis, S. 2000. "The Tyrant's Myth," in C. Smith and J. Serrati (eds.), *Sicily From Aeneas to Augustus: New Approaches in Archaeology and History*. Edinburgh. 97–196.
- Lichtenberger, A. et al. (eds.). 2012. *Das Diadem der hellenistischen Herrscher. Übernahme, Transformation oder Neuschöpfung eines Herrschaftszeichens?* Bonn.
- Moloney, E. 2014. "Philippus in acie tutior quam in theatro fuit... (Curtius 9, 6, 25): The Macedonian Kings and Greek Theatre," in E. Csapo et al. (eds.), *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B.C.* Berlin and Boston. 231–248.
- Monoson, S.S. 2012. "Dionysius I and Sicilian Theatrical Traditions in Plato's *Republic*: Representing Continuities Between Democracy and Tyranny," in K. Bosher (ed.), *Theater Outside Athens: Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy*. Cambridge. 156–172.
- Morgan, K. A. 2015. *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford and New York.
- Mossé, C. 2006. "Plutarch and the Sicilian tyrants," in S. Lewis (ed.), *Ancient Tyranny*. Edinburgh. 188–96.
- Muccioli, F. 1999. *Dionisio II: storia e tradizione letteraria*. Bologna.
- Müller, S. 2010. "In the Shadow of His Father: Alexander, Hermolaus, and the Legend of Philip," in E. Carney and D. Ogden (eds.), *Philip II and Alexander the Great: Father and Son, Lives and Afterlives*. Oxford and New York. 25–32.
- 2014. *Alexander, Makedonien und Persien*. Berlin.
- 2015. "A History of Misunderstandings? Macedonian Politics and Persian Prototypes in Greek Polis-Centered Perspective," in R. Rollinger and E. van Dongen (eds.), *Mesopotamia in the Ancient World: Impact, Continuities, Parallels*. Münster. 459–480.
- 2016. *Die Argeaden: Geschichte Makedoniens bis zum Zeitalter Alexanders des Großen*. Paderborn.
- 2017. "The artistic king: reflections on a *Topos* in Second Sophistic Historiography," in T. Howe, S. Müller, and R. Stoneman (eds.), *Ancient Historiography on War & Empire*. Oxford and Philadelphia. 250–261.
- Olbrycht, M. J. 2010. "Macedonia and Persia," in J. Roisman and I. Worthington (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*. Malden, MA and Oxford. 342–369.
- 2014. "The Diadem in the Achaemenid and Hellenistic Periods." *Anabasis* 5: 177–187.
- Pownall, F. 2010. "The Symposia of Philip II and Alexander III of Macedon: The View from Greece," in E. Carney and D. Ogden (eds.), *Philip II and Alexander the Great: Father and Son, Lives and Afterlives*. Oxford and New York. 55–65.
- 2013. "Philistos (556)," in I. Worthington (ed.), *Brill's New Jacoby* (on-line).
- 2014. "Callisthenes in Africa: The Historian's Role at Siwah and in the Proskynesis Controversy," in P. Bosman (ed.), *Alexander in Africa, Acta Classica Supplementum* 5: 56–71.

- 2017. “The horse and the stag: Philistus’ view of tyrants,” in T. Howe, S. Müller, and R. Stoneman (eds.), *Ancient Historiography on War & Empire*. Oxford and Philadelphia. 62–78.
- forthcoming. “Liberation Propaganda as a Legitimizing Principle in Warfare: Dionysius I as an Antecedent to Philip and Alexander of Macedon,” in K. Ruffing, S. Fink, and K. Droß-Krüpe (eds.), *Societies at War: Proceedings of Tenth Symposium of the Melammu Project*. Münster.
- Reinhold, M. 1970. *History of Purple as a Status Symbol in Antiquity*. Brussels.
- Rhodes, P. J. and R. Osborne. 2003. *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404–323 BC*. Oxford and New York.
- Roisman, J. 2017. *The Classical Art of Command: Eight Greek Generals Who Shaped the History of Warfare*. Oxford and New York.
- Sabattini, C. 1989. “Leptine di Siracusa. Potere e consenso all’epoca di Dionisio I,” *RSA*: 19: 7–65.
- Sanders, L. J. 1987. *Dionysius I of Syracuse and Greek Tyranny*. London / New York / Sydney.
- 1990–1991. “From Dionysius to Augustus: Some Thoughts on the *Nachleben* of Dionysius I of Syracuse,” *Kokalos* 36–37: 111–137.
- 1991. “Dionysius I of Syracuse and the Origins of the Ruler cult in the Greek World,” *Historia* 40: 275–287.
- 1995. “Theopompus and the Dionysian Empire.” *EMC/CV* 14: 337–353.
- Sekunda, N.V. 2009. “Philistus and Alexander’s Empire (Plutarch, *Vita Alexandri* 8.3),” in J. Pigoń (ed.), *The Children of Herodotus: Greek and Roman Historiography and Related Genres*. Newcastle. 181–186.
- Shear, J.L. 2011. *Polis and Revolution: Responding to Oligarchy in Classical Athens*. Cambridge and New York.
- Sheridan, B. 2012. “Nikoboule (127),” in I. Worthington (ed.), *Brill’s New Jacoby* (on-line).
- Shrimpton, G. S. 1991. *Theopompus the Historian*. Montreal and Kingston.
- Smith, R. R. R. 1988. *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*. Oxford.
- Sordi, M. 1983. “Alessandro Magno e l’eredità di Siracusa,” *Aevum* 57: 14–23.
- Spawforth, T. 2007. “The Court of Alexander the Great between Europe and Asia,” in A. J. S. Spawforth (ed.), *The Court and Court Society in Ancient Monarchies*. Cambridge. 82–120.
- 2012. “The Pamphleteer Ehippus, King Alexander and the Persian Royal Hunt,” *Histos* 6: 169–213.
- Weber, G. 2009. “The Court of Alexander the Great as Social System,” in W. Heckel and L. A. Tritle (eds.), *Alexander the Great: A New History*. Malden, MA and Oxford. 83–98.
- Worthington, I. 2004. *Alexander the Great: Man and God*. Rev. ed. Harlow, Essex.
- 2008. *Philip II of Macedonia*. New Haven and London.