

Maxim M. Kholod\*

# The Cults of Alexander the Great in the Greek Cities of Asia Minor

DOI 10.1515/klio-2016-0041

**Summary:** The paper deals with the cults of Alexander the Great in the Greek cities of Asia Minor (on the coast and the nearby islands). The author argues that although some cults in these cities could be set up after the Macedonian king's death, at least most known to us (or supposed) cults of Alexander in them were instituted still in his lifetime, in all likelihood, in 324–323 BC. It seems that the cults of the king were established only in a certain, probably far from overwhelming, number of the Greek cities of Asia Minor in this period. In turn, it should be believed that the *do ut des* principle played an important role when these cities introduced such cults. At the same time, their institution was also caused by a sense of gratitude of the inhabitants of the Greek cities of Asia Minor to Alexander for the liberation of them from the unpopular power of both the Persians and the pro-Persian oligarchs or tyrants and, in addition, for those general and particular benefactions that were given by the Macedonian king to the communities.

**Keywords:** ruler cult, deification, Alexander the Great, Greek cities of Asia Minor, Alexandria

Arrian puts into Callisthenes' mouth the following words that he, according to the ancient author, uttered at the banquet in Bactra during the debate with Anaxarchus on Alexander's attempt to introduce the *proskynesis* for his Macedonian and Greek entourage in 327 BC:<sup>1</sup>

„Anaxarchus, I declare Alexander unworthy of no honours appropriate for a man; but men have used numerous ways of distinguishing all the honours which are appropriate for men and for gods; thus we build temples and erect images and set aside precincts for the gods, and we offer them sacrifices and libations and compose hymns to them, while eulogies are for men; but the most important dis-

---

1 rr. an. 4.11.2–4. The whole speech: 4.11.2–9. Cf. Curt. 8.5.14–19.

---

\*Kontakt: Maxim M. Kholod, St. Petersburg State University, Institute of History, Dept. of History of Ancient Greece and Rome, Mendeleevskaya line 5, 199034 St. Petersburg, Russia, E-Mail: mmkholod@yandex.ru; m.holod@spbu.ru

tion concerns the matter of obeisance. At greeting men receive a kiss, but what is divine, I suppose because it is seated above us and we are forbidden even to touch it, is for that very reason honoured by obeisance; dances, too, are held for the gods and paeans sung in their praise. In this distinction there is nothing surprising, since among the gods themselves all are not honoured in the same way; and what is more, there are different honours for the heroes, distinct again from those paid to gods. It is not, therefore, proper to confuse all this, by raising mortals to extravagant proportions by excesses of honour, while bringing the gods, as far as men can, down to a demeaning and unfitting level by honouring them in the same way as men [...]“, translated by P. A. Brunt, Loeb.

Whatever one thinks about the degree of veracity of these as well as further words in the speech of Callisthenes, – whether they were fabricated entirely by Arrian himself or whether he altered them in his own way, relying on some information that originated in the age of the Macedonian king or appeared afterwards<sup>2</sup> – in this speech we find the expression of the classic religious theory that absolutely, or it is more correct to say almost absolutely, predominated in the Greek world before Alexander.<sup>3</sup> According to the theory, there is a clear-cut distinction between divine and human, and nobody of mortals can and must cross a boundary drawn between these two spheres. Also there is a strict boundary between gods and heroes, but such does not exist – incidentally, Callisthenes’ silence on that in the text of Arrian is significant – between heroes and human beings. Gods and heroes receive different honours which, in addition, are distinct from one another, appropriate to the particular case of each, but mortals are not allowed to receive such honours. Yet, no matter how Callisthenes – or, at any rate, many others at this time – defended the stability of this theory, its days were over: the deification of Alexander in the Greek cities that, in addition, most likely happened still during his lifetime, marked the beginning of the epoch of ruler cult that came to an end only with the victory of Christianity.

In this essay I do not intend to discuss the whole range of issues connected with Alexander’s apotheosis, the problem that is hotly debated in scholarship.<sup>4</sup> My

---

**2** For the degree of reliability of the speech of Callisthenes given by Arrian, see Bosworth (1995) 77–90 (with relevant literature); also see Billows (1995) 61–63; Bosworth (1996) 111. Of recent works, see, in particular, the following: Fredricksmeier (2003) 275; Olbrycht (2004) 38–39; Anson (2013) 110–112; Bowden (2013) 72–76; Pownall (2014) 61–65.

**3** In this connection, see, for example, the famous passage from Pindar’s *Nemea* (6.1–4).

**4** There is ample literature dealing with this problem. Apart from corresponding parts contained, it seems, in all modern biographies of Alexander as well as in works considering, in more or less detail, the issue of ruler worship in antiquity, there are, in addition, many studies that are specially devoted to Alexander’s deification. Survey of scholarship, see in: Seibert (1972) 192–202, 302–305; Marinovich (1993) 208–210 (in connection with the so called Exiles’ Decree). Among studies that

aim is more limited – to examine only its one aspect, namely the cults of Alexander in the Greek cities of Asia Minor (on the coast and the nearby islands). The examination of this issue seems important: it allows to contribute, at least to some extent, to our knowledge not only of the problem of Alexander's deification by the Greeks but also of another very debatable question – the relationship between him and the Greek cities of Asia Minor. Besides, the present state of research on Alexander's cults in these cities also stimulates consideration of this issue. The fact is that, apart from the corresponding part of the book „Gottmenschentum und Griechische Städte“ by Ch. Habicht published as far back as 1956 (and republished with some supplements and changes in 1970),<sup>5</sup> there is no study that examines this issue so thoroughly, to my knowledge.<sup>6</sup> Likewise, it should be pointed out that today the study of Habicht can no longer be regarded – at least as far as the issue in question is concerned – as properly satisfactory: despite this study's doubtless value, it is partly outdated, while a number of Habicht's ideas appear unconvincing (which, as will be shown below, in some cases has been rightly demonstrated by other scholars) and need to be reconsidered.

\*\*\*

Let us begin with a consideration of evidence that we possess on the cults of Alexander in the Greek cities of Asia Minor.<sup>7</sup>

---

appeared after Seibert's survey or were left out of his account, see, in particular, the following: Habicht (1970) 17–36, 245–252; Edmunds (1971) 363–391; Atkinson (1973) 310–335; Jaschinski (1981) 93–119; Badian (1981) 27–71; Bosworth (1988) 278–290; Cawkwell (1994) 263–272; Badian (1996) 11–26; Hammond (1999) 103–115; Blackwell (1999) 151–155; Fredricksmeier (2003) 251–278; Dreyer (2009) 218–234; Anson (2013) 83–120.

5 Habicht (1956); Habicht (1970) 17–28, 245–246.

6 Although a number of critical notes by some modern historians on Habicht's thoughts are important (for these notes, see below), they, of course, cannot be compared with his study as regards details. Nor can part of B. Dreyer's essay be regarded as comparable; in fact, he almost completely repeats Habicht's ideas on the subject; see Dreyer (2009) 223–228.

7 Note that below I shall leave aside the evidence belonging to the reign of Philip II, namely the information that his statue was placed in the temple of Artemis at Ephesus (Arr. an. 1.17.11) and that there were altars to Zeus Philippius at Eresus on Lesbos (Ellis-Evans [2012] 204–209, A 3, ll.4–5). Although these pieces of evidence (either both or one of them) have been rather often given as arguments for the existence of Philip's cults in these cities (for instance, see Habicht [1970] 14–16, 245; Fredricksmeier [1979] 51–52, 60–61, n. 58; Fredricksmeier [1981] 146–148; Dreyer [2009] 225), I do not incline to agree with this opinion. The view that Philip was worshipped in the Artemisium as a temple-sharing god (σύνναος θεός) is not convincing: Arrian names his statue not as an ἄγαλμα (the term used to designate a cult statue) but as an εἰκὼν (the term used, as a rule, for a profane image), and this fact allows to hold the statue to be not more a token of the Ephesians' gratitude to Philip, presumably for their liberation (or for some help in such an event) from Persian domination during the military operations waged by the Macedonian expeditionary force in Asia Minor in 336–335 BC. As to the altars to Zeus Philippius at Eresus, they most likely should be

**The Ionian League.** The existence of Alexander's cult in the Ionian League is attested by the fact of regular celebration of the *Alexandreia*, a pan-Ionian festival in honour of the Macedonian king. The *Alexandreia* most likely were celebrated on Alexander's birthday and included, among other things, probably a procession and offering of sacrifices (IErythrai 504, ll.5–6<sup>8</sup> = Kotsidu 198, E 1 [268–262 BC]) as well as undoubtedly contests (IErythrai 30, ll.22–23 [270–260 BC]; 87, l.6 [3rd–2nd cent. BC];<sup>9</sup> SEG 46.422, ll.8–10 [2nd–1st cent. BC];<sup>10</sup> IErythrai 89a, ll.6–7 [after 31 BC]). At the time of Strabo the festival was always held in a grove consecrated to Alexander, between Erythrae and Teos (Strab. 14.31.644). But at first (and for rather a long period) it was celebrated in various cities of the Ionian League – either alternately<sup>11</sup> or already from the very beginning in one or another city on more or less long-term basis: at least at a certain moment in the 2nd–1st centuries BC,

---

regarded as an indication of the worship of not Philip as Zeus but Zeus as Philip's protector. It is possible that these altars were set up by the Eresians in acknowledgement of Philip's help in the overthrow of the 'first' tyrannical regime at Eresus perhaps in the same 336 BC. On the Eresian tyrants of the 4th century BC, see more recently Dmitriev (2004) 354–357; Kholod (2008) 98–101; Ellis-Evans (2012) 183–185, 189–201. So, in my opinion, there is nothing that can testify of Philip's cults in the Greek cities of Asia Minor. A similar view, see, in particular, Taeger (1957) 174; Badian (1981) 40–41; Walbank (1984) 90; Badian (1996) 13; Worthington (2008) 231; cf. Kotsidou (2000) 244, L; \*343, E (commentaries); Anson (2013) 86.

**8** A decree of the Ionian League, from Clazomenae, in honour of Antiochus I and his son. [πομπή(?) καὶ θυσίαν is the restoration of L. and J. Robert of l.6 that appears to me rather grounded; at least the restoration [ἡμέραν τὴν γενεῆς]ἱαν given in OGIS 222 is impossible, for in such a case γενέθλιον would be needed. See Robert (1959) 228. But it seems highly probable that this festival was celebrated indeed on Alexander's birthday. See Magie (1950) I 66; Habicht (1970) 17; Dreyer (2009) 223; besides, see below.

**9** L. Robert, in my view, is right (although he provides no argumentation in such a connection) believing that the *Alexandreia* mentioned here is a festival of the Ionian League and not a local festival held at Erythrae. See Robert (1929) 148; cf. the commentary on IErythrai 87. True, since Erythrae was a member of the Ionian League and hence could take part in the common *Alexandreia* each time, I see no reason for the establishment by the Erythraeans also their own analogous festival in honour of Alexander. Therefore Habicht's doubts on that (as well as Dreyer's who follows him) seem strange. See Habicht (1970) 19; Dreyer (2009) 224; cf. Magie (1950) II 868, n. 51.

**10** An inscription from Messene recording, among other things, the victory of an athlete in the *Alexandreia* celebrated by the Ionian League at Smyrna. On this inscription, see Habicht (2000) 126; Gauthier (2000) 634–635; Herrmann (2002) 231–232.

**11** If the restoration of ll.24–26 of the same inscription from Clazomenae (see above) occurring in OGIS 222 ([ἐπειδὴν δὲ ἐπανάεθ]ωσιν αἱ πρεσβεῖαι, τὴμ πόλιν, [ἐν ἧ ἄν συντελέσωμεν τὴν θυσίαν τῶν Ἀλεξανδρείων, [παρακαλεῖν πάντας δήμ]ους κτλ) is correct. The idea that at first the *Alexandreia* were held in the cities of the Ionian League alternately is admitted by Magie (1950) I 66; Habicht (1970) 17; Habicht (2000) 126; Dreyer (2009) 223; but see Gauthier (2000) 634–635; cf. Herrmann (2002) 232. At the same time, see the commentary on IErythrai 504, where it is noted

before the age of Strabo, Smyrna is evidenced as a place of, it seems, regular celebrations of the *Alexandreia* by the Ionians (SEG 46.422, ll.8–10).<sup>12</sup>

**Individual cities.** It is highly probable that the civic cult of Alexander is attested for Ilium: an inscription of the 1st century AD refers to the tribe *Alexandris* presumably named after the Macedonian king (Iliion 122, l.1 = Kotsidu 205, E).<sup>13</sup> Besides, basing on the statements of a number of ancient authors that Alexander refounded Smyrna (Plin. nat. 5.118; Paus. 7.5.1; Aristeid. 20.7,20; 21.4 Keil),<sup>14</sup> it is possible to suppose that there was his cult in the city as the founder.<sup>15</sup> Alexander's cult at Erythrae is evidenced several times: an epigraphic document which in relevant part is dated to ca. 270 BC mentions the sale of the priesthood of „King Alexander“ (βασιλέως Ἀλεξάνδρου) (IErythrai 201, l.a78 = Kotsidu 235, E 1); an inscription of 188–150 BC recording the city's expenditures on sacrifices refers also to the money for sacrifices to „Alexander“ (Ἀλεξάνδρωι) (IErythrai 207, l.90 = Kotsidu 198, E 2);<sup>16</sup> in addition, as is follows from one more inscription, the priest

---

that such an idea contradicts to Strabo's indication of the place of the *Alexandreia*'s celebration. However, this contradiction, it seems, can be easily removed by the suggestion that here we are dealing with some changes happening with time.

**12** The word *συντελούμενα* (praes.) in l.9 of this inscription appears to indicate that the *Alexandreia* were held at Smyrna regularly. See Gauthier (2000) 635. It is unclear how long it celebrated in this city. Nevertheless, if the idea that at first the *Alexandreia* were held in the cities of the Ionian League alternately is correct, one can suggest that later, from a date, the festival begun to celebrate only in a certain city (immediately at Smyrna?) and then, by the time of Strabo, already in the grove consecrated to Alexander.

**13** Habicht (1970) 21; Dreyer (2009) 224; besides, see Kotsidou (2000) 205, E (commentary). In turn, see the commentary on Iliion 122, where it is pointed out that since another inscription mentions the tribe *Panthois* named so after the Trojan hero *Panthous* (Iliion 123, l.1), it is not ruled out that the tribe *Alexandris* derived its name not from the Macedonian king but from Alexander-Paris. However, taking into account the benefactions that Ilium received from Alexander (see below), such a suggestion seems unconvincing. In addition, we know the name of another tribe of Ilium, *Attalis*, that was by no means of mythological origin (Iliion 121, with commentary). The supposed connection of the tribe *Alexandris* with the Macedonian king and not with Paris cannot be also denied by the discovery at Ilium of a block with the inscription ΔΗΙΦΟ: it is groundless to believe that this is not a certain reference to *Deiphobus* son of *Priam* but to a tribe of Ilium named after him. On the block with the inscription, see Rose (1993) 105. In general, cf. Cohen (1995) 152–153. Besides, according to W. Leschhorn, it is possible that the presumable cult of Alexander in Ilium was that of its founder. See Leschhorn (1984) 213. Nevertheless, the scholar's suggestion, in my opinion, is rather weak: while the existence of the tribe probably named after Alexander does not necessarily imply just this, it is significant that there are no further grounds for such an idea.

**14** The same legend is displayed also on the city's coins of the Imperial period (mid-2nd – 3rd cent. AD); for this, see in detail: Dahmen (2007) 27–28, 83–84, 129–130, Pl. 15.

**15** Stewart (1993) 420.

**16** On the idea that these sacrifices were connected not with the cult of Alexander in the Ionian League, as U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff has believed (Wilamowitz-Möllendorff [1909] 51; simi-

of „Alexander the God“ (θεοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου) exercised his functions at Erythrae as late as the 3rd century AD (IErythrai 64, l.7 = Kotsidu 235, E 2). Next, the existence of Alexander’s cult at Teos is supposed on the basis of M. I. Rostovtzeff’s the following restoration of l.12 of a list of kings inscribed in the mid-2nd century BC (OGIS 246): [Ἀλεξάνδρου] Θεοῦ Φιλίππου<sup>17</sup> However, taking into account the remaining letters in the lacuna, such a restoration appears unsound; also it is disputable that this inscription originated just at Teos.<sup>18</sup> All this, of course, does not exclude the possibility that there was the civic cult of Alexander in the city but, as is evident, we have no doubtless information about that. As to Ephesus, it seems that we can assume the existence of the cult of Alexander in it – in addition, still during his lifetime – on the basis of our literary tradition. We have the account of Artemidorus (flor. ca. 100 BC),<sup>19</sup> cited by Strabo, according to which Alexander promised to the Ephesians to compensate all expenditures, both past and future, on the rebuilding of the temple of Artemis under the condition that his name should appear in a dedicatory inscription; nevertheless, the Ephesians rejected such an offer, and one of them claimed „that it is not befitting for a god to dedicate offerings to gods“ (ὡς οὐ πρόπει θεῶ θεοῖς ἀναθήματα κατασκευάζειν) (Strab. 14.1.22.641). Although this story has anecdotal nature, there seems to be no reason to doubt the historical veracity of the information it contains.<sup>20</sup> Furthermore, the existence of Alexander’s cult at Ephesus (in the Imperial period though) is documented epigraphically: an inscription dated to 102–117 AD in honour of T. Statilius Crito, the influential physician of this time, records, among other things, that he was the priest of „Alexander the King“ (Ἀλεξάνδρου βασιλέως) (IEphesos 719, ll.8–9 = Kotsidu 245, E). The point that the cult of Alexander existed also at Magnesia-on-the-Maeander, is presumably attested by a reference to the Alexandria which occurs at the very beginning of an inscription concerning the institution of the

---

larly: Magie [1950] II 868, n. 51) but just with the civic cult existing at Erythrae, see Robert (1929) 148–149; Habicht (1970) 19, 93–94; Dreyer (2009) 224. Cf. Kotsidou (2000) 198, E 1–2 (commentary).

<sup>17</sup> Rostovtzeff (1935) 62.

<sup>18</sup> Habicht (1970) 20; Dreyer (2009) 224; Kotsidou (2000) 198, E (commentary). In turn, see F. Piejko’s convincing restoration of l.12 of the inscription: Δημητρίου θεοῦ Φιλᾶ[δέλφου] (he argues that Demetrius II Nicator is referred to here); by the way, it is remarkable that the scholar even does not mention the indicated restoration of Rostovtzeff. See Piejko (1982) 129–130.

<sup>19</sup> For general information on him and his works, see Berger (1896) 1329; Gärtner (1979) 617; also see recently Schiano (2010).

<sup>20</sup> Scholars, as a rule, have confidence in this story because of, among other things, Artemidorus’ high authority. See, in particular, Habicht (1970) 18; Badian (1966) 25; Dreyer (2009) 225. The story’s interpretation by Stewart doubting the historicity of the information in it is interesting but, in my opinion, unconvincing. See Stewart (1993) 99.

festival in honour of Artemis Leucophryene at the city ca. 207/6 BC (I. Magnesia 16, l.1 = Kotsidu 251, E). Yet, since the top of the stone is destroyed, it is difficult to say in what connection the *Alexandreia* are mentioned in the document. But if one takes into consideration the fact that Magnesia-on-the-Maeander was not a member of the Ionian League, it is possible to suggest that in this case we meet with the *Alexandreia* held by not the League<sup>21</sup> but by the Magnesian community itself. At the same time, it is not ruled out too that here we are dealing with a reference to the *Alexandreia* celebrated by the Ionian League, something in organizational matters of which the Magnesians merely borrowed for their own new festival and correspondingly reflected the fact in the present document.<sup>22</sup> The existence of the civic cult of Alexander at Priene appears to be attested by mentioning of the *Alexandreion*, possibly his shrine,<sup>23</sup> in an inscription of the second half of the 2nd century BC; as we learn from it, the *Alexandreion* became dilapidated by this time and was repaired with private wealth (IPriene 108, ll.75, 78–79 = IPriene<sup>2</sup> 64 = Kotsidu 256, E).<sup>24</sup> Lastly, we have one more evidence for Alexander's cult in the Greek cities on the coast of Asia Minor: in the early 3rd century AD Bargylia refurbished a statue of „Alexander the God“ (θεὸν Ἀλέξανδρον) located in the gymnasium that was restored at the moment as well, and, as a result, the cult of the Macedonian king was revived in the city (OGIS 3 = IErythrai 620 = Kotsidu 288, E, with commentary; also see IIsasos 616, ll.23–24, presumably from Bargylia).<sup>25</sup> As regards the islands of the Eastern Aegean, the cults of Alexander are attested for

**21** As is suggested, for instance, in Syll.<sup>3</sup> 557, Anm. 1; similarly: Robert (1929) 148; Taeger (1957) 221, Anm. 66; cf. Kotsidou (2000) 251, E (commentary).

**22** Cf. Habicht (1970) 21; id. (2000) 126; Dreyer (2009) 227.

**23** It is also possible that it was a stoa or a gymnasium. See Magie (1950) II 893, n. 100. But even in this case one must not exclude a certain connection of such a building with Alexander's cult. Cf. Kotsidou (2000) 256, E (commentary); IPriene<sup>2</sup> 64 (commentary).

**24** It seems that there are no strong grounds for the identification of the *Alexandreion* with any building discovered in Priene. According to F. Hiller von Gaertringen (see his commentary on IPriene 108), the *Alexandreion* can be identified with the remains of a shrine („Heilige Haus“) discovered on the West Gate Street; at least, as the scholar writes, just at this place the archaeologists have found part of Alexander's marble statuette that may have been related to his cult. Similarly: Habicht (1970) 18; Dreyer (2009) 227. Nevertheless, as B. S. Ridgway points out, the sum of 1000 drachmas spent, according to the inscription (IPriene 108, ll.78–79), on the *Alexandreion*'s repair is too large, taking into consideration the modesty of the discovered building. See Ridgway (1990) 122–123. On that issue, also see Kotsidou (2000) 256, E (commentary); IPriene<sup>2</sup> 205 (commentary). In turn, note F. Taeger's mistake who has written that this inscription refers to the *Alexandreia*. See Taeger (1957) 221, Anm. 66.

**25** On this, see too Habicht (1970) 20, 143–144; Dreyer (2009) 227. Besides, relatively recently at Iasus there was founded a base of altar dedicated to Alexander and Olympias (1st cent. BC–1st cent. AD). See SEG 60.1110; Maddoli (2010) 129–131; for the historical interpretation, also see now Maddoli (2015) 137–143; Biraschi (2015) 145–161.

Rhodes and most probably for Cos.<sup>26</sup> A Coan fragmentary decree concerning a sacrifice, dated to ca. 250 BC, refers to an *Alexandreion*, perhaps, as in the case of Priene, the Macedonian king's shrine (Bosnakis/Hallof [2003] 13 = IG XII 4. 69, l.8).<sup>27</sup> In Rhodes the cult of Alexander is evidenced repeatedly: while a Rhodian inscription of the last quarter of the 3rd century BC mentions the priest of „Alexander“ (Ἀλεξάνδρου) (Segre [1941] 30, ll.13–14 = Kotsidu 149, E 1), a number of other epigraphical documents record the local *Alexandreia*. In all likelihood, at first this festival was autonomous (Lindos II 1. 197 f, l.5 = Kotsidu 149, E 2) but later, between ca. 156<sup>28</sup> and 129 BC (Lindos II 1. 233, ll.8–9 = Kotsidu 149, E 3), it was united with another festival, *Dionysia*, celebrated heretofore separately.<sup>29</sup> Despite

---

**26** However, if one takes into account the Aegean Sea as a whole, then the case of Thasos should be added to them: a Thasian inscription of the last quarter of the 4th century BC mentions, together with various local festivals, the *Alexandreia*. See Salviat (1958) 195, l.2 = Kotsidou (2000) 183, E. Note that among the pieces of our evidence it is chronologically the first mention of the *Alexandreia* (and, in addition, the earliest epigraphical evidence for Alexander's cult in a Greek city). When this festival was instituted, is unclear. But, in my opinion, it is most probable that its institution, like, in all likelihood, the institution of Alexander's cults in a number of other Greek communities (see below), should be dated to 324–323 BC. If the Thasian inscription appeared after the death of Alexander, then it is possible to suggest that his cult in Thasos was not abolished with the beginning of the Lamian War but continued to exist. It is not excluded that the further existence of the cult of the Macedonian king in Thasos was supported by Lysimachus who could influence the island very much, if not even controlled it directly, with time. For studies that discuss the use of the figure of Alexander by Lysimachus in his politics (and propaganda), see below. Incidentally, it is possible that a head of statue of the Roman period found on Thasos in 1985 is connected just with the local cult of Alexander: it is supposed that it is not merely the Macedonian king's image but even a copy of his original cult statue. See Stewart (1993) 283–284. In general on the cult of Alexander in Thasos, cf. Salviat (1958) 244–248; Habicht (1970) 251–252; Kotsidou (2000) 183, E (commentary); Mari (2008) 245–247, 268; Dreyer (2009) 228.

**27** It is not ruled out as well that this *Alexandreion*, like maybe the Prienean one, was a gymnasium or a stoa (having some link, according to the decree, with a *Ptolemaieion*). Yet, even if so, the context of the inscription shows that the *Alexandreion* (together with the *Ptolemaieion*) had certain religious functions and hence was most probably connected with the cult of Alexander in Cos. At the same time, that the Macedonian king's cult in the city was combined with that of Ptolemy I (Gauthier [2004] 637–638), in my opinion, is not necessarily. For Alexander's cult in Cos, cf. Grieb (2008) 178; Buraselis (2012) 261–262, n. 52; and especially, Bosnakis – Hallof (2003) 226–228; Gauthier (2004) 637–638; SEG 53.847; IG XII 4. 69 (commentaries on the inscription).

**28** The date of the last of the indicated inscriptions.

**29** On the separate existence of the *Alexandreia* and the *Dionysia*, see especially Habicht (1970), 26. However, K. Buraselis did not support such an idea. He suggests that the Rhodians instituting the *Alexandreia* possibly in the last decades of the 3rd century BC (in his opinion, in connection with the establishment or the renovation of Alexander's cult in the city) have united them with the *Dionysia* from the very beginning. See Buraselis (2012) 254–255, 261, n. 49. Yet, I believe that in the dedicatory epigram for Lysistratus son of Pythagoras (Lindos II 1. 197 f, l.5–6) these two festivals



such a combination, the cult of the Macedonian king did not amalgamate with that of Dionysus, and Alexander was never equated with this god.<sup>30</sup> It is significant that when mentioning the combined festival the *Alexandreia* preserved its own name and are recorded in all sources before *Dyonysia* (for instance, see *Lindos II* 1. 233, ll.8–9; *IGR* 4. 1116, ll.6–7; *IG XII* 1. 57, ll.8–9; 71, l.5).<sup>31</sup> The content of the festival should be mostly just supposed; it is possible to speak only that it included tragic and comedy contests (*Kotsidu* 149, E 3:1,3,5,7,8) and apparently chariot races (*IGR* 4. 1116, l.6–7 = *Kotsidu* 149, E 3:2).

Thus the evidence of the cults of Alexander in the Greek cities of Asia Minor is not scarce (not abundant though). At the same time, it should not but observe that, except one account of our literary tradition that appears to indicate the existence of the cult of the Macedonian king at Ephesus yet in his lifetime, the rest of the evidence, epigraphical, belongs to the later period, from ca. the second third of the 3rd century BC to the early 3rd century AD. Also it is noticeable that all this evidence reveals one or another cult of Alexander as already existing and provides no information on when and in what connection exactly it was set up. Hence in view of such a state of evidence it seems important to try to clear up the date as well as the reasons of the establishment of Alexander's cults in these cities.

Habicht has argued that the institution of each known to us cult of Alexander in the Greek cities of Asia Minor is related to the Macedonian king's lifetime and has offered two arguments in favour of this idea. First, the *Alexandreia* of the Ionian League had to be established, like the festival instituted in honour of Antiochus I, on Alexander's birthday, consequently during his lifetime, for, as F. Jacoby has shown in case of the γενέσια,<sup>32</sup> the festivals in honour of dead persons were celebrated on the anniversary of a man's death; and these *Alexandreia*, once introduced, naturally continued to be held on the same day after the Macedonian king's death as well. Second, Habicht draws attention to the designation of Alexander's priests in some cases: in the scholar's opinion, the use of the title „King“ also speaks that these cults were set up during the reign of Alexander. On the contrary, there are no grounds to suggest that the cults of the Macedonian king in these cities were established after his death. According to Habicht, it is possible to believe *a priori* that the civic cults of Alexander in the cities of the Ionian League were introduced almost simultaneously and together with them a common festival

---

are named not as united (as in the interpretation of Buraselis) but as separate: this seems to be proved by the mention of Bacchus before Alexander in l.5, a fact that does not occur in the designations of the combined festival (the *Alexandreia* are mentioned always before the *Dionysia*).

<sup>30</sup> Habicht (1970) 27; Dreyer (2009) 227; cf. Taeger (1957) 218–220.

<sup>31</sup> The relevant epigraphical material is collected in: *Kotsidou* (2000) 149, E 3.

<sup>32</sup> Jacoby (1944) 65–75.

of the League, the *Alexandria*, was set up, too. Moreover, as the scholar points out, it is natural to think that the institution of Alexander's cults in the other Greek cities of Asia Minor happened at the same moment. Habicht believes that there are only two dates in Alexander's lifetime when it could take place: (1) 334–333; (2) 324 BC. However, stating the lack of evidence for the Greek cities of Asia Minor in connection with the events that are related to the deification of Alexander at the end of his reign, the scholar rejects the latter date. At the same time, the former one, in Habicht's view, fits very well for the introduction of Alexander's cults in these cities: this is supported by a number of pieces of evidence, including the fact that several Greek communities of Asia Minor, for instance Priene, regarded 334 BC as the beginning of a new era. The scholar notes that in such a case the main reason of so high honours bestowed on Alexander is obvious: it was a sign of gratitude of the Greeks of Asia Minor to Alexander for their liberation from the Persian yoke; besides, doing so, some cities could be motivated also by the particular benefactions that were given to them by the Macedonian king.<sup>33</sup>

This theory of Habicht has been criticized by E. Badian who has at the same time expressed his view on the issue. Badian points out that the first argument of Habicht is insufficiently forceful, because there is no reason to necessarily believe that the festivals in honour of a dead person were never instituted on his birthday; Jacoby's conclusions which have been referred to by Habicht do not extend – no matter how to value them – beyond the γενέσια. But, in Badian's opinion, the second argument of Habicht seems more valid (in contrast to his additional argument, according to which the beginning of new eras in a number of Greek cities of Asia Minor in 334–333 BC points to the existence of Alexander's cult in his lifetime). If, as Badian writes, we accept Habicht's second argument, it turns out that some Greek cities of Asia Minor indeed worshipped Alexander as a god during his lifetime. However, it is hard to determine in what moment of the reign of the Macedonian king the first introduction of his cult happened. The position of Habicht who suggests for that only two dates and, in addition, thinks that all the cults of Alexander were set up in the Greek cities of Asia Minor at or about the same time is unconvincing for Badian. He finds no grounds to deny the possibility of the institution of Alexander's cult in one or another Greek city of Asia Minor at any time between 334 and 323 BC. Likewise, in view of Badian, there is no need to believe that these cults were established in all these cities simultaneously; it is quite probable that Alexander's cult was spreading gradually from one city to another, and, moreover, it is not necessarily that it existed in every Greek city of Asia Minor by the Macedonian king's death. Badian inclines to believe that the process of instituting Alexander's cults began not earlier than the last four years of his life. This

---

<sup>33</sup> Habicht (1970) 22–25, 245–246.

idea, according to him, can be supported by the following considerations. First, it is difficult to imagine that the oracle of the Branchidae, which proclaimed the Macedonian king's divine sonship in the winter of 332/1 BC, did so two years after the Ionians had instituted in their cities his cults. Second, the famous inscription from Priene that records the settlement enacted by Alexander in relation to this city in, as the scholar supposes, ca. 330 BC<sup>34</sup> gives no evidence that he was recognized here as a god. Third, the speech of Callisthenes at Bactra in 327 BC, which, in Badian's opinion, is close to its original, implies that at this moment there were as yet no cults of Alexander.<sup>35</sup>

A. Stewart has expressed a somewhat different view on the issue in question that, in my opinion, also deserves to be considered.<sup>36</sup> He has advanced the following arguments against the hypothesis of Habicht that Alexander's cults were set up in the Greek cities of Asia Minor in 334–333 BC as a token of gratitude for their liberation: first, none of the known to us cult titles of the Macedonian king describe him as liberator; second, although liberation was one of the official slogans of Alexander's expedition, there is no indication that the Greeks of Asia Minor hailed him as their liberator; third, there is no hint in our sources that the introduction of the cults of the Macedonian king in the Greek cities of Asia Minor happened right after this „liberation“. Besides, as Stewart points out, if such honours had been granted at this moment or during the next decade, it is unclear why they were not referred to as precedents in the debates on Alexander's deification in the Greek Mainland in 324–323 BC. At the same time, Stewart inclines to believe that the Greeks of Asia Minor worshipped Alexander as a god yet in his lifetime and suggests for that the end of the Macedonian king's reign: the scholar finds no reason for granting Alexander divine honours after his death.<sup>37</sup>

With the above-cited views of the historians in mind, we can proceed further and utter now our thoughts on the issue under consideration in this essay. To begin with, it is necessary to answer the following question: should we date the establishment of Alexander's cults in the Greek cities of Asia Minor indeed to the

---

34 On the dating of this inscription, see below.

35 Badian (1981) 60–63. Cf. Badian (1996) 24–26.

36 Note that, insofar as we are able to judge, other scholars who touch on the issue in their works limit themselves to only several phrases in this connection and their ideas ultimately go back to the corresponding views of either Habicht (see, for instance, Taeger [1957] 221; Hamilton [1974] 140; Hammond [1988] 82; Chaniotis [2003] 435) or Badian (see, in particular, Walbank [1984] 90; Fredricksmeyer [2003] 276; Nawotka [2003] 33; Cartledge [2004] 247) or are contented sometimes only with the assumption that Alexander's cults were instituted in the Greek cities of Asia Minor still in his lifetime (of such works, see, for example, the following: Lane Fox [1973] 130; Bosworth [1988] 289; Christesen – Murray [2010] 443; Anson [2013] 117).

37 Stewart (1993) 98–102, 419–420.

period of his reign? Like Badian, I regard the first argument of Habicht that the Alexandria of the Ionian League had to be celebrated on the Macedonian king's birthday and hence to go back to his lifetime as insufficiently forceful. True, the festivals in honour of the deified Hellenistic monarchs were mostly held on their birthdays and therefore it is quite possible to believe that the Alexandria of the Ionians were celebrated on such a day too.<sup>38</sup> However, this is not to say that the Alexandria had to be necessarily instituted during the Macedonian king's lifetime: it is known that sometimes the celebrations in honour of a deified ruler could take place on his birthday even if his cult was set up posthumously.<sup>39</sup> In turn, in contrast to Badian, I disagree with the second argument of Habicht as well, i. e. with his argument stemming from the use of the title „King“ in the cults of Alexander at Erythrae and Ephesus (see above). In my opinion, such a designation of him in these cases cannot be accepted as a reliable indicator of time: the fact that Alexander with the title „King“ is mentioned in the epigraphical documents from the Greek cities of Asia Minor not only during his lifetime but also after his death (Priene: IPriene<sup>2</sup> 1, 1.1 [ca. 285 BC]; 149, 1.1 [most likely 334 BC];<sup>40</sup> Colophon: Meritt (1935) 1, 1.6 [314–307/6 BC];<sup>41</sup> Iasus: Iasos 30, 1.7 [333–323 BC]; Chios: Rhodes – Osborne [2003] 84A, ll.1,18 [undoubtedly 332 BC];<sup>42</sup> Mytilene: Rhodes – Osborne [2003] 83B, ll.28,45,47 [probably 332 BC];<sup>43</sup> Eresus: Ellis-Evans [2012] 204–209, A 1, ll.10,25; B 4, 1.18 [306–301 BC]<sup>44</sup>) makes it quite clear that there was no rigid rule in such a connection. Furthermore, just this appears to be proved by the fact how

---

**38** Until relatively recently it seemed that we possess a piece of evidence supporting the existence of such a practice under Alexander. It is the following reconstruction of 1.46 of the well-known decree from Mytilene concerning the settlement of disputes in this city after returning exiles: ἀπυδόμενα τοῖς βασι[λῆος γενεθλίοισι κατ' ἐνιαυ]τον (OGIS 2 = Tod [1933–1948] 201). However, this reconstruction has been convincingly rejected by A. J. Heisserer who has proposed instead of it ἀπυδόμενα τοῖς βασι[λῆος τοῖς θεοῖσι κατ' ὀνιαυ]τον. See Heisserer (1980) 130. Heisserer's reconstruction is supported, for example, by Labarre (1996) 252–253, no. 2. Cf. Rhodes – Osborne (2003) 85B, where, except βασι[λῆος], the rest of the reconstruction of 1.46 is not given. The *basileis* were the magistrates of Mytilene attested in this (ll.1, 9, 13) as well as in other Mytilenean inscriptions. On the dating of the inscription, see below.

**39** See Habicht (1998) 38–41 (in connection with a decree of Miletus concerning the birthday celebration of Eumenes II: IDidyma 488; cf. commentaries on this decree in: Bringmann – von Steuben [1995] 286, E; Kotsidou [2000] 276, E).

**40** For the dating of these Prienean inscriptions and for the former document's specific character, see below. Here it is worth noting only that the heading of IPriene<sup>2</sup> 1 where Alexander is mentioned with the title „King“ (1.1) is not part of the original document but was added by the Prieneans later, at the moment of the inscription's publication in ca. 285 BC. See Sherwin-White (1985) 81; IPriene<sup>2</sup> 1 (commentary).

**41** On the dating, see Robert (1936) 158–161; Meier (1959–1961) 69, with commentary.

**42** Kholod (2012) 26, where the opinion that this inscription can be dated to 334 is criticized.

**43** Kholod (2010a) 42–44 (with relevant literature).

differently Alexander is named in the case of his cult at Erythrae (unfortunately, we have a single epigraphical evidence for Ephesus and hence cannot draw any definite conclusion as regards this city): while one Erythraean inscription refers to Alexander with the title „King“ (IErythrai 201, l.a78), the other mentions him by name (IErythrai 207, l.90) and the third records the epithet „God“ (IErythrai 64, l.7); at the same time, it is hardly possible to suppose the existence of several civic cults of the Macedonian monarch at such a city as Erythrae, for which, in addition, there is no reason.

Both arguments of Habicht thus do not seem to me sufficiently persuasive. Yet, it does not follow from this that the thesis that Alexander's cults in the Greek cities of Asia Minor were established during his reign must be rejected. As has been noted, the existence of Alexander's cult still in his lifetime appears to be clearly attested in our literary tradition for Ephesus (see above). Besides, in my view, the following argument (which, I believe, is needed to be regarded as strong) also speaks in favour of the given thesis: it is unclear why the Greek cities of Asia Minor, more or less collectively, should bestow divine honors on Alexander, introducing his cults, when he had already passed away and therefore could be by no means helpful (or harmful) for them.<sup>45</sup> True, insofar as we are able to judge, the *do ut des* principle played an extremely important, if not decisive, role when the Greek communities offered divine honors to one or another ruler, at least in the early Hellenistic period: instituting ruler cult, the cities tried to establish a close relationship with a deified person and at the same time not only expressed their gratitude for his past services but (especially) showed their expectations of benefactions from him in the future.<sup>46</sup> Of course, in some cases the establishment of Alexander's cult by the Greeks of Asia Minor could take place also at a moment after his death (perhaps even much later): for instance, at Iasus at the age of Augustus (see above); in turn, if at Smyrna the cult of the Macedonian king as the founder really existed (see above), its introduction should be dated to a point later than his death, since there is every reason to believe that in reality the city was refounded by the efforts of Antigonos the One-Eyed and Lysimachus.<sup>47</sup> But when such cases

---

44 Although, as has been shown by A. Ellis-Evans, the new editor of the so called Tyrants Dossier from Eresus, it was inscribed in 306–301 BC as a whole (Ellis-Evans [2012] 188–189), it contains the documents of different times: concerning the trials of the ex-tyrants Agonippus and Eurysilaus (332 BC) (Ellis-Evans [2012] 204–209, A 3, ll.1–32; B 4, ll.1–33); concerning the first attempt of the descendants of Apollodorus, Hermon and Hiraeus, the ex-tyrants being in power before Agonippus and Eurysilaus, to return (324 BC) (A 3, ll.33–41; A 4, ll.1–20); concerning their second attempt (319 BC) (A 4, ll.21–28); and, finally, concerning the attempt of the sons of Agonippus and Eurysilaus to return (306–301 BC) (A 1, ll.1–40; A 4, ll.29–43).

45 Similarly: Stewart (1993) 102. Cf. Habicht (1970) 22.

46 Chaniotis (2003) 431–443; cf. Walbank (1984) 93–94; Mikalson (2006) 215.

happened in the Greek cities of Asia Minor, they, in all likelihood, were rare and each time resulted from some specific reasons that did the introduction of the cult of Alexander after his death profitable for those who took such a step.<sup>48</sup>

Hence, the aforesaid, in my view, allows to believe that the establishment of Alexander's cults in the Greek cities of Asia Minor must be dated to the period of his reign. At the same time, the idea of Habicht that most of these cities, if not all of them, were involved in this process seems hardly convincing. Rather it would be correct to speak about a certain, probably far from overwhelming, number of the Greek communities of Asia Minor that set up the cults of the Macedonian king in this period (and maybe about several cities which did so later): otherwise, it appears, one should wait for more pieces of corresponding evidence, first of all epigraphical, in view of the fact that, judging from the surviving information, Alexander's cults continued to exist in the Greek cities of Asia Minor over a very long time after the Macedonian king's death.

Let us now answer the next question: to what date exactly within the years of Alexander's reign should we relate the establishment of his cults in these cities? I would remind that Habicht believes that 334–333 BC, i. e. the time following the liberation of the Greek cities of Asia Minor by the Macedonians from the Persian yoke, are only suitable for that. However, in my opinion, such a view is hardly convincing, which has been noted by other scholars as well (see above).

At the same time, I do not incline to agree with a number of arguments given by these scholars against the hypothesis of Habicht. Indeed, I believe that it is difficult to regard the argument of Badian that if in Callisthenes' speech at Bactra

---

**47** On the refoundation of Smyrna, see Leschhorn (1984) 217–218; Cohen (1995) 180–183, 422–423 (with relevant literature).

**48** It seems that for the same Smyrna the claim that Alexander was its founder and possibly the establishment of his corresponding cult in it had to contribute to the enhancement of the city's prestige. When the legend attributing the refoundation of Smyrna to Alexander appeared, we do not know. However, taking into consideration that Strabo giving a rather detailed description of Smyrna (14.1.37.646) does not mention such a story and that in the other ancient writings it appears only from ca. the second half of the 1st century AD and begins to be displayed on coins of the city from ca. the mid-2nd century AD (see above), it is worth believing that the legend became to gain wide currency, if not originated, after the age of Strabo. In such a case it is possible to suggest that at Smyrna the cult of Alexander as the founder, if it actually existed, was established not earlier. For other cities, including those in Western Asia Minor (Alexandria Troas and Nicaea in Bythnia) which, like Smyrna (and, it seems, chiefly by the same reason), connected afterwards their foundations, contrary to reality though, with Alexander, see Leschhorn (1984) 217–222; Cohen (1995) 420–423. On the reflection of these local legends on civic coins of a number of cities (mainly in the 2nd–3rd centuries AD), see especially Dahmen (2007) 20–34, 52–55, 77–92, 101–102, 123–135, 141–142, Pl. 11–20, 24. That in some of these cities such legends could provoke the institution of the cults of Alexander as the founder, is impossible to exclude.

in 327 BC (see above) there is no mention of the institution of Alexander's cults in the Greek cities of Asia Minor, such cults did not exist yet, as persuasive: even if one leaves aside the mere consideration that Callisthenes being in the depths of Asia could not know about what was happening in the Greek cities of Asia Minor at this time, it is obvious that there is no waiting a comprehensive reflection of historical details from the speech composed either completely or partly by Arrian himself, even if presumably on the basis of some information going back to Alexander's age (see above). Besides, I cannot accept also two arguments of Stewart, according to whom the suggestion that Alexander's cults were set up in the Greek cities of Asia Minor still in 334–333 BC as a token of gratitude for their liberation is unsound because both of the known to us cult epithets of the Macedonian king which do not describe him as liberator and the lack of evidence that the Greeks of Asia Minor hailed him in such a capacity (see above). As to the first argument of Stewart, it seems impossible to draw any definite conclusion from those designations that we have in connection with the cults of Alexander in the Greek cities of Asia Minor: apart from the absence of absolute certainty that such designations were strictly connected with a particular cult and were not, so to speak, accidental (the above-indicated variety of Alexander's designations in his cult at Erythrae is noticeable), it must be also taken into account that later the granting of divine honours by a Greek community to one or another Hellenistic ruler who represented himself (at least officially) as the champion of its freedom was not always accompanied with giving him any specific cult epithet.<sup>49</sup> As to the second argument of Stewart, it is completely groundless: our sources clearly show the strong support of Alexander by most citizens of the overwhelming majority of Greek communities of Asia Minor when he or his officers freed them from the power of the Persians and the pro-Persian local oligarchic or tyrannical governments.<sup>50</sup>

Though, in my opinion, it is difficult to agree with these arguments of the scholars, their other arguments against Habicht's hypothesis that Alexander's cults were set up in the Greek cities of Asia Minor in 334–333 BC seem to me wholly convincing. First, there is no necessary connection between Alexander's deification and the interpretation by the Greek cities of Asia Minor of their liberation as the beginning of a new epoch, clearly reflected in the prescripts of a range of

---

<sup>49</sup> For instance, when Scepsis bestowed divine honors on Antigonos the One-Eyed in 311 BC (OGIS 6 = Kotsidu 214–215, E). It remains unclear what cult epithets of Alexander should be, in Stewart's opinion, in such a case, taking into account those that are known to us (from the material relating to the Greek cities) in connection with monarchs of the subsequent time. On the official epithets of Hellenistic rulers, including their cult ones, see now especially Muccioli (2013) 63–352.

<sup>50</sup> For that, see in detail: Kholod (2010 b) 265–282 (the Greek communities in Asia Minor); also see Kholod (2008) 44–123 (the cities both in Asia Minor and on the nearby islands). Cf. Marinovich (1993) 169–176; Nawotka (2003) 30–37.

Priene's decrees after 334 BC (IPriene 2–4, 6–7 = IPriene<sup>2</sup> 15–19: Πριηνέων αὐτονομῶν (ἐ)όντων): it is evident that in the Hellenistic period the introduction of a new city era was not always caused by the bestowing of divine honours on a ruler by one or another community. (Moreover, I believe, it is impossible at all to speak about the official establishment of new city eras in the Greek cities of Asia Minor, including Priene, under Alexander.<sup>51</sup>) Second, it is the proclamation of Alexander the son of Zeus by the oracle of Apollo at Didyma (the oracle of the Branchidae) only in late 332 BC (and possibly at the same moment the appearance of the similar pronouncement of the Erythraean prophetess) (Callisth. FGrH 124 F14 a p. Strab. 17.1.43.814),<sup>52</sup> a fact that is difficult to explain, if Alexander's cults had already been set up in the Ionian cities. (In addition, it is significant that both these reve-

---

**51** Indeed, except the case of Priene, there is no evidence that can be interpreted as an official introduction of new city eras in the Greek cities of Asia Minor: the instances of Miletus and Colophon given by Habicht in this connection are irrelevant. See Habicht (1970) 24. But even at Priene the autonomy formula occurring in its decrees after 334 BC was, it seems, hardly more than an accented statement by the Prieneans of their community's new status: it is significant that such a formula is contained in the prescripts of not each Prienean decree belonging to the period of the 330s–300 s BC (it is absent in: IPriene 4 b [„ca. 327/6“] = IPriene<sup>2</sup> 20 [„ca. 330–300“]; IPriene = IPriene<sup>2</sup> 5 [„shortly before 326/5“], although it is not ruled out that the formula was present in the partly damaged beginning of this inscription; IPriene 8 [„ca. 328/7“] = IPriene<sup>2</sup> 107 [„the 280 s“]; IPriene 10 [„4th cent.“] = IPriene<sup>2</sup> 7 [„ca. 334“]), a fact that would be strange, if in this case we were dealing with the indication of a functioning city era. Besides, if the supposed by C. V. Crowther different dating of a number of decrees of Priene related by Hiller von Gaertringen to Alexander's time (IPriene 3–4, 6–7 = IPriene<sup>2</sup> 16–19) is correct, then there remains only one Prienean decree with the autonomy formula belonging to this period (IPriene 2 = IPriene<sup>2</sup> 15), while the others, according to Crowther, should be dated to the 290s–280 s BC. See Crowther (1996) 195–238. It is clear that in such a case (and, at the same time, in view of the presence, if we accept the conclusions of Crowther, at least one decree without the autonomy formula belonging to Alexander's reign: IPriene<sup>2</sup> 7) it is hardly possible to regard the grounds for the idea of the official introduction of a new city era at Priene under the Macedonian king as sufficient. Moreover, according to Leschhorn, it seems, one cannot speak about the use in the Greek communities at this time of such a method of counting years as a new era; it gained ground in cities, including those that were situated in Western Asia Minor, later, under the Seleucids. See Leschhorn (1993) 8–13. For the case of Priene, cf. in general: Nawotka (2003) 32.

**52** The arrival of the Milesian (and apparently Erythraean) ambassadors with such news in all likelihood took place when Alexander came to Memphis after his journey to the oasis at Siwah (in the early spring of 331 BC): at Memphis the Macedonian king met a number of Greek embassies (Arr. an. 3.5.1), among which there may have been also the embassy from Miletus (as well as one from Erythrae). In order that the embassies could reach Memphis by this point, the pronouncement of the oracle at Didyma (and of the Erythraean prophetess) had to appear not later than the end of 332 BC. See Bosworth (1980) 271. Of recent works on this revelation of the oracle at Didyma and on the circumstances of its appearance, see the following: Nawotka (2010) 155–158; Anson (2013) 107; Pownall (2014) 58; and now especially: Sekunda (2014) 107–117.



lations proclaimed not the recognition of Alexander as a god but only his divine sonship.) Third, it is the strange absence in our sources, if one suggests that Alexander was deified in the Greek cities of Asia Minor already at the beginning of his expedition, of any mention (or even hint) of this for both 334–333 BC and the following time, at least up to the last years of his reign; nevertheless, had the cults of Alexander been actually introduced in 334–333 BC (or at a time later) in these cities, this fact surely could not but be referred to as a precedent during the debates on the deification of the Macedonian king taking place at Athens in 324 BC (and in view of the importance of such a reference, it is quite doubtful that it did not merely survive in the extant, not numerous though, pieces of evidence on these debates.<sup>53</sup>)

In the light of the above it is thus hardly possible to consider 334–333 BC the date of the establishment of Alexander's cults in the Greek cities of Asia Minor. Instead of these years, in my view, 324–323 BC when in accordance with the Macedonian king's wish, if not on his demand, the Greek states (perhaps including even Athens) began officially to pay divine honours to him fit that much better. I would remind that Habicht rejects this date for the introduction of the cults of Alexander in the Greek cities of Asia Minor for the reason that he did not find any confirmation of it in our sources. However, it appears that we possess at least one piece of evidence in this case, namely the episode given by Artemidorus/Strabo, concerning Alexander's intention to dedicate the temple of Artemis at Ephesus (see above). Indeed, in my opinion, it is incorrect to date this event (as scholars, including Habicht, have often done) to 334 BC when the Macedonian king stayed at Ephesus.<sup>54</sup> It is unlikely that Alexander, whose financial situation was difficult during his campaign in Asia Minor, could compensate all expenditures, both past and future, on the rebuilding of the temple of Artemis in this period: he became able to provide such a substantial sum of money only later, after his victory at Issus when he captured considerable Persian riches.<sup>55</sup> Besides, we have enough information to suggest that Alexander looked with favour on the Ephesians and their

---

53 The relevant evidence is collected in: Kotsidou (2000) 6, L.

54 Habicht (1970) 18. The same opinion, see, in particular, Stewart (1993) 99, 192–193; Dreyer (2009) 225; cf. Kotsidou (2000) \*357, L (commentary).

55 For Alexander's difficult financial position at the outset of his Asian expedition, see Plut. Alex. 15; Plut. de Alex. fort. 1.3.327d; 2.11.342e; Arr. an. 7.9.6; Curt. 10.2.24. Although in this evidence one can see the features of a literary *topos* (see, for instance, Müller [2011] 61), it is, in my view, erroneous to reduce all to it alone. Regardless of what one thinks about the accuracy of the figures provided by the authors, it is worth believing that the fact of Alexander's acute need of funds on the eve of his expedition are attested in the literary tradition correctly; cf. Müller (2011) 61. It is clear that such a position of the Macedonian king could not have improved much until his victory at Issus; at the same time, it seems that Alexander had partly succeeded in improving his finances

famous sanctuary: it is known that at Ephesus the Macedonian king made a sacrifice to Artemis and organized a military parade in her honour (Arr. an. 1.18.2); ordered the old *phoros* paid by the Ephesian community to the Persians to be henceforth spent for the needs of the Artemisium (Arr. an. 1.17.10);<sup>56</sup> probably at the same time expanded the territory of the asylum in it (Strab. 14.1.23.641); was in correspondence with Megabxyus, *neōkoros* of Artemis (Plut. Alex., 42); and, lastly, placed in the temple (surely not without permission of the Ephesians) his portrait by Apelles who depicted Alexander with a thunderbolt in hand (Cic. Verr. 3.135; Plin. nat. 35.92; Plut. de fort. Alex. 2.2.335a–b; Plut. Is. 24.360 a; Plut. Alex. 4; Ael. var. 2.3 = Kotsidu \*357, L).<sup>57</sup> It seems that so well-disposed attitude of Alexander towards the Ephesian community would be hardly possible after he had been refused to dedicate the temple of Artemis in 334 BC. Thus, in my view, there is every reason to believe that the episode described by Artemidorus/Strabo should be related not to 334 BC but to a certain moment later, most likely to the end of Alexander's life when the question of his deification became topical in Greece and at least in a number of Greek cities his cults were set up.<sup>58</sup> In turn, it is not ruled out that we also have an indirect evidence in this connection: when Hypereides in his

---

already during the campaign in Asia Minor. On this issue in general, see: Kholod (2015 b) 243–247; Kholod (2015 c) 138, n. 11 Cf. Bellinger (1963) 36–38; Bosworth (1980) 142; Rebuffat (1983) 43–52; Mørkholm (1991) 45; Le Rider (2003) 107–108, 113–122; and now especially: Holt (2016) 23–43.

**56** For the interpretation of such an order as a privilege given by Alexander to the Ephesian community, see Kholod (2007) 135–138. Similarly: Bosworth (1980) 133; Bringmann – von Steuben (1995) 263, L (commentary); Nawotka (2003) 30.

**57** Note that it is impossible to hold this portrait, as scholars sometimes do, to be a direct evidence of the deification of Alexander at Ephesus: insofar as we are able to judge, a painting of ruler, in contrast to a cult statue of him (ἄγαλμα), was not an object of adoration in the Hellenistic period. See Kotsidou (2000) \*357, L (commentary). It seems that this portrait by Apelles should be thought not more than an image of Alexander with the main attribute of Zeus that stressed the Macedonian king's corresponding sonship (and the overmastering force of his power on earth). It is difficult to say when Apelles finished this painting; but most likely he did it at a point after the battle of Gaugamela and before the returning of the Macedonian army from India. On this portrait and on the timeframe of its completion, see in detail: Stewart (1993) 191–198; cf. Fredricksmeier (2003) 272; Anson (2013) 101–102.

**58** For the same dating of this episode, see, for example, Bosworth (1980) 132–133; Bringmann – von Steuben (1995) 263–264, L (commentaries); Nawotka (2003) 29; cf. Bosworth (1988) 290. Note that Badian has first dated the episode to 334 BC but afterwards renounced this date, relating it to the time shortly before the death of Alexander. See Badian (1966) 47; (1981) 61, n. 56; cf. Badian (1996) 25. Under what circumstances the Macedonian king made such an offer to the Ephesians is unclear. However, it is not excluded that an Ephesian who answered him was a member of the official embassy of his home city that, together with the other embassies, including Greek ones, could come to Alexander in Babylon in 323 BC (Diod. 17.113.1–4; Arr. an. 7.19.1–2). Cf. Bringmann – von Steuben (1995) 264, L (commentary).

funeral speech in honour of the Athenians fallen in the Lamian War in 322 BC says with bitterness that the worship of Alexander as a god became widely adopted (6.21),<sup>59</sup> he presumably does not resort here to a rhetorical exaggeration and means not only (if at all) Athens but also the other Greek cities, including those of Asia Minor; and, as it is evident from the text, in this case he describes the recent situation and perhaps even the present state of affairs.<sup>60</sup> Besides, almost complete lack of direct evidence on the existence of Alexander's cult in the Greek cities of Asia Minor is very well explicable, in contrast to the earlier time, exactly for the end of his reign: in addition to the fact that the events relevant to the deification of the Macedonian king in Greece in 324–323 BC are poorly reflected in our sources (even the Athenian material is more than modest),<sup>61</sup> it must be taken into consideration that the Greek cities of Asia Minor entirely drop out of sight of the ancient authors by this moment (the account of Artemidorus/Strabo is the only exception), while the epigraphical evidence that is directly connected with the relationship between Alexander and the Greek cities of Asia Minor in this period is, so to speak, close to zero.

Hence, it seems, one can well believe that the establishment of Alexander's cults in a number of individual Greek communities of Asia Minor should be dated to 324–323 BC. At the same time, the question arises as to whether or not we must accept this date also for the institution of the cult of Alexander in the Ionian League. Some scholars' position on such an issue is dependent on how they date the refoundation of the League:<sup>62</sup> as to those who believe that it happened at the initiative of Alexander, this idea itself (supplemented, as a rule, by certain arguments though) encourages them to relate the introduction of the pan-Ionian cult of

---

**59** Scholars are unanimous that Hypereides implies just that (as well as the posthumous heroization of Hephaestion) in this passage („The practices which even now we have to countenance are proof enough: sacrifices being made to men, images, altars, and temples carefully perfected in their honour, while those of the gods are neglected, and we ourselves are forced to honour as heroes the servants of these people“, translated by J. O. Burtt, Loeb).

**60** On the passage, cf., in particular, Bickerman (1963) 71–75; Habicht (1970) 29–31, 246–250; Badian (1981) 55; Bosworth (1988) 288–289; Cawkwell (1994) 297–299; Badian (1996) 25; Hammond (1999) 113; Dreyer (2009) 230–232; Herrman (2009) 88–91.

**61** The relevant evidence is collected in: Kotsidou (2000) 6, L (Athens); 62, L (Sparta). For the case of Thasos, see above.

**62** Survey of scholarship on the relationship between Alexander and the Ionian League, including the issue of its supposed refoundation by the Macedonian king, see in: Seibert (1972) 90–92, 268. Among studies that were published after Seibert's survey or were left out of his account, see, in particular, the following: Magie (1950) I 65–67, II 868–869, n. 51; Bean (1966) 217; Habicht (1970) 17; Verkinderen (1987) 263–268; Debord (1999) 475; Dreyer (2009) 223; Vujčić (2009) 142 (these historians incline to attribute the refoundation of the Ionian League to Alexander); Caspari (1915) 183–185; Billows (1990) 217–218 (these attribute it to Antigonos). Cf. Fogazza (1973) 167.

the Macedonian king, with the festival in his honour, to his lifetime; as to those who assume that the revival of the Ionian League took place later, at the initiative of Antigonus the One-Eyed, it is natural for them to hold the institution of Alexander's cult in it to be posthumous. I do not agree with both opinions on the date of the refoundation of the Ionian League: there is every reason to believe that it, as an association of purely religious kind, was restored to life as early as ca. 373 (Diod. 15.49.1–3; Strab. 8.7.2.385) and did not cease to exist not only during the rest of the 4th century BC but it was the same one which, as is well known, functioned almost interruptedly throughout further several centuries and disappeared only at a point after the mid-3rd century AD.<sup>63</sup> Therefore, in my view, the refoundation of the Ionian League could be connected neither with Alexander (there are no grounds to suggest that some time after its revival the League was dissolved and then was reanimated again by the Macedonian king)<sup>64</sup> nor especially with Antigonus. Indeed, it appears that a number of inscriptions of the second half of the 4th century BC exclude any attribution of the refoundation of the Ionian League to Antigonus, fixing its earlier existence: the first is a fragment of the decision of the *boule* of the Ionian League to allow the Lebedians to set up a stele at the Panionion (IPriene 139 = IPriene<sup>2</sup> 398); the second is the very beginning of a decree of the Ionians and Aeolians (IErythrai 16, ll.6–11); the third is a fragment of regulations concerning the Panionia (Kleiner – Hommel – Müller-Wiener [1967] 49 = IPriene<sup>2</sup> 399).<sup>65</sup> It is impossible to date these inscriptions exactly. However, taking into account that Ionic forms which occur in each of them become very rare in epigraphic documents from the cities of Ionia by the late 320 s<sup>66</sup>, one can conclude that the mentioned inscriptions were engraved, in all likelihood, before this time, i. e. under

---

**63** On the Ionian League in the 4th century BC, see most recently Kholod (2015 a) 92–106 (with relevant sources and literature). For the League in the Roman epoch (mainly in the Imperial period), see, in particular, Vujčić (2009) 139–151; and especially: Herrmann (2002) 223–240.

**64** The archaeological evidence, it seems, also speaks against the League's dissolution after 373 BC: the excavations at the probable site of the Panionion show the construction activities in it in ca. the mid-4th century BC. See Kleiner – Hommel – Müller-Wiener (1967) 15; in addition, see Hansen – Fischer-Hansen (1994) 68–69.

**65** Here I deliberately leave out of account one more inscription that mentions the Panionion (IPriene 4, l.36 = IPriene<sup>2</sup> 19), since its dating is controversial: Hiller von Gaertringen has dated the corresponding part of the epigraphical document to ca. 332/1 (see his commentary on IPriene 4), while, in Crowther's opinion, the decree should be dated to 294/3 BC; see Crowther (1996) 216–219. Cf. IPriene<sup>2</sup> 19 („ca. 330–300“).

**66** For instance, in Priene: while in IPriene<sup>2</sup> 15 (= IPriene 2) (334/3 BC) Ionic forms are present, in IPriene<sup>2</sup> 5 (= IPriene 5) (shortly before 326/5 BC) they are absent. Similarly in Ephesus; see respectively IEphesos 1419 (probably 336–334/3 BC) and IEphesos 1435 (322/1 BC). In the inscriptions known to us from Erythrae Ionic forms also become scarce by the late 320 s and almost completely disappear by 300 BC; see Garbrah (1978) 145–152.

Alexander at the latest. (Of course, it is not ruled out that one or another of them could appear later, even when the Ionian cities were under Antigonos' control, but the possibility of engraving all the three inscriptions at this period seems – because of the indicated dialectical specificity of their texts – very small.) On the other hand, it is quite unnecessary to restrict the date of these epigraphical documents only to the years of Alexander's reign; it is more likely that at least one of the inscriptions appeared before his Asian expedition.

It thus becomes clear that the institution of Alexander's cult in the Ionian League had no connection with its refoundation. Let us turn now to the arguments that are offered by the advocates of the introduction of such a cult in the League during the Macedonian king's lifetime. I would remind that Habicht argues that the *Alexandreia* of the Ionian League were celebrated on Alexander's birthday and, consequently, were established in his lifetime. However, as has been shown above, this argument cannot be regarded as sufficiently forceful. Nor do I consider as such another argument presented by some scholars in favour of the *Alexandreia*'s institution during the reign of the Macedonian king: according to those scholars, if this festival were introduced not under Alexander but under Antigonos, it would have been called the *Anigoneia*.<sup>67</sup> One can object to this argument in the following way: first, it is not improbable that Antigonos himself requested the Ionians to honour not him but Alexander in their festival; second, it is not ruled out that at first the pan-Ionian festival was indeed called the *Anigoneia* but then, after the Ionian League had fallen under the control of Lysimachus, this ruler ordered it to be renamed the *Alexandreia*, just as he renamed *Antigonia Troas* as *Alexandria*.<sup>68</sup> Yet, despite the indicated defects in both arguments (though it does not follow from this that they must be regarded as entirely invalid), I believe that it is better to date the establishment of Alexander's cult in the Ionian League, with the festival in his honour, to the period of his reign. Even if we leave aside the considered arguments (although they taken together acquire a certain force), the introduction of Alexander's cults in a number of individual cities of Asia Minor, including Ionian (see above), happening, insofar as we are able to judge, in his lifetime, most likely in 324–323 BC, speaks, in my opinion, just for this date: there seems to be no reason to separate the institution of the cults of the Macedonian king in these cities from the analogous event connected with the Ionian League; on the contrary, it is logical to

---

<sup>67</sup> See, for example, Magie (1950) II 868–869, n. 51 (he also refers to the similar view of Er. Meyer).

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Billows (1990) 217–218. On the special role which the figure of Alexander played in Lysimachus' politics (and propaganda), see, in particular, Lund (1992) 159–165; Bosworth (2002) 277–278; Plischke (2011) 61–69; on the reflection of that on Lysimachus' coins, see especially Dahmen (2007) 16–17, 49–50, 119–120 (Pl. 8). For the foundation of *Antigonia Troas* by Antigonos and its renaming as *Alexandria* by Lysimachus, see Cohen (1995) 145, 421 (with relevant literature).

believe that they were interconnected. Moreover, if so, it is not excluded that the fact that the civic cults of Alexander are evidenced (or supposed) only in several Ionian cities implies that they were set up a little earlier than the pan-Ionian cult: the institution of the latter may have been not only provoked by the establishment of the cults of Alexander in a number of cities of Ionia but stopped the further spreading of the Macedonian king's civic cult from one Ionian community to another, because at that stage the continuation of such a process became already superfluous.

Now let us turn to the reasons of the introduction of Alexander's cults in the Greek cities of Asia Minor, the issue that I have partly touched on. As has been noted, one of the main reasons of the institution by the Greek communities of a cult of one or another ruler, at least in the early Hellenistic period, was the intention not only to incur his displeasure but (especially), establishing thus a close relationship with this person and pleasing him, to receive from him some benefits in the future, first of all in the form of various privileges and favours. It is worth believing that the Greek cities of Asia Minor with the introduction by them of the cults of Alexander in his lifetime were not an exception in this case, too. However, it seems that the institution of his cults by the Greeks of Asia Minor was hardly caused by only such, purely pragmatic, considerations. In all likelihood, we are dealing here also with the reflection of their sincere attitude towards Alexander, namely with their gratitude for the liberation of the Greek cities of Asia Minor by him from the unpopular power of both the barbarian Persians and pro-Persian oligarchs or tyrants and, in addition, for those general and particular benefactions that were given by the Macedonian king to the communities.<sup>69</sup>

Indeed, insofar as we are able to judge, thanks to Alexander the overwhelming majority of these cities, if not all of them, restored their *autonomia*, were rid (either from the very beginning or in some cases with time) of the presence of Macedonian garrisons in them, stopped to pay *phoros*, established democratic constitutions, i. e., in accordance with the Greek notions of that epoch, in principle, obtained the characteristics of a free *polis*. Although in reality the Greek communities of Asia Minor did not become genuinely free, independent cities (there is no doubt that their freedom was limited to the power of Alexander who in case of need could interfere in their affairs and dictate his will to them), the possession of even such, defective, freedom favourably distinguished their new position from that in which they had been before, when there was no free status of these communities, even if to a certain extent formal.<sup>70</sup> Furthermore, as has been said, these general benefactions were supplemented also by the special ones which Alexander gave (or claimed that they should be given) to some communities. As to the Greek cities of

---

<sup>69</sup> On that, I agree with Habicht (and with all other scholars who follow this idea).

Asia Minor where the existence of Alexander's cult is clearly evidenced or supposed (see above), we have the following information in this connection. When in 334 BC the Macedonian king visited Ilium being at this time rather a village than a city he adorned the temple of Athena with votive offerings, including his armour, gave Ilium the status of a city, ordered the local officials to restore its buildings and claimed it to be free and exempted from *phoros*; later, after the complete defeat of Persia, Alexander sent a letter to Ilium promising to transform it into a great city and the temple of Athena into a magnificent sanctuary and to establish sacred games (Diod. 17.18.1; Arr. an. 1.11.7; Strab. 13.1.26.593; cf. Diod. 18.4.5).<sup>71</sup> One of the particular benefactions of the Macedonian king was planned to be given to Erythrae as well: he prescribed to make a canal in order to convert this city with Mt. Mimas into an isle; nevertheless, such a plan remained unfulfilled (Plin. nat. 5.116; Paus. 2.1.5).<sup>72</sup> In addition, Alexander showed his special favour to Ephesus (see above) and Priene: as it is known from an extract of the original edict of the Macedonian king to Priene, written most probably in 334 BC (IPriene<sup>2</sup> 1),<sup>73</sup> he settled affairs in this city to the advantage of its inhabitants; besides, it is not ruled out that Alexander also promised to finance the construction of the Prienean temple of Athena Polias (and possibly afterwards did so to a certain degree) and, as a result, most likely already in 334 BC acquired the right to dedicate the temple to the

**70** For all this, see Kholod (2008) 125–232; cf. Nawotka 2003, 15–41. On the individual aspects of the status of the Greek cities of Asia Minor under Alexander, see also my other works: Kholod (2010 c) 249–258 (garrisons); Kholod (2007) 134–142; Kholod (2013) 83–92 (financial obligations); Kholod (2010 b) 265–282 (democratic regimes).

**71** Cf. Bringmann – von Steuben (1995) 246–248, \*335, L (commentaries); in addition, cf. Verkinderen (1987) 255–261. Nevertheless, it seems that under Alexander not all what he claimed as regards Ilium was fulfilled. See Cohen (1995) 152–157, 422. Note, incidentally that the opinion of N.G.L. Hammond that Alexander renamed Ilium as Alexandria and became thus the new founder of the city (Hammond [1998] 259–260), is, I believe, erroneous: in this case the scholar has confused Ilium with Alexandria Troas which were two different cities; this fact seems obvious even in the considered by Hammond passage of Strabo (13.1.26.593).

**72** However, it is most probable that this prescription of Alexander (if, of course, the information on it is veracious) was not more than an intention: according to the observations of J. Keil, its fulfillment was impossible because of the natural conditions of the place. See Keil (1912) 59–60. Cf. Frazer (1898) 8; Bringmann – von Steuben (1995) \*359, L (commentary).

**73** That the surviving inscription is not an authentic edict of Alexander but an excerpt from it, published by the Prieneans in the temple of Athena Polias later, under Lysimachus (ca. 285 BC), has been convincingly argued by S. M. Sherwin-White. See Sherwin-White (1985) 69–87. On the date of 334 for Alexander's original edict to Priene, see Kholod (2005), 10–23. My arguments in favour of this date have been supported by Ch. Mileta. See Mileta (2008) 36–37. The same opinion on its dating is shared also by P. Thonemann recently publishing the new variant of reconstruction of the surviving inscription. See Thonemann (2012) 23–36. However, see rather indistinct indication on the date of the original edict of Alexander to the Prieneans in: IPriene<sup>2</sup> 1 („334–330“).

goddess (IPriene<sup>2</sup> 149).<sup>74</sup> As regards Rhodes, if one leaves aside certain offerings (head of bull and Alexander's armour, with inscriptions) brought by the Macedonian king to the temple of Athena in Lindus in 330 BC (Lindos. II 1. 2, ll.103–109 [XXXVIII]),<sup>75</sup> we know about his benefactions to the Rhodian community itself only from the so called *Liber de morte testamentumque Alexandri Magni*, a political pamphlet composed at the very beginning of the period of the Successors. It states that the Macedonian monarch expressing his last will treated the Rhodians with particular favour and richly gifted them: by money, ships, grain etc. (Metz Epit. 107–108, 116, 118; cf. Ps.-Callisth. 3.33.3–10, 12, 14 [rec. α] Kroll; Diod. 20.81.3). There is no doubt that this information is fake (and not without the Rhodians' initiative was partly interpolated in the text later), being not more than a product of propaganda.<sup>76</sup> However, it is not excluded that in his time Alexander gave some special benefactions to Rhodes the evidence of which did not survive.<sup>77</sup>

Hence, in my opinion, it is worth believing that all this – not only the pragmatic considerations but also a sense of gratitude of the Greeks of Asia Minor for Alexander's deeds with respect to their cities, including the general and particular benefactions given by him to them – had to provide so fertile ground in these cities that their inhabitants when the question of the deification of the Macedonian king became topical in Greece agreed to take the corresponding step. It appears rea-

---

74 For the appearance of the dedicatory inscription probably in 334 BC, see Kholod (2009) 117–125. However, see Arena (2013) 48–75. Cf. IPriene<sup>2</sup> 149 („334–323“).

75 Also see Bringmann – von Steuben (1995) 194, E, with commentary.

76 Despite this, it is worth believing that such statements in the pamphlet after the appearance of the interpolations in it had to make an impact on Alexander's cult in Rhodes: favourably connecting Rhodes with the figure of the Macedonian king, these statements, in my view, thus contributed to rooting his cult here. On the pamphlet, see Heckel (1988); besides the book by Heckel, for the pamphlet's connection with Rhodes, see Fraser (1952) 202–204; Hauben (1977) 311–316; Berthold (1984) 37; Gorlov (1990) 215–216; Bringmann – von Steuben (1995) \*352, L (commentary). It is most probable that this cult, like Alexander's cults in the other Greek cities of Asia Minor, was set up in Rhodes still during his lifetime. However, it is not ruled out that it fell into decay after 323 BC, when the Rhodians expelled the Macedonian garrison from their city (Diod. 18.8.1), and was renovated later, in the second half of the 3rd century BC, possibly because of, in addition, Rhodes' intention to strengthen its friendly relations with the Ptolemies. Cf. Buraselis (2012) 255.

77 It would be, of course, tempting to support G. Pugliese Carratelli who argued that the famous Rhodian constitution of the Hellenistic time was indebted namely to Alexander. See Pugliese Carratelli (1949) 154–171. But, as P. M. Fraser has convincingly shown, this view cannot be admitted as valid. See Fraser (1952) 192–206. For the Rhodian constitution in this period, see now especially Grieb (2008) 263–353. On the other hand, if my supposition expressed elsewhere that the (re) establishment of the Macedonian garrison in Rhodes at a moment before 323 BC (Diod. 18.8.1) happened due to the corresponding request of the then pro-Alexander democratic government of the city is right, this action might well be regarded by these democrats as a benefaction. See Kholod (2010 c) 254–255.



sonable to suppose that the establishment of the cults of Alexander in the Greek cities of Asia Minor was initiated by one of the pro-Macedonian democratic leaders taking power with the assistance of the Macedonians in 334–332 BC<sup>78</sup> and that during the debates on such a question in these cities it did not do (like at the same moment at Athens) without an expression of dissatisfaction from part of citizens at the respective proposals, without hot discussions on the subject. Despite this, most inhabitants, as is evident, have supported the bestowing of divine honours on Alexander, and it seems that they have done so with all willingness. At least it is significant that, in contrast to Alexander's cults that, insofar as we are able to judge, were set up in a number of cities of the Greek Mainland and ceased to exist either right after his death, with the beginning of the Lamian War (in some cities),<sup>79</sup> or at a time shortly after it (in others),<sup>80</sup> the cults of the Macedonian king in the Greek cities of Asia Minor continued to exist afterwards (although perhaps not without interruptions in some cases), not only over the whole Hellenistic period but even during several centuries of Roman domination. Of course, it should be admitted that the further worship of Alexander as a god in these cities received from time to time new stimuli, a certain feed – among other things, from one or another ruler (Hellenistic monarch or Roman emperor)<sup>81</sup> who resorted to the use of the Macedonian king's image and thus naturally promoted an increase of interest

---

**78** Or in certain cases by some exiles restored in their home cities due to the Exiles' Decree of Alexander, published in 324 BC. At least it is clear that after their return such elements were ready to express their gratitude to the Macedonian king by all possible means. To illustrate this, one can refer to the institution by the returned Samian exiles of the cult of Philip III Arrhidaeus and Alexander IV, with the festival in the kings' honour, in 321 BC (Kotsidou [2000] 174, E, 1.11–12B). For that instance, see now Mari (2004) 184–185 (with relevant literature).

**79** In those that joined the anti-Macedonian coalition in the war.

**80** In those that were the Macedonian allies or remained neutral in the Lamian War. By the way, note that, in my view, in this case the abolition of Alexander's cults could happen for two reasons: first, because of the absence of respective support from the Macedonians most of whom, as is known, still in the lifetime of Alexander had expressed very negative attitude towards all his attempts to receive divine honours, considering them, perhaps like Antipater, an impiety (Curt. 10.5.11; Suda. s. v. Ἀντίπατρος); second, because of the unwillingness of these cities themselves to further maintain – after the disappearance of political motivation for them – Alexander's cults which were regarded by them as (to a considerable degree, if not completely) imposed. For the position of the Macedonians on Alexander's worship as a god in his lifetime, see Hammond (1989) 235; Hammond (1999) 106–109. It is remarkable that apart from the posthumous private heroization of Alexander in Macedonia, the establishment of his regular national or civic cult in it, insofar as we are able to judge, happened neither during his lifetime nor after his death. See Mari (2008) 228–231, 244–245.

**81** Likewise, it is clear that sometimes the cities themselves initiated the increase of attention to the cults of Alexander existing in them (and possibly in some cases revived such cults had fallen into decay), holding under certain circumstances it to be profitable for them (in particular, to

in him.<sup>82</sup> However, it is hardly correct to reduce the explanation of such stability of Alexander's cults to the current situation alone. As has been noted by one modern biographer of the Macedonian king, „Il n'y a que ceux qu'on aime qui soient immortels.“<sup>83</sup> Indeed, it seems obvious that the main support to the cults of Alexander in the Greek cities of Asia Minor, first of all securing their vitality, was given by the firm positive attitude of their population towards the figure of the Macedonian king, going back to the time of his reign.

## Bibliography

- Anson (2013): E. M. Anson, *Alexander the Great. Themes and Issues*, London 2013.
- Arena (2013): E. Arena, *Alessandro basileus nella documentazione epigrafica. La dedica del tempio di Atena a Priene (I.Priene 156)*, *Historia* 62, 2013, 48–79.
- Atkinson (1973): K.M.T. Atkinson, *Demosthenes, Alexander, and Asebeia*, *Athenaeum* 51, 1973, 310–335.
- Badian (1966): E. Badian, *Alexander the Great and the Greeks of Asia*, in: E. Badian (ed.), *Ancient Society and Institutions. Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg on His 75th Birthday*, Oxford 1966, 37–69.
- Badian (1981): E. Badian, *The Deification of Alexander the Great*, in: H. J. Dell (ed.), *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of C. F. Edson*, Thessaloniki 1981, 27–71.
- Badian (1996): E. Badian, *Alexander the Great between Two Thrones and Heaven. Variations on an Old Theme*, in: A. Small (ed.), *Subject and Ruler. The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity. Papers Presented at a Conference Held in the University of Alberta on April 13–15, 1994, to Celebrate the 65th Anniversary of D. Fishwick*, Ann Arbor 1996, 11–26.
- Bean (1966): G. E. Bean, *Aegean Turkey. An Archaeological Guide*, London 1966.
- Bellinger (1963): A. R. Bellinger, *Essays on the Coinage of Alexander the Great*, New York 1963.
- Berger (1896): H. Berger, s. v. *Artemidoros* (27), in: *RE* II, 1896, 1329–1330.
- Berthold (1984): R. M. Berthold, *Rhodes in the Hellenistic Age*, Ithaca 1984.
- Bickerman (1963): E. Bickerman, *Sur un passage d'Hypéride (Epitaphios, col. VIII)*, *Athenaeum* 41, 1963, 70–83.
- Billows (1990): R. A. Billows, *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State*, Berkeley 1990.

---

strengthen their friendly relations with a certain dynasty – for instance with the Ptolemaic one, for which Alexander's cult was important – or, especially later, to enhance their, i. e. the cities', prestige on a regional level).

**82** The use of Alexander's image by subsequent rulers of the Ancient world in politics (and ideology), particularly reflected in the phenomenon of *imitatio Alexandri*, has received much attention. Here I shall limit myself only to a reference to two books (both with further literature on the subject): Bohm (1989) (the Hellenistic period); Kühnen (2008) (the Roman epoch). For the detailed analysis of the relevant numismatic material, see especially Dahmen (2007).

**83** Faure (1985) 513.

- Billows (1995): R. A. Billows, *Kings and Colonists. Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism*, Leiden 1995.
- Biraschi (2015): A. M. Biraschi, Alessandro ed *Olimpiade a Iasos. Tradizioni greco-troiane fra Epiro ed Asia Minore da Alessandro ad Augusto*, SCO 61, 2015, 145–161.
- Blackwell (1999): Ch. B. Blackwell, *In the Absence of Alexander. Harplus and the Failure of Macedonian Authority*, New York 1999.
- Bohm (1989): C. Bohm, *Imitatio Alexandri im Hellenismus. Untersuchungen zum politischen Nachwirken Alexanders des Großen in hoch- und späthellenistischen Monarchien*, Munich 1989.
- Bosnakis – Hallof (2003): D. Bosnakis – K. Hallof, *Alte und neue Inschriften aus Kos I*, Chiron 33, 2003, 203–262.
- Bosworth (1980): A. B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian’s History of Alexander*, I, Oxford 1980.
- Bosworth (1988): A. B. Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire. The Reign of Alexander the Great*, Cambridge 1988.
- Bosworth (1995): A. B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian’s History of Alexander*, II, Oxford 1995.
- Bosworth (1996): A. B. Bosworth, *Alexander and the East. The Tragedy of Triumph*, Oxford 1996.
- Bosworth (2002): A. B. Bosworth, *The Legacy of Alexander. Politics, Warfare, and Propaganda under the Successors*, Oxford 2002.
- Bowden (2013): H. Bowden, *On Kissing and Making up. Court Protocol and Historiography in Alexander the Great’s „Experiment with Proskynesis“*, BICS 56, 2013, 55–77.
- Bringmann – von Steuben (1995): K. Bringmann – H. von Steuben, *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer, I. Zeugnisse und Kommentare*, Berlin 1995.
- Buraselis (2012): K. Buraselis, *The Coordination and Combination of Traditional Civic and Ruler Cult Festivals in the Hellenistic and Roman East*, in: J. R. Brandt – J. W. Iddeny (eds.), *Greek & Roman Festivals. Content, Meaning, and Practice*, Oxford 2012, 247–265.
- Cartledge (2004): P. Cartledge, *Alexander the Great. The Hunt for a New Past*, Woodstock 2004.
- Caspari (1915): M. O. B. Caspari, *The Ionian Confederacy*, JHS 35, 1915, 173–188.
- Cawkwell (1994): G. L. Cawkwell, *The Deification of Alexander the Great. A Note*, in: I. Worthington (ed.), *Ventures into Greek History. Essays in Honour of N.G.L. Hammond*, Oxford 1994, 263–272.
- Chaniotis (2003): A. Chaniotis, *The Divinity of Hellenistic Rulers*, in: A. Erskine (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, Oxford 2003, 431–445.
- Cohen (1995): G. M. Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*, Berkeley 1995.
- Christesen – Murray (2010): P. Christesen – S. C. Murray, *Macedonian Religion*, in: J. Roisman – I. Worthington (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, London 2010, 428–445.
- Crowther (1996): C. V. Crowther, *I.Priene 8 and the History of Priene in the Early Hellenistic Period*, Chiron 26, 1996, 195–238.
- Dahmen (2007): K. Dahmen, *The Legend of Alexander the Great on Greek and Roman Coins*, London 2007.
- Debord (1999): P. Debord, *L’Asie Mineure au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle (412–323 a.C.). Pouvoirs et jeux politiques*, Bordeaux 1999.
- Dmitriev (2004): S. Dmitriev, *Alexander’s Exiles Decree*, Klio 86.2, 2004, 348–381.
- Dreyer (2009): B. Dreyer, *Heroes, Cults, and Divinity*, in: W. Heckel – L. A. Tritle (eds.), *Alexander the Great. A New History*, Oxford 2009, 218–234.

- Edmunds (1971): L. Edmunds, *The Religiosity of Alexander*, GRBS 12, 1971, 363–391.
- Ellis-Evans (2012): A. Ellis-Evans, *The Tyrants Dossier from Eresos*, Chiron 42, 2012, 183–212.
- Faure (1985): P. Faure, *Alexandre*, Paris 1985.
- Fogazza (1973): G. Fogazza, *Per una storia della Lega Ionica*, PP 28, 1973, 157–169.
- Fraser (1952): P. M. Fraser, *Alexander and the Rhodian Constitution*, PP 7, 1952, 192–206.
- Frazer (1898): J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias's Description of Greece*, III, London 1898.
- Fredricksmeyer (1979): E. A. Fredricksmeyer, *Divine Honors for Philip II*, TAPhA 109, 1979, 39–61.
- Fredricksmeyer (1981): E. A. Fredricksmeyer, *On the Background of the Ruler Cult*, in: H. J. Dell (ed.), *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of C. F. Edson*, Thessaloniki 1981, 145–156.
- Fredricksmeyer (2003): E. A. Fredricksmeyer, *Alexander's Religion and Divinity*, in: J. Roisman (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great*, Leiden 2003, 251–278.
- Gärtner (1979): H. Gärtner, s. v. Artemidoros (1), in: KIP I, <sup>2</sup>1979, 617.
- Garbrah (1978): K. A. Garbrah, *A Grammar of the Ionic Inscriptions from Erythrae. Phonology and Morphology*, Meisenheim am Glan 1978.
- Gauthier (2000): Ph. Gauthier, *Iscription agonistique de Messène*, REG 113, 2000, 631–635.
- Gauthier (2004): Ph. Gauthier, *Kos*, REG 117, 2004, 636–638 (Bull. ép. 237).
- Gorlov (1990): Yu. V. Gorlov, *Ellinisticheskiy Rodos*, in: E. S. Golubtsova (ed.), *Ellinizm: ekonomika, politika, kul'tura*, Moscow 1990, 186–222 (in Russian).
- Grieb (2008): V. Grieb, *Hellenistische Demokratie. Politische Organisation und Struktur in freien griechischen Poleis nach Alexander dem Großen*, Stuttgart 2008.
- Habicht (1956): Ch. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum und Griechische Städte*, Munich 1956.
- Habicht (1970): Ch. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum und Griechische Städte*, Munich <sup>2</sup>1970.
- Habicht (1998): Ch. Habicht, „Zur ewig währenden Erinnerung“. Ein auf das Nachleben zielender Topos, Chiron 28, 1998, 35–41.
- Habicht (2000): Ch. Habicht, *Neues aus Messene*, ZPE 130, 2000, 121–126.
- Hamilton (1974): J. R. Hamilton, *Alexander the Great*, Pittsburgh 1974.
- Hammond (1988): N. G. L. Hammond, *From the Death of Philip to the Battle of Ipsus*, in: N.G.L. Hammond – F. W. Walbank, *A History of Macedonia*, III, Oxford 1988, 3–196.
- Hammond (1989): N. G. L. Hammond, *The Macedonian State. Origins, Institutions, and History*, Oxford 1989.
- Hammond (1998): N. G. L. Hammond, *Alexander's Newly-founded Cities*, GRBS 39, 1998, 243–269.
- Hammond (1999): N. G. L. Hammond, *Heroic and Devine Honors in Macedonia before the Successors*, AncW 30, 1999, 103–115.
- Hansen – Fischer-Hansen (1994): M. H. Hansen – T. Fischer-Hansen, *Monumental Political Architecture in Archaic and Classical Greek Poleis. Evidence and Historical Significance*, in: D. Whitehead (ed.), *From Political Architecture to Stephanus Byzantius*, Stuttgart 1994, 23–90.
- Hauben (1977): H. Hauben, *Rhodes, Alexander and the Diadochi from 333/332 to 304 B.C.*, Historia 26, 1977, 307–339.
- Heckel (1988): W. Heckel, *The Last Days and Testament of Alexander the Great. A Prosopographic Study*, Stuttgart 1988.
- Heisserer (1980): A. J. Heisserer, *Alexander the Great and the Greeks. The Epigraphic Evidence*, Norman 1980.
- Herrman (2009): J. Herrman, *Hyperides. Funeral Oration*, Oxford 2009.

- Herrmann (2002): P. Herrmann, Das κοινὸν τῶν Ἴώνων unter römischer Herrschaft, in: N. Ehrhard – L.-M. Günther (eds.), *Widerstand – Anpassung – Integration. Die griechische Staatenwelt und Rom. Festschrift für J. Deininger zum 65. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart 2002, 223–240.
- Holt (2016): F. L. Holt, *The Treasures of Alexander the Great. How One Man's Wealth Shaped the World*, Oxford 2016.
- Jacoby (1944): F. Jacoby, Γενέσθαι. A Forgotten Festival of the Dead, *CQ* 38, 1944, 65–75.
- Jaschinski (1981): S. Jaschinski, *Alexander und Griechenland unter dem Eindruck der Flucht des Harpalos*, Bonn 1981.
- Keil (1912): J. Keil, *Forschungen in der Erythraia II*, *JÖAI* 15, 1912, 1–75 (Beiblatt).
- Kholod (2005): M. M. Kholod, *Nadpisi iz Prieny i Alexandr Velikiy: k probleme datirovki dvukh epigraficheskikh textov*, *Antiquitas aeterna* 1, 2005, 10–27 (in Russian).
- Kholod (2007): M. M. Kholod, *Aphorologesia gretcheskikh gorodov Maloy Azii pri Alexandre Velikom*, *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo Universiteta (Seriya 2)* 3, 2007, 134–142 (in Russian).
- Kholod (2008): M. M. Kholod, *Makedonskaya monarkhiya i gretcheskie polisy Maloy Azii (336–323 gg. do n.e.)*, Diss. St. Petersburg 2008 (in Russian).
- Kholod (2009): M. M. Kholod, *Posvyascheniya Alexandrom Velikim gretcheskikh khramov*, *Mnemon* 8, 2009, 117–130 (in Russian).
- Kholod (2010 a): M. M. Kholod, *Mitilena pri Alexandre Velikom: put' k demokratii pod monarkhicheskoy egidoy*, *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo Universiteta (Seriya 2)* 4, 2010, 36–45 (in Russian).
- Kholod (2010 b): M. M. Kholod, *Utverzhdeniye demokraticheskikh rezhimov v gretcheskikh polisakh Maloy Azii pri Alexandre Velikom*, in: E. D. Frolov (ed.), *Problemy antichnoy demokratii*, St. Petersburg 2010, 265–282 (in Russian).
- Kholod (2010 c): M. M. Kholod, *The Garrisons of Alexander the Great in the Greek Cities of Asia Minor*, *Eos* 97, 2010, 249–258.
- Kholod (2012): M. M. Kholod, *On the Dating of a New Chian Inscription Concerning the Property of Returned Exiles*, in: L.-M. Günther – V. Grieb (eds.), *Das imperiale Rom und der hellenistische Osten. Festschrift für J. Deininger zur 75. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart 2012, 21–33.
- Kholod (2013): M. M. Kholod, *On the Financial Relations of Alexander the Great and the Greek Cities in Asia Minor. The Case of Syntaxis*, in: A. Mehl – A. Makhlayuk – O. Gabelko (eds.), *Ruthenia Classica Aetatis Novae. A Collection of Works by Russian Scholars in Ancient and Roman History*, Stuttgart 2013, 83–92.
- Kholod (2015 a): M. M. Kholod, *K istorii Ionii v IV v. do n.e.*, *Mnemon* 15, 2015, 92–106 (in Russian).
- Kholod (2015 b): M. M. Kholod, *O sostoyanii finansov Alexandra Velikogo v nachale ego pokhoda v Aziyu: zametchanie*, *Mnemon* 15, 2015, 243–247 (in Russian).
- Kholod (2015 c): M. M. Kholod, *The Financial Administration of Asia Minor under Alexander the Great. An Interpretation of Two Passages from Arrian's Anabasis*, in: T. Howe – S. Müller – R. Stoneman (eds.), *Ancient Historiography on War and Empire*, Oxford 2016, 136–148.
- Kleiner – Hommel – Müller-Wiener (1967): G. Kleiner – P. Hommel – W. Müller-Wiener, *Panionien und Melie*, Berlin 1967.
- Kotsidou (2000): H. Kotsidou, *TIMH KAI ΔΟΞΑ. Ehrungen für hellenistische Herrscher im griechischen Mutterland und in Kleinasien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der archäologischen Denkmäler*, Berlin 2000.
- Kühnen (2008): A. Kühnen, *Die imitatio Alexandri in der römischen Politik (1 Jh. v. Chr.–3 Jh. n. Chr.)*, Münster 2008.

- Labarre (1996): G. Labarre, *Les cités de Lesbos aux époques hellénistique et impériale*, Paris 1996.
- Lane Fox (1973): R. Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great*, London 1973.
- Le Rider (2003): G. Le Rider, *Alexandre le Grand. Monnaie, finances et politique*, Paris 2003.
- Leschhorn (1984): W. Leschhorn, „Gründer der Stadt“. Studien zu einem politisch-religiösen Phänomen der Griechischen Geschichte, Stuttgart 1984.
- Leschhorn (1993): W. Leschhorn, *Antike Ären*, Stuttgart 1993.
- Lund (1992): H. S. Lund, *Lysimachus. A Study in Early Hellenistic Kingship*, London 1992.
- Maddoli (2010): G. Maddoli, *Du nouveau sur les Hekatomnides. D'après les inscriptions de lasos*, in: R. van Bremen – J.-M. Carbon (eds.), *Hellenistic Karia*, Bordeaux 2010, 123–131.
- Maddoli (2015): G. Maddoli, *Ara in onore di Alessandro ed Olimpiade*, *SCO* 61, 137–143.
- Magie (1950): D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ*, I–II, Princeton 1950.
- Mari (2004): M. Mari, II „culto della personalità“ a Samo, tra Lisandro e Demetrio Poliorcete, in: E. Cavallini (ed.), *Samo. Storia, letteratura, scienza*, Pisa 2004, 177–196.
- Mari (2008): M. Mari, *The Ruler Cult in Macedonia*, *SE* 20, 2008, 219–268.
- Marinovich (1993): L. P. Marinovich, *Greki i Alexandr Makedonskiy (k probleme krizisa polisa)*, Moscow 1993 (in Russian).
- Meier (1959–1961): F. G. Meier, *Griechische Mauerbauinschriften*, I–II, Heidelberg 1959–1961.
- Meritt (1935): B. D. Meritt, *Inscriptions of Colophon*, *AJPh* 56, 1935, 358–397.
- Mikalson (2006): J. D. Mikalson, *Greek Religion. Continuity and Change in the Hellenistic Period*, in: G. R. Bugh (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World*, Cambridge 2006, 208–222.
- Mileta (2008): Ch. Mileta, *Der König und sein Land. Untersuchungen zur Herrschaft der hellenistischen Monarchen über das königliche Gebiet Kleinasiens und seine Bevölkerung*, Berlin 2008.
- Mørkholm (1991): O. Mørkholm, *Early Hellenistic Coinage. From the Accession of Alexander to the Peace of Apamea (336–188 B.C.)*, Cambridge 1991.
- Muccioli (2013): F. Muccioli, *Gli epiteti ufficiali dei re ellenistici*, Stuttgart 2013.
- Müller (2011): S. Müller, *Onesikritos und das Achaimenidenreich*, *Anabasis* 2, 2011, 5–12.
- Nawotka (2003): K. Nawotka, *Freedom of Greek Cities in Asia Minor in the Age of Alexander the Great*, *Klio* 85, 2003, 15–41.
- Nawotka (2010): K. Nawotka, *Miletus and Alexander the Great*, in: E. Dąbrowa et al. (eds.), *Hortus Historiae. Księga pamiątkowa ku czci profesora J. Wolskiego w setną rocznicę urodzin*, Cracow 2010, 143–163.
- Olbrycht (2004): M. J. Olbrycht, *Aleksander Wielki i świat irański*, Rzeszow 2004 (in Polish).
- Piejko (1982): F. Piejko, *Ptolemies in a List of Deified Seleucids from Teos*, *OGIS* 246, *ZPE* 49, 1982, 129–131.
- Plischke (2011): S. Plischke, *Herrschaftslegitimation und Städtektul im Reich des Lysimachos*, in: S. Plischke – L.-M. Günther (eds.), *Studien zum vorhellenistischen und hellenistischen Herrscherktul*, Berlin 2011, 55–76.
- Pownall (2014): F. Pownall, *Callisthenes in Africa. The Historian's Role at Siwah and in the Proskynesis Controversy*, in: Ph. Bosman (ed.), *Alexander in Africa*, Pretoria 2014, 56–71.
- Pugliese Carratelli (1949): G. Pugliese Carratelli, *Alessandro e la costituzione rodia*, *PP* 4, 1949, 154–171.
- Rebuffat (1983): F. Rebuffat, *Alexandre le Grand et les problèmes financiers au début de son règne*, *RN* 25, 1983, 43–52.

- Rhodes – Osborne (2003): P. J. Rhodes – R. Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404–323 B.C.*, Oxford 2003.
- Ridgway (1990): B. S. Ridgway, *Hellenistic Sculpture I. The Styles of ca. 331–200 B.C.*, Madison 1990.
- Robert (1929): L. Robert, *Inscription agonistique d'Erythrai*, RPh 55, 1929, 148–149.
- Robert (1936): L. Robert, *Décrets de Kolophon*, RPh 62, 1936, 158–161.
- Robert (1959): L. Robert/ J. Robert, *Thasos*, REG 72, 1959, 226–229 (Bull. ép. 323).
- Rose (1993): C. B. Rose, *The 1992 Post-Bronze Age Excavations at Troia*, ST 3, 1993, 98–116.
- Rostovtzeff (1935): M. I. Rostovtzeff, *Πρόγονοι*, JHS 55, 1935, 56–66.
- Salviat (1958): F. Salviat, *Une nouvelle loi thasienne: institutions judiciaires et fêtes religieuses a la fin du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C.*, BCH 82, 1958, 193–267.
- Schiano (2010): C. Schiano, *Artemidoro di Efeso e la scienza del suo tempo*, Bari 2010.
- Segre (1941): M. Segre, *Epigraphica VII. Il culto rodio di Alessandro e dei Tolomei*, Bulletin de la Société Archéologique d'Alexandrie 34, 1941, 29–39.
- Seibert (1972): J. Seibert, *Alexander der Große*, Darmstadt 1972.
- Sekunda (2014): N. Sekunda, *The Importance of the Oracle of Didyma, Memphis 331 BC*, in: V. Grieb – K. Nawotka – A. Wojciechowska (eds.), *Alexander the Great and Egypt. History, Art, Tradition*. Wrocław – Breslau 18./19. Nov. 2011, Wiesbaden 2014, 107–117.
- Sherwin-White (1985): S. M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Archives. The Edict of Alexander to Priene, a Reappraisal*, JHS 105, 1985, 69–89.
- Stewart (1993): A. Stewart, *Faces of Power. Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics*, Berkeley 1993.
- Taeger (1957): F. Taeger, *Charisma. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes*, I, Stuttgart 1957.
- Thonemann (2012): P. Thonemann, *Alexander, Priene and Naulochon*, in: P. Martzavou – N. Papazarkadas (eds.), *The Epigraphy of the Post-Classical Polis*, Oxford 2012, 23–36.
- Tod (1933–1948): M. N. Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions, I–II*, Oxford 1933–1948.
- Vacante (2015): S. Vacante, *Colophon in the Early Hellenistic Age*, Klio 97.2, 2015, 539–602.
- Verkinderen (1987): F. Verkinderen, *The Honorary Decree for Malousios of Gargara and the κοινὸν of Athena Ilias*, Tyche 2, 1987, 247–269.
- Vujčić (2009): N. Vujčić, *Savez Jonjana u doba Rimskog carstva*, Zbornik Matice srpske za klasične studije 11, 2009, 139–151 (in Serbian).
- Walbank (1984): F. W. Walbank, *Monarchies and Monarchic Ideas*, in: CAH VII 1, <sup>2</sup>1984, 64–100.
- Wilamowitz-Möllendorff (1909): U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *Nordionische Steine*, Berlin 1909.
- Worthington (2008): I. Worthington, *Philip II of Macedonia*, New Haven 2008.