ELECTRUM * Vol. 28 (2021): 317–320
doi:10.4467/20800909EL.21.019.13377
www.ejournals.eu/electrum

Kai Trampedach, Alexander Meeus (eds.), *The Legitimation of Conquest: Monarchical Representation and the Art of Government in the Empire of Alexander the Great*, (*Studies in Ancient Monarchies* – 7), Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2020, 363 pp. + 5 b/w ills.; ISBN 978-3-515-12781-3

Alexander the Great's extraordinary life continues to attract historians' attention, with scores of studies published every year on the Macedonian's conquests and their consequences. Of particular importance among such works are those appraising Alexander's governance of newly-conquered peoples and his attempts at unifying culturally-diverse territories under his banner. Concluded and ongoing research projects continue to provide us with more information on Alexander's art of government in its theoretical and practical aspects. Relevantly to this review, a group of scholars studying Alexander's monarchical representation and governance in conquered territories gathered in Menaggio (Italy, May 10–12, 2018) to participate in a conference "Alexander's Empire: The Legitimation of Conquest." Conference papers, written by scholars from Austria, Ireland, Germany, Russia, Italy and the USA, were recently published as a volume edited by Franz Steiner Verlag as a part of their *Studies in Ancient Monarchies* series.

The volume opens an introduction by K. Trampedach and A. Meus ("Introduction: Understanding Alexander's Relations with His Subjects," pp. 9–18) that examines the *status questionis* and summarizes methodologies, conclusions and common points of contributions. Underscoring the ambiguous nature of sources on Alexander's methods of governance, the editors note the uniform research perspective adopted by all contributors—namely, Max Weber's tripartite classification of legitimate authority/leadership (*Herrschaftssoziologie*), with particular attention given to charismatic aspects of leadership that were left somewhat underdeveloped in Weber's analyses (pp. 9–13).

Chapters within the volume divide into four parts. The first section concentrates on Alexander's self-representation and legitimization of his rule ("Self-presentation and Royal Persona") and includes four articles, respectively by T. Hölscher ("From Early On To Become a Hero ('Held'): Mythical Models of Alexander's Image and Biography," pp. 21–44), K. Trampedach ("Staging Charisma: Alexander and Divination," pp. 45–60), Chr. Mann ("Alexander and Athletics or How (Not) To Use a Traditional Field of Monarchic Legitimation," pp. 61–75) and M. Haake ("Violence and Legitimation: The Social Logic of Alexander the Great's Acts of Violence between the Danube and the Indus—A Conceptual Outline and a Case Study," pp. 77–95). The authors consider Alexander's management of his multifaceted public image, carefully adjusted to match divergent expectations of Alexander's subjects and soldiers. Every social group demand-

ed a tailored reputation management strategy. At some times, Alexander accentuated his heroic persona to legitimize his authority, linking his lineage to famed heroes of myth such as Achilles or Heracles. On other occasions, the Macedonian promoted oracles and soothsayers who proclaimed his allegedly divine heritage and represented his actions as driven by destiny. Assiduously cultivating his numinous authority, Alexander selected which oracles to proclaim to civilians and which ones to his military, a novel image management strategy. Unlike other contemporary rulers, the Macedonian only rarely established, funded, or participated in any athletic games, organizing them solely for his soldiers to reward and inspire their loyalty (cf. pp. 67–75). Alexander asserted and legitimized his authority also through violent humiliation of defeated leaders and rulers, a strategy that demands further intellectual inquiry.

The second section of the volume includes five papers examining Alexander's strategies to impose and legitimize his rule over diverse lands that made up his empire ("Local Perspectives and Interactions"). Here we find chapters by R. van den Hoff ("Alexander's Dedications to the Gods: Sacred Space, Pious Practice and Public Legitimation," pp. 99–121), S. Wallace ("Communication and Legitimation: Knowledge of Alexander's Asian Conquests in the Greek World," pp. 123–144), W. Köhler ("Legitimation—Unwitting and Unrequested: Alexander of Macedon's Portrayal as Divine Tool in Zechariah 9," pp. 145–164), M. Jursa ("Wooing the Victor with Words: Babylonian Priestly Literature as a Response to the Macedonian Conquest," pp. 165–177) and M. Giangiulio ("Shaping the New World: Once More on the Cities of Alexander," pp. 179–194). The authors discuss Alexander's legitimization strategies in specific cultural and political contexts, either in Greece and Macedonia (core lands of the empire) or in conquered territories in the East. After 334 BCE, Alexander earned his reputation in Greece through endowing temples with lands and material gifts. Testifying to his political acumen, Alexander's donations often made a symbolic statement. After the battle of the Granicus River in May 334 BCE, Alexander gave Athens 300 Persian shields that were conspicuously displayed in the Parthenon, vividly embodying the revenge exacted on Greece's erstwhile invaders and endearing Athenian hearts to Alexander's cause. Arrian of Nicomedia's *Anabasis of Alexander* affirms that the Macedonian made certain to support and endow other sanctuaries as well (7.28.1). Apart from religious endowments, Alexander appears to have employed other strategies to reward and win gratitude of Greek city-states that, having suffered from the Persian hands, supported Alexander and his army during his campaigns. In turn, Alexander's authority in Macedonia was promoted by numerous inscriptions dedicated to Alexander's commanders, their texts praising the commanders' valor and listing military campaigns in which they participated.

In the conquered lands, Alexander famously founded cities named after him, a well-researched yet still intriguing practice. One still unanswered question concerns Alexander's choice of foundation locations in Central Asia and India. Giangiulio's contribution suggests that new foundations meant to replace existing administrative centers in order to incorporate these remote territories more firmly into Alexander's nascent empire (cf. pp. 189–194).

Köhler and Jursa's texts investigate how local elites reacted to Alexander's conquest on the basis of data in biblical and Babylonian sources. Although very few contemporary Babylonian sources on Alexander survive to this day, the Seleucid accounts on the Greco-

Macedonian conquest of Babylon capture some sentiments of the conquered populace. Alexander appears to have won support of local priestly elites thanks to his respect for Babylonian religious traditions. The information on views on Alexander held by the Jewish elites comes from the *Book of Daniel* and the *First Book of Maccabees*: W. Köhler argues that echoes of Alexander's conquests also surface in the *Book of Zechariah*, whose author alludes to Alexander's deeds in context of Zechariah's theology.

The third section of the volume encompasses four chapters on local administration and uses of legitimation in Alexander's empire ("Administration and Institutions"), written by M. Mari ("Alexander, the King of the Macedonians," pp. 197–217), M. M. Kholod ("On the Titulature of Alexander the Great: the Title *basileus*," pp. 219–241), M. Faraguna ("Alexander the Great and Asia Minor: Conquest and Strategies of Legitimation," pp. 243–261) and A. Monson ("Alexander's Tributary Empire," pp. 263–287).

Alexander's conquest has fundamentally changed the political structure and extent of his sovereignty, from king of Macedonia to ruler of the half of the known world. Appropriately, such a meteoric rise in status must have influenced the king's public image and prerogatives in his Macedonian homeland. The surviving evidence indicates that the older Macedonian royal customs, observed under Alexander, were being adapted to suit Alexander's imperial status. Simultaneously, the evolution of royal court etiquette and titulature under Alexander, a continuous process, logically followed from changes previously introduced by Philip II and was in turn to be followed by similar developments in the Hellenistic era. The extent of these changes is perhaps most visible when considering Alexander's use of royal titulature.

Monson's chapter controversially argues that Alexander's power came equally from his troops and his overstuffed coffers, with conquests and taxation providing Alexander with enough financial leverage over his subjects so that he did not need to legitimize his rule in any other fashion (cf. pp. 286–287). Even if we conditionally accept Monson's arguments, other contributors to the volume have amply demonstrated that Alexander still attempted, for one reason or another, to inspire loyalty of his subjects.

The fourth section of this volume ("Epilogues") groups two chapters. The first one by A. Meeus ("The Strategies of Legitimation of Alexander and the Diadochi: Continuities and Discontinuities," pp. 291–317) considers the continuance (or lack thereof) of Alexander's governance methods under his successors. Although the paucity of data does not allow one to draw any general conclusions, the author showcases that the *diadochi* by and large continued Alexander's policies in propaganda and public image management (p. 317). The second text by H.-J. Gehrke ("Concluding Remarks," pp. 319–323) succinctly summarizes key points and conclusions made by the volume contributors.

The breadth and multiplicity of perspectives within the reviewed volume translates to palpable differences in argument structure and style, an unavoidable consequence for any collection of conference proceedings. Nevertheless, the volume's sustained focus on legitimization of Alexander's rule across his diverse empire ensures that every chapter makes a valuable contribution to our knowledge. The sheer scope of discussed topics demonstrates that careful application of novel research paradigms allows one to draw new insights even from an ostensibly well-researched body of data. Crucially, authors' conclusions often demonstrate that commonly-held scholarly ideas on Alexander's

imperial administration are proven to be false when subjected to intense scrutiny, since Alexander appears to have flexibly adopted various policies in various parts of the empire. Even if the volume adds to the already voluminous and seemingly well-researched body of work on Alexander's governance of conquered territories, the brilliance and focus of the volume's authors make it a most welcome addition.

Edward Dąbrowa
http:/orcid.org/0000-0002-9324-9096
Jagiellonian University in Kraków