Alexander the Great
The Rise and Fall of Empire and The Birth of Hellenistic Greece
CHW 3M
8 Lessons – Lesson #1  
Course: CHW 3M  
Topic/Unit: Alexander the Great/The Transition to Hellenistic Greece  
Introductory Lesson

Overview: This lesson will introduce the topic/unit of the transition from the Classical period of Greek history to the Hellenistic period by focusing on the figure of Alexander the Great and his role in the changes that occurred. The element of wonder or awe for this unit can be inspired in students through the exploration of how one man was able to conquer most of the known world and how his military actions spread Greek culture throughout the near East, as well as increasing understanding of the Persian perspective, which is a side often left unexplored in the discussion about Alexander. A variety of both primary and secondary sources are used throughout the series of 8 lessons, with the structure of the unit being very discussion based with a focus on encouraging critical and historical thinking when engaging with sources. This introductory lesson will provide students with a basic outline of the content needed to proceed into the details that will be taught through the lens of the “Big Six”¹ historical thinking concepts over the course of the following 6 lessons.

Learning Goals:  
By the end of this lesson students will be equipped with the basic content knowledge about the main points of the life of Alexander the Great and the period of transition to Hellenistic Greece, allowing them to proceed to more detailed analysis of significant aspects of the period.

Curriculum expectation of focus for the unit:  
• Describe the roles of selected individuals and groups in the process of change.

Materials:  
i. Primary Sources:  
• Images of Alexander:  
  o Marble Portrait of Alexander the Great, housed at the British Museum,  
    http://www.britishmuseum.org/explore/highlights/highlight_objects/gr/m/portrait_alexander_the_great.aspx  
  o Silver *decadrachm* of Alexander the Great, housed at the British Museum,  
  o Portrait of Alexander the Great (356-323 BC), Department of Greek, Etruscan, and Roman Antiquities: Hellenistic Art (3rd – 1st centuries BC), Louvre Museum,  
  • Plutarch, *Alexander*, ch. 4 (Appendix 1.2)


ii. Other Resources
   • “Alexander the Great” Powerpoint – Appendix 1.3
   • Video: Great Military Battles: The Battle of Gaugamela on Youtube: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mUu2rz8WhZg

iii. Prompts for Students
   • Summative Assessment Rubric - Appendix 1.4
   • TkWL Chart – Appendix 1.5

Plan of Instruction:
Because this is an introductory lesson with a focus on content, as opposed to historical thinking skills, it will not follow the same structure as the rest of the lessons that follow, i.e. modeling, guided practice, independent activity.

Step 1: Prior knowledge? (10 minutes)
- Hand out the TkWL Chart to all students
- Ask them to fill in what they think they already know/what assumptions they have about Alexander the Great. Teacher can assist/encourage students by creating a mind map or list of their assumptions on the board.
  - Ask students where they obtained their prior knowledge of the subject. Do they think these are reliable sources?
- Students will then proceed to fill out what they want to learn during this unit and to share with the class. If multiple students have the same questions, these can be recorded on a piece of chart paper and posted in the classroom to be referred to throughout the unit.

Step 2: Introduction of New Material (15 minutes)
- Show “Alexander the Great” Powerpoint presentation (Appendix 1.3), asking students to copy down important information in a note.
- Discuss how much of this basic contextual information aligns with their “prior knowledge” that they recorded in their charts.

Step 3: Activity/Discussion (30 minutes)
- Show images of a variety of representations of Alexander the Great (Appendix 1.1)
  - Ask students what they think of these representations? What do they signify and what is their importance?
- Read chapter 4 of Plutarch’s Alexander (Appendix 1.2)
  - Ask students to work together to create a visual representation on the board of what they are hearing the teacher read or have students listen and draw individually at their desks as the teacher reads.
  - Discuss context – Classical Greek ideas of temperament, etc. What does this tell us about the world Alexander lived in?
Step 4: Introduction of Assessment Task

- Throughout the series of lessons on Alexander the Great and the transition to the Hellenistic period students will work on a task that will allow for assessment for learning and eventually assessment of learning. After this introductory lesson students will be given a piece of chart paper and asked to create a portrait of Alexander. Every day after the lesson students will add to it by drawing, finding pictures or creating some kind of visual representation of what they thought were the most significant aspects discussed. On the back of the chart paper they will then write a short explanation of why they chose to add what they did and why they think it is significant. At the end of the unit, they will present their portraits to the class, explaining their choice of the 3 most significant things overall and their decision on whether Alexander can be labeled a great historical figure and why or why not. Hand out Rubric. (Appendix 1.4)
Appendix 1.1: Images of Alexander

1. Marble portrait of Alexander the Great
   http://www.britishmuseum.org/explore/highlights/highlight_objects/gr/m/portrait_alexander_the_great.aspx

Hellenistic Greek, 2nd-1st century BC Said to be from Alexandria, Egypt
Youthful image of the conqueror king

Literary sources tell us, though perhaps not reliably, that Alexander (reigned 336-323 BC) chose only a few artists to produce his image, and famous names such as the sculptor Lysippos and the painter Apelles were associated with his portraiture. Though none of the famous images have been recovered, many sculptures in different materials, as well as portraits on gemstones and coins, survive. These were mostly produced long after Alexander's death and while the portraits follow similar general characteristics, they also vary in style.

Alexander was always shown clean-shaven, which was an innovation: all previous portraits of Greek statesmen or rulers had beards. This royal fashion lasted for almost five hundred years and almost all of the Hellenistic kings and Roman emperors until Hadrian were portrayed beardless. Alexander was the first king to wear the all-important royal diadem, a band of cloth tied around the hair that was to become the symbol of Hellenistic kingship.

Earlier portraits of Alexander, in heroic style, look more mature than the portraits made after his death, such as this example. These show a more youthful, though perhaps more god-like character. He has longer hair, a more dynamic tilt of the head and an
upward gaze, resembling his description in literary sources.

This head was acquired in Alexandria, the city founded by Alexander in 331 BC, and the location of his tomb. Alexandria was also the capital of the longest surviving Hellenistic dynasty, the Ptolemies. From the time of the reign of Ptolemy I Soter ("Saviour") (305-282 BC), Alexander was worshipped as a god and the forefather of the dynasty.

2.

Silver *decadrachm* of Alexander the Great

Greek, around 324 BC

**The only image of Alexander to survive from his lifetime**
In 326 BC Alexander the Great's conquest of the world had taken him as far east as India, where he fought a successful battle at the River Hydaspes with the Indian king Porus. It is generally accepted that this coin is from a series issued by the victorious Alexander, perhaps after his return to Babylon in 324 BC, although there is no firm evidence for its place of production, and Alexander's name is absent from these coins and their accompanying issues.

If they were issued by Alexander then they are remarkable historical documents. On the front of the coin is depicted a figure on horseback, presumably Alexander, attacking a figure riding an elephant, perhaps intended to represent Porus, or a generic Indian warrior. On the back is a standing figure wearing a Macedonian cloak, a Persian headdress and Greek armour. He is almost certainly intended to represent Alexander the Great, but carries in his hand a thunderbolt, a clear sign of divinity. If Alexander was the issuer of these coins, it is undeniable that he is making claims to divinity in his own lifetime.
3.

**Portrait of Alexander the Great (356-323 BC)**
Department of Greek, Etruscan, and Roman Antiquities: Hellenistic Art (3rd-1st centuries BC), housed at the Louvre Museum

Thanks to its original antique inscription, this figure can be definitely identified as Alexander the Great, son of Philip II of Macedon. The leonine hair brushed up from the forehead is characteristic of portraits of the Macedonian sovereign. The work is a copy of the head of a work from 330 BC attributed to Lysippos - doubtless the statue of Alexander with a bronze lance mentioned by Plutarch (Moralia, 360 d). The Louvre's small bronze, Br 370, is another copy of the same work.

**Alexander the Great**
This work takes the form of a herm: a pillar whose upper part has been sculpted in the shape of a head. It shows a young man, his head slightly lifted. The features are idealized, but there is a degree of individualization in his inspired expression, and the mane of hair falling in strands on his forehead. The authenticity of the antique inscription - which identifies the bust as that of Alexander the Great - is open to discussion, but the physiognomy of the figure leaves no doubt. The particular arrangement of the hair is well attested in other images of the Macedonian conqueror.

**A diplomatic gift?**
This bust was part of a gallery of herms featuring portraits of famous men, unearthed in 1779 during an excavation at Tivoli organized by Joseph Nicolas Azara, the Spanish ambassador to the Holy See and, later, to France. For a time, this was the only known portrait of Alexander the Great; the value and significance of Azara's gift of it to Napoleon Bonaparte was, then, considerable. The date of the presentation is uncertain:
according to some texts, Azara intended to offer it as a diplomatic gift during the negotiations surrounding the Armistice of Bologna in 1796, as a gauge of the Holy See's good will towards . Nevertheless, the inscription tells us that Napoleon received the herm during his time as First Consul, ie. not before 1803, the year in which he gave the work to the Louvre (as indicated by the inscription on the right-hand side of the pillar). The inscription, together with Bonaparte's other imperial symbols, was probably made after his downfall in 1815.

**The echo of a lost statue**

This bust was badly damaged during its time underground, and has been extensively restored. It is, nevertheless, the portrait of Alexander that comes closest to the work of Lysippos, a Greek artist of the fourth century BC. Lysippos's fame is due as much to his works in bronze as to his status as Alexander's official portraitist. Contemporary sources tell us that the sovereign authorized only three such artists: the sculptor Lysippos, the gem-engraver Pyrgoteles, and the painter Apelles. No direct trace of Lysippos's work has come down to us. Most antique bronze statues disappeared long ago, and are known only through small bronze copies or Roman versions in marble. The Azara Herm and the bronze Br 370 are copies of the same original, created by Lysippos around 330 BC. Alexander is shown looking upwards, as if to challenge the gods themselves. This vision of the inspired ruler, widely copied by Alexander's successors and imitators, became a standard model for Hellenistic royal portraiture.

4.

Image: Depiction of Alexander the Great in the Luxor Temple

The Egyptians, oppressed under the Persian rule, welcomed Alexander the Great with open arms when he entered the country in 332 B.C. While there he visited the Oracle of Amon, at Siwa, where he was declared "the son of Amon." Exactly how this happened is unclear. One story is that either upon entering or exiting the temple he was greeted by the priest as "my son." Alexander's army and followers were not in a strategic position to see the priest and thought the words came from the god himself. However it happened, from that point on Alexander was instated as a son of god, like the pharaohs of old. Alexander initiated the building of Alexandria, but never lived to see the city. He left Egypt in 331 B.C. and left Cleomenes of Naukratis in charge of the territory. This position was later claimed by Ptolemy. When Alexander died, Ptolemy's generals divided the kingdom.

Read more: http://www.touregypt.net/macdyn01.htm#ixzz2kdG8dYwt

The outward appearance of Alexander is best represented by the statues of him which Lysippus made, and it was by this artist alone that Alexander himself thought it fit that he should be modelled. For those peculiarities which many of his successors and friends afterwards tried to imitate, namely, the poise of the neck, which was bent slightly to the left, and the melting glance of his eyes, this artist has accurately observed. [2] Apelles, however, in painting him as wielder of the thunderbolt, did not reproduce his complexion, but made it too dark and swarthy. Whereas he was of a fair colour, as they say, and his fairness passed into ruddiness on his breast particularly, and in his face. Moreover, that a very pleasant odour exhaled from his skin and that there was a fragrance about his mouth and all his flesh, so that his garments were filled with it, this we have read in the Memoirs of Aristozenus.

[3] Now, the cause of this, perhaps, was the temperament of his body, which was a very warm and fiery one; for fragrance is generated, as Theophrastus thinks, where moist humours are acted upon by heat. Wherefore the dry and parched regions of the world produce the most and best spices; for the sun draws away the moisture which, like material of corruption, abounds in vegetable bodies. [4] And in Alexander’s case, it was the heat of his body, as it would seem, which made him prone to drink, and choleric. But while he was still a boy his self-restraint showed itself in the fact that, although he was impetuous and violent in other matters, the pleasures of the body had little hold upon him, and he indulged in them with great moderation, while his ambition kept his spirit serious and lofty in advance of his years. [5] For it was neither every kind of fame nor fame from every source that he courted, as Philip did, who plumed himself like a sophist on the power of his oratory, and took care to have the victories of his chariots at Olympia engraved upon his coins; nay, when those about him inquired whether he would be willing to contend in the foot-race at the Olympic games, since he was swift of foot, ‘Yes,’ said he, ‘if I could have kings as my contestants.’ [6] And in general, too, Alexander appears to have been averse to the whole race of athletes; at any rate, though he instituted very many contests, not only for tragic poets and players on the flute and players on the lyre, but also for rhapsodists, as well as for hunting of every sort and for fighting with staves, he took no interest in offering prizes either for boxing or for the pancratium.
Appendix 1.3: Introductory Content Slideshow
All content information taken from:

**Macedon and Philip the Great**
- Considered a backwater of Greece
  - Spoke a Greek dialect
  - People were farmers and shepherds
  - Not as wealthy as the Greek city states to the south
- Macedonians were united in the 4th Century BCE by several kings, the most prominent of which was Philip the Great (father of Alexander)
- Philip created a professional army and trained them in the Theban tactic of the phalanx.
- He defeated and united the mainland Greeks at the Battle of Chaeronea in 338 BC
- Philip was assassinated by one of his own officers

**Philip the Great**
- Archaeologists have excavated a royal tomb at Vergina in Northern Greece
- The outer facade has a painting of a lion hunt, possibly depicting a young Alexander
- Inside was found silver and gold items, with armour and the burnt bones of a man some believe to be Philip, while others claim it was his son Philip III Arrhidaeus (Alexander’s half brother)

**Alexander III**
- Alexander was born in approximately 356 BCE.
- He was taught by the philosopher Aristotle.
- He became king at the age of 20 after his father’s death.
- In 334 BCE he took his father’s army of 35,000 men to attempt to conquer the Achaemenid Empire (Persia).
- After he succeeded in conquering King Darius of Persia he continued to conquer other territories as far east as the Indus River Valley before turning back towards Macedon.

**Rule of the Empire and Death**
- Alexander used Greek language and culture as a unifying force throughout the empire.
  - However, he also allowed the people he conquered to continue using their own laws and customs and incorporated their leaders into the structure of his government.
- Alexander died in 323 BCE, just before he would have turned 33.
  - Shortly after his death his empire began to break up into smaller pieces ruled by his most powerful generals.
- The death of Alexander marks the shift from what historians have termed the Classical Age (480-323BCE) to the Hellenistic Age (323-31 BCE)
Appendix 1.4  Summative Assignment
A Portrait of Alexander

For this unit you will create a portrait of Alexander the Great. Each day you will add a new element to your portrait, related to the material covered in class.

Task Requirements: The following must be present on your Portrait of Alexander
- At least one visual representation from each lesson (min of 7)
- For each visual representation, include a short description and explanation on the back of the portrait. This is your reasoning. (3-5 sentences)
- Appropriate labelling of elements and their corresponding written component.

This is an opportunity to use your creativity to illustrate what you understand about Alexander the Great.

Think about what things stood out to you during the unit, what things surprised you, if your image of Alexander has changed.

| Rubric |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Categories | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |
| **Knowledge and Understanding**  
- Accurate knowledge of content  
- Understanding of content | -Knowledge of content is difficult to see.  
-Understanding is difficult to see. | -Knowledge of content is visible.  
-Understanding is visible. | -Knowledge of content is evident.  
-Understanding is clear. | -Demonstrates thorough knowledge of content  
-Demonstrates thorough understanding. |
| **Thinking**  
- Use of processing skills  
- Use of creative/critical thinking skills | -A unclear analysis has been made  
-Minimal critical thinking has been done. | -An analysis has been made  
-Some critical thinking has been done. | - A clear analysis has been made  
-Clear evidence of critical thinking. | - Clear analysis through reasoning has been made.  
-? |
| **Communication**  
-Expression and Organization of ideas  
-Use of conventions | -Voice is unclear  
-Difficult to follow organisation.  
-few key words are used with minimal effectiveness. | -Voice is clear.  
-Organisation allows following.  
-Key words are used appropriately. | -Voice is clear and confident.  
-Organisation is effective.  
-Uses key words from unit considerable effectiveness. | -Voice is clear and confident - organization facilitates understanding.  
-Uses key words thoroughly and effectively. |
| **Application**  
-Application of knowledge  
-Making connections to different contexts | -Draws few conclusions from unit knowledge.  
-Few connections are made. | -Some accurate conclusions are drawn from unit knowledge.  
-Some Connections are effectively drawn. | -Draws accurate conclusions from unit knowledge  
-Connections are effectively and clearly drawn. | -Draws conclusions that expand on unit knowledge.  
-Connections drawn expand on unit knowledge. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What I THINK I Know</th>
<th>What I WANT to Know</th>
<th>What I LEARNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 Lessons – Lesson #2
Course: CHW 3M
Topic/Unit: Alexander the Great/The Transition to Hellenistic Greece
Historical Thinking Concept: Significance
The Sarissa, and the Macedonian Phalanx

**Overview:** This lesson will help students determine what is historically significant. Students will create a definition of significance and use it to analyse primary and secondary resources.

**Learning Goals:** Students will develop an idea of what it means for something to be significant, or have significance.

**Curriculum Expectations**
- Describe the roles of selected individuals and groups in the process of change (e.g., Akhenaton, Nebuchadnezzar II, Socrates, Augustus, Peter the Apostle, Alexander the Great, Constantine I, Charlemagne, Jeanne d’Arc; the Aryans, the Babylonians, the Vikings, the Mongols);

**Materials:**
- Appendix 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5
- Spear like item (if possible)/ student
- Field or other open area
- Whistle/horn/ loud voice.
- Cardboard (shields)
- Tape (duct/masking)
- Chart Paper

**Plan of Instruction:**

**Step 1 : Warm-up – word map (2-3 minutes)**
- On the board is written the word “significance”. Invite students to write on the board to create a word map around the term “significant”

**Step 2 : Discussion (10 minutes)**
- What is significance? Discuss with the class why they chose to write those terms on the board. What if the term was changed to “historical significance”? How would their examples change? Questions to spur on the conversation should look to draw student’s attention towards ideas of change, revelation, construction, and variation.

**Step 3 : Modelling (15 minutes)**
- Create a definition of significance as a class. Ensure that the concepts of change, revelation, construction, and variation.
- What can be historically significant?
- Show students that events/people/developments are historically significant when they cause change, or reveal something about the past. Give examples. Such as: Adolf Hitler, the discovery of ancient Roman pottery etc. A T chart on the board would be useful.
Step 4: Guided Practice (20 minutes)
• Students work in groups to compile a list of events/people/developments that they would consider significant from what they already know of Alexander the Great from the intro class and the documentary. Provide students with chart paper.
• For each example, students must include why/how that event/person/development is important, such as it being a change, a revelation, and if it was constructed, or is significant for a certain group of people.

Step 5: Independent Activity (rest of class / for homework)
• Show students a picture of a Sarissa. Appendix 1.1. (Primary resource)
• Quick discussion as to what the Sarissa is (recap from introduction lesson)
• Provide students with handout 1.3
• Students fill in the handout.
• Allow students to also work on their “Portrait of Alexander” adding in an element of Significance for the day.
• Remind students to bring in some cardboard for the next day. A pizza box lid would be a good size.

Next day
• Before students head outside to do the phalanx drill activity, take up the homework handout on the board / smart board by asking for examples from the students. Highlight key words and well thought out responses.

Phalanx drill activity (45 minutes)
• Students bring in their cardboard and use the tape provided to create a handle to attach it to their arms.
• Show students a picture of a phalanx. Appendix 1.2. highlighting rank formation and the position of sarissas.
• Head outside
• If available, give students the “Sarissas” one each.
• Arrange them in a phalanx formation.
• Run students through a series of drills, such as march, halt, right, turn, left turn. Lower phalanx, raise phalanx.
• If time permits, drill more advanced manoeuvres such as the tilted phalanx used to pierce enemy lines at the battle of Gaugamela.

Step 6: Sharing/Discussion/Teaching
• The sharing of student learning would take place during the homework take up and the group sharing.
• Experiencing the drilling of a Macedonian phalanx allows students to feel what it would be like to march in Alexander’s army.
• Key things to note: While drilling, or soon after, ask students to share what they think it would be like to be in a Macedonian phalanx. Sometimes the infantry would have to stand, eat, sleep, and go to the bathroom in formation for hours or days at a time.

Assessment: Homework take-up next day, group sharing and continued work on the Summative.
Appendix – Lesson 1
1.1


1.2
**Historical Significance**

Name: ___________________________________________ Date: ____________

**Primary or secondary source:**

**Event or person that is historically significant in this source:**

**Brief description:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Significance Criteria</strong></th>
<th>In what ways is this development historically significant?</th>
<th>Does it apply? (Y/N)</th>
<th>In what way does this development meet the criteria?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Resulting in Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Was this a new development or an enhancement on old technology?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>What did these changes allow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>What effects did the change have?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Revealing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How does this development shed light on enduring or emerging issues in history or contemporary life?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In what ways could a historian construct significance about this development?
How might the historical significance of this development change over time and/or to different people?

Modified from: Center for the Study of Historical Consciousness, UBC
Overview:
This lesson entails the development of skills in identification and analysis of primary and secondary sources recounting events from the life of Alexander the Great. It connects to the unit’s goals and purpose by encouraging students to think critically about the information available on the topic and how they can use these sources to further their understanding of Alexander’s empire.

Learning Goal:
By the end of the lesson students will acquire or further develop the ability to differentiate between primary and secondary sources. They will also practice interacting with several sources and will assess their usefulness and credibility by:

1. Making inferences from primary sources
2. Asking questions of the sources to turn them into evidence
3. Engaging in sourcing by questioning who created the sources and why
4. Understanding and analyzing the context in which the sources were created
5. Corroborating with other sources that students will find independently.

Curriculum Expectations:

Primary Specific Expectation: describe the roles of selected individuals and groups in the process of change

Secondary Curriculum Expectations:
Citizenship and Heritage
• Overall Expectations:
  o Demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which various individuals, groups, and events influenced changes in major legal, political, and military traditions before the sixteenth century
• Specific Expectations:
  o Legal, Political, and Military Traditions: describe the contributions of various individuals and groups to the development of legal, political, and military traditions in societies prior to the sixteenth century
  o Individuals, Groups, and Authority: explain the bases of authority in a variety of societies from the time of the first communities to the sixteenth century

Methods of Historical Inquiry and Communication
• Overall Expectations:
  o Interpret and analyze information gathered through research, employing concepts and approaches appropriate to historical inquiry
• Specific Expectations:
o Interpretation and Analysis: analyze historical events and issues from the perspectives of different participants in those events and issues,
o Draw conclusions based on supporting evidence, effective analysis of information, and awareness of diverse historical interpretations
o Research: evaluate the credibility of sources and information (e.g., by considering the authority, impartiality, and expertise of the source and checking the information for accuracy, reliability, underlying assumptions, prejudice and bias, and validity of argument)

Materials:
i. Primary Sources:
   • Mosaic of the Battle of Issus (Museo Archeologo Nazionale di Napoli) – Appendix 3.1
   • “The Need for Source Criticism: A Letter from Alexander to Aristotle?”, Fordham University (Full text: Appendix 3.2):
   • Arrian, "Speech of Alexander the Great", from The Campaigns of Alexander (Full text: Appendix 3.3):
   • Arrian, Anabasis of Alexander: The Battle of Gaugamela (Book III, 7-16), translated By: E. J. Chinnock (Full text: Appendix 3.4):

ii. Secondary Sources/Other resources:
   • Video: Great Military Battles: The Battle of Gaugamela on Youtube: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mUu2rz8WhZg
   • Computers, laptops, iPads or student devices if available (Internet access)

iii. Prompts for Students
   • BLM 3.3 (Appendix 3.5):

Plan of Instruction:

Step 1: Warm up (10 minutes)
   • Take up homework
Activity: “Hook, Line and Linker”2 – Observations and analysis of the mosaic of the Battle of Issus (Museo Archeologo Nazionale di Napoli) – Appendix 3.1

- Ask students what they observe, without making inferences, creating lines of inquiry for future discussion
- Proceed to making inferences about the image and what it tells us as a piece of historical evidence
- For more information about the mosaic see the website of the Museo Archeologo Nazionale di Napoli: http://cir.campania.beniculturali.it/museoarcheologiconazionale/thematic-views/image-gallery/RA103/?searchterm=alexander%20the%20great

Step 2: Discussion (10-15 minutes)
- Activate prior knowledge of primary and secondary sources with a mind map, asking students to think of various types of both primary and secondary sources and where to find them

Step 3: Modeling (25 minutes)
“The Need for Source Criticism: A Letter from Alexander to Aristotle?” (Appendix 3.2)
- Hand out BLM 2.3 (Appendix 3.5) and read through questions as a class
- Read a portion of the letter (last 2-3 paragraphs) as a class, asking students to consider if there are any “red flags” they find within the source that we should look into.
- Share with students the information about where the source was found/who created it and discuss the questions included with the source on the Fordham University website:

1. Why is no source given for the document?

2. Why was this letter posted on a modern nationalist website? How does it support the claims of modern Macedonia compared to other political groups/interests in the area?

3. Why would Alexander be using modern geographical terms such as "Aegean basin" or showing modern geographical knowledge such as about the "Bay of Bengal" or the "Coast of China"?

4. Why the constant differentiation between "Greeks" and "Macedonians"?

Discuss: Is this a reliable source? Why or why not?

Step 4: Guided Practice (30 minutes)
Arrian, “Speech of Alexander the Great”, from The Campaigns of Alexander (Appendix 3.3)

2Seixas, Peter, and Tom Morton. The Big Six: Historical Thinking Concepts, 53.
• Students read the speech and use BLM 2.3 to record information
• Internet access will be required for students to be able to do some research on the author, corroborate the source, etc.

Step 5: Independent Activity (20 minutes)

• Show video: Great Military Battles: The Battle of Gaugamela on Youtube (from approx. 29:30-33:30) - http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mUu2rz8WhZg followed by the scene of the Battle of Gaugamela from the film Alexander
• Organize students into pairs or small groups and distribute one paragraph of the following source to each group:
  o Anabasis of Alexander: The Battle of Gaugamela (Book III, 7-16) (Appendix 3.4)
• Have each group read their paragraph and take notes of the main points then make comparisons with the videos that they saw.

Step 6: Sharing (15 minutes)
• Have each group share the important points from their section of the reading and give a letter grade for reliability as historical evidence to the videos that they watched with an explanation of their rationale.

Assessment: Students will add to their portrait of Alexander and take a picture of this stage with their (or the teacher's) phone or device.

The Internet History Sourcebooks Project is dedicated to making original primary sources available on the Internet. An important aspect of using primary source material is learning how to critique a source. It is quite possible, for example, for a source to be invented, to be edited, or to be mistranslated. Checking into the authenticity and reliability of a source is called source criticism. The text and commentary here present an example of how sources may be invented, and misused, and of the way historians respond.

In September 1998 the Republic of Macedonia website posted the following text on its pages. Here various parts are highlighted for later discussion.

To Aristotle of Stagirus, director of the school at Athens

My great and beloved teacher, dear Aristotle!

It is a very, very long time since I wrote to you; but as you know I have been over-occupied with military matters, and while we were marching through Hyrcania, Drangiana, and Gedrosia, conquering Bactria, and advancing beyond the Indus, I had neither the time nor the inclination to take up my pen. I have now been back in Susa for some months; but I have been so overwhelmed with administrative business, appointing officials, and mopping up all kinds of intrigues and revolts, that I have not had a moment till today to write to you about myself. Of course, you know roughly from the official reports what I have been doing; but both my devotion to you and my confidence in your influence on cultivated Hellenic circles urge me once more to open my heart to you as my revered teacher and spiritual guide.

I remember that years ago (how far away it seems to me now!) I wrote you an absurd and enthusiastic letter on the tomb of Achilles; I was on the threshold of my Persian expedition, and I vowed then that my model for life should be the valiant son of Peleus. I dreamed only of heroism and greatness; I had already won my victory over Thrace, and I thought that I was advancing against Darius at the head of my Macedonians and Hellenes simply to cover myself with laurels worthy of my ancestors. I can say that I did not fall short of my ideal either at Chaeronea or at Granicus; but today I hold a very different view of the political significance of my actions at that time. The sober truth is that our Macedonia was constantly threatened from the north by the Thracian barbarians; they could have attacked us at an unfavorable moment which the Greeks would have used to violate their treaty and break away from Macedonia. It was absolutely necessary to subdue Thrace so that Macedonia should have her flank covered in the event of Greek treachery. It was sheer political necessity, my dear Aristotle; but your pupil did not understand this thoroughly then and gave himself up to dreams of exploits like those of Achilles.

With the conquest of Thrace our situation changed: we controlled the whole of the western coast of the Aegean; but our mastery of the Aegean was threatened by the maritime power of Persia. Fortunately I struck before Darius was ready. I thought I was
following in the footsteps of Achilles and should have the glory of conquering a new Illium for Greece; actually, as I see today, it was absolutely necessary to drive the Persians back from the Aegean Sea; and I drove them back, my dear master, so thoroughly that I occupied the whole of Bithynia, Phrygia, and Cappadocia, laid waste Cilicia, and only stopped at Tarsus. Asia Minor was ours. Not only the old Aegean basin but the whole northern coast of the Mediterranean was in our hands.

You would have said, my dear Aristotle, that my principal political and strategic aim - namely, the final expulsion of Persia from Hellenic waters - was now completely achieved. But with the conquest of Asia Minor a new situation arose: our new shores might be threatened from the south - that is, from Phoenicia or Egypt; Persia might receive reinforcements or material from there for further wars against us. It was thus essential to occupy the Tyrian coasts and control Egypt; in this way we became masters of the entire littoral. But simultaneously a new danger arose: that Darius, relying on his rich Mesopotamia, might fling himself upon Syria and tear our Egyptian dominions from our base in Asia Minor. I therefore had to crush Darius at any cost; I succeeded in doing this at Gaugamela; as you know, Babylon and Susa, Persepolis and Pasargadae, dropped into our lap. This gave us control of the Persian Gulf; but so as to protect these new dominions against possible invasions from the north we had to set out northward against the Medes and Hycarans. Now our dominions stretched from the Caspian Sea to the Persian Gulf but lay open to the east; I advanced with my Macedonians to the borders of Area and Drangiana, I laid waste Gedrosia, and gave Arachosia a thrashing, after which I occupied Bactria as a conqueror; and to safeguard these military victories by a lasting union, I took the Bactrian Princess Roxana to wife. It was a simple political necessity; I had conquered so many Eastern lands for my Macedonians and Greeks that willy-nilly I had to win over my barbarous Eastern subjects by my appearance and splendor, without which these poor shepherds cannot imagine a powerful ruler. The truth is that my old Macedonian Guard took it badly; perhaps they thought that their old commander was becoming estranged from his war comrades. Unfortunately I had to have my old friends Philotas and Calisthenes executed; my dear Parmenion lost his life, too. I was very sorry about this; but it was unavoidable if the rebellion of my Macedonians was not to endanger my next step. I was, in fact, just preparing for my expedition to India. I must tell you that Gedrosia and Arachosia are enclosed within high mountains like fortifications; but for these fortifications to be impregnable they need a foreground from which to undertake a sally or a withdrawal behind the ramparts. This strategic foreground is India as far as the Indus. It was a military necessity to occupy this territory and with it the bridgehead on the farther bank of the Indus; no responsible soldier or statesman would have acted otherwise; but when we reached the river Hyphasis my Macedonians began to make a fuss and say they were too tired, ill, or homesick to go any farther. I had to come back; it was a terrible journey for my veterans, but still worse for me; I had intended to reach the Bay of Bengal to secure a natural frontier in the east for my Macedonia and now I was forced to abandon this task for a time.

I returned to Susa. I could be satisfied at having conquered such an empire for my Macedonians and Hellenes. But so as not to have to rely entirely on my exhausted people I took thirty thousand Persians into my army; they are good soldiers and I urgently need them for the defense of my Eastern frontiers. And do you know, my old soldiers are extremely annoyed about it. They cannot even understand that in winning for my people
Oriental territories a hundred times greater than our own country I have become the
great King of the East; that I must choose my officials and counselors from amongst the
Orientals and surround myself with an Oriental court; all this is a self-evident political
necessity which I am carrying out in the interests of Greater Macedonia. Circumstances
demand of me more and more personal sacrifices; I bear them without complaint, for I
think of the greatness and strength of my beloved country. I have to endure the barbarous
luxury of my power and magnificence; I have taken to wife three princesses of Eastern
kingdoms; and now, my dear Aristotle, I have actually become a god.

Yes, my dear master, I have had myself proclaimed god; my good Eastern subjects kneel to
me and bring me sacrifices. It is a political necessity if I am to have the requisite authority
over these mountain shepherds and these camel drivers. How far away are the days when
you taught me to use reason and logic! But reason itself bids me adapt my means to
human unreason. At first glance my career must appear fantastic to anyone; but now
when I think it over at night in the quiet of my godlike study I see that I have never
undertaken anything which was not rendered absolutely necessary by my preceding step.

You see, my dear Aristotle, it would be in the interests of peace and order, and consistent
with political interests, if I were recognized as god in my Western territories as well. It
would free my hands here in the East if my own Macedonia and Hellas accepted the
political principle of my absolute authority; I could set out with a quiet heart to secure for
my own land of Greece her natural frontiers on the coast of China. I should thus secure the
power and safety of my Macedonia for all eternity. As you see, this is a sober and
reasonable plan; I have long ceased to be the visionary who swore an oath on the tomb of
Achilles. If I ask you now as my wise friend and guide to prepare the way by philosophy
and to justify my proclamation as god in such a way as to be acceptable to my Greeks and
Macedonians, I do so as a responsible politician and statesman; I leave it to you to
consider whether you wish to undertake this task as a reasonable and patriotic work and
one which is politically necessary.

Greetings, my dear Aristotle,

from your Alexander

**Commentary**

The text as here is clearly suspicious, as was immediately realized by Jerome Arkenberg,
who posted an inquiry about the text to the Ancien-L discussion list.

Here are some of the general questions that might make a historian, even one who knew
little of the details of Alexander's career, suspicious:

1. Why is no source given for the document?

2. Why was this letter posted on a modern nationalist website? How does it support the
   claims of modern Macedonia compared to other political groups/interests in the area?

3. Why would Alexander be using modern geographical terms such as "Aegean basin" or
   showing modern geographical knowledge such as about the "Bay of Bengal" or the "Coast
4. Why the constant differentiation between "Greeks" and "Macedonians"?

With a more knowledge of history of texts, the problems with the letter become even clearer. For instance, it is known that while no certainly genuine letter from Alexander survives, a number of fake letters were composed during the middle ages. So perhaps the letter above was a medieval fake (and thus an interesting document in itself)? These sorts of questions seem to have motivated the comments of Marc Steinberg on the Ancien-l list:

I’d guess that the reference to China probably makes it at least medieval (and I also wonder if the term camel-driver was used generally for people in the east before the Arab conquest). However, it doesn’t sound like any medieval letter to Aristotle I’ve ever read. The lack of anything that would sound fantastic to modern ears (quite common particularly in medieval letters to Aristotle), the strongly nationalistic focus that is conveniently in line with the web-site owners needs, and the justifications of conquest only for defensive purposes make me suspect its modern. Also, I’ve run across this type of thing before while surfing the web. I’ve seen a number of highly questionable Alexander sources that are used to support arguments ranging from the more obvious nationalistic fights (e.g., Slav vs. Greek) to the more obscure (e.g., Alexander was really Nordic).

Note that this criticism of the text derives from a number of considerations:

1. Marc Steinberg’s knowledge of current historical studies of Alexander and sources about him. 2. Consideration of the coherence of the text. 3. Consideration of who is promoting the text, and an estimation of their reasons for doing so.

Criticism of the text derives from a greater number of issues:

1. The incongruity of the language in the letter with Greek style. 2. A comparison of the letter with other ancient sources on Alexander, such as Plutarch. 3. An explanation of how the text does not even fit the known facts of Alexander’s military career. 4. A clear estimation of the agenda of the promoters of the text.

Conclusion

In this case then, the falsity of the source is easily established. Even so, a considerable number of different issues were taken into consideration by the various commentators. It is not always this easy: the creators of the letter could have been much cleverer - for instance they could have got their facts correct, and made the language accord more with Greek style. More: the text could have been picked up by other websites without a clear nationalist bias, and could have made it appear a more reasonable text.

The more one progresses in historical research, the more important do questions about the authenticity and reliability of sources become. Always, as Peter Green notes, Caveat Emptor! ("Let the buyer beware!").

I observe, gentlemen, that when I would lead you on a new venture you no longer follow me with your old spirit. I have asked you to meet me that we may come to a decision together: are we, upon my advice, to go forward, or, upon yours, to turn back?

If you have any complaint to make about the results of your efforts hitherto, or about myself as your commander, there is no more to say. But let me remind you: through your courage and endurance you have gained possession of Ionia, the Hellespont, both Phrygias, Cappadocia, Paphlagonia, Lydia, Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia, Phoenicia, and Egypt; the Greek part of Libya is now yours, together with much of Arabia, lowland Syria, Mesopotamia, Babylon, and Susia; Persia and Media with all the territories either formerly controlled by them or not are in your hands; you have made yourselves masters of the lands beyond the Caspian Gates, beyond the Caucasus, beyond the Tanais, of Bactria, Hycania, and the Hycranian sea; we have driven the Scythians back into the desert; and Indus and Hydaspes, Acesines and Hydraotes flow now through country which is ours. With all that accomplished, why do you hesitate to extend the power of Macedon--your power--to the Hyphasis and the tribes on the other side? Are you afraid that a few natives who may still be left will offer opposition? Come, come! These natives either surrender without a blow or are caught on the run--or leave their country undefended for your taking; and when we take it, we make a present of it to those who have joined us of their own free will and fight on our side.

For a man who is a man, work, in my belief, if it is directed to noble ends, has no object beyond itself; none the less, if any of you wish to know what limit may be set to this particular campaign, let me tell you that the area of country still ahead of us, from here to the Ganges and the Eastern ocean, is comparatively small. You will undoubtedly find that this ocean is connected with the Hycranian Sea, for the great Stream of Ocean encircles the earth. Moreover I shall prove to you, my friends, that the Indian and Persian Gulfs and the Hycranian Sea are all three connected and continuous. Our ships will sail round from the Persian Gulf to Libya as far as the Pillars of Hercules, whence all Libya to the eastward will soon be ours, and all Asia too, and to this empire there will be no boundaries but what God Himself has made for the whole world.

But if you turn back now, there will remain unconquered many warlike peoples between the Hyphasis and the Eastern Ocean, and many more to the northward and the Hycranian Sea, with the Scythians, too, not far away; so that if we withdraw now there is a danger that the territory which we do not yet securely hold may be stirred to revolt by some nation or other we have not yet forced into submission. Should that happen, all that we have done and suffered will have proved fruitless--or we shall be faced with the task of doing it over again from the beginning. Gentlemen of Macedon, and you, my friends and allies, this must not be. Stand firm; for well you know that hardship and danger are the price of glory, and that sweet is the savour of a life of courage and of deathless renown beyond the grave.

Are you not aware that if Heracles, my ancestor, had gone no further than Tiryns or
Argos—or even than the Peloponnese or Thebes—he could never have won the glory which changed him from a man into a god, actual or apparent? Even Dionysus, who is a god indeed, in a sense beyond what is applicable to Heracles, faced not a few laborious tasks; yet we have done more: we have passed beyond Nysa and we have taken the rock of Aornos which Heracles himself could not take. Come, then; add the rest of Asia to what you already possess—a small addition to the great sum of your conquests. What great or noble work could we ourselves have achieved had we thought it enough, living at ease in Macedon, merely to guard our homes, accepting no burden beyond checking the encroachment of the Thracians on our borders, or the Illyrians and Triballians, or perhaps such Greeks as might prove a menace to our comfort?

I could not have blamed you for being the first to lose heart if I, your commander, had not shared in your exhausting marches and your perilous campaigns; it would have been natural enough if you had done all the work merely for others to reap the reward. But it is not so. You and I, gentlemen, have shared the labour and shared the danger, and the rewards are for us all. The conquered territory belongs to you; from your ranks the governors of it are chosen; already the greater part of its treasure passes into your hands, and when all Asia is overrun, then indeed I will go further than the mere satisfaction of our ambitions: the utmost hopes of riches or power which each one of you cherishes will be far surpassed, and whoever wishes to return home will be allowed to go, either with me or without me. I will make those who stay the envy of those who return.
7. Alexander arrived at Thapsacus in the month Hecatombaion,[1] in the archonship of Aristophanes at Athens; and he found that two bridges of boats had been constructed over the stream. But Mazaeus, to whom Darius had committed the duty of guarding the river, with about 3,000 cavalry, 2,000 of which were Grecian mercenaries, was up to that time keeping guard there at the river. For this reason the Macedonians had not constructed the bridge right across as far as the opposite bank, being afraid that Mazaeus might make an assault upon the bridge where it ended. But when he heard that Alexander was approaching, he went off in flight with all his army. As soon as he had fled, the bridges were completed as far as the further bank, and Alexander crossed upon them with his army. Thence he marched up into the interior through the land called Mesopotamia, having the river Euphrates and the mountains of Armenia on his left. When he started from the Euphrates he did not march to Babylon by the direct road; because by going the other route he found all things easier for the march of his army, and it was also possible to obtain fodder for the horses and provisions for the men from the country. Besides this, the heat was not so scorching on the indirect route. Some of the men from Darius’s army, who had been dispersed for the purpose of scouting, were taken prisoners; and they reported that Darius was encamped near the river Tigris, having resolved to prevent Alexander from crossing that stream. They also said that he had a much larger army than that with which he fought in Cilicia. Hearing this, Alexander went with all speed towards the Tigris; but when he reached it he found neither Darius himself nor any guard which he had left. However he experienced great difficulty in crossing the stream, on account of the swiftness of the current, though no one tried to stop him. There he made his army rest, and while so doing, an eclipse of the moon nearly total occurred.[2] Alexander thereupon offered sacrifice to the moon, the sun and the earth, whose deed this was, according to common report. Aristander thought that this eclipse of the moon was a portent favourable to Alexander and the Macedonians; that there would be a battle that very month, and that victory for Alexander was signified by the sacrificial victims. Having therefore decamped from the Tigris, he went through the land of Aturia, having the mountains of the Gordyaeans on the left and the Tigris itself on the right; and on the fourth day after the passage of the river, his scouts brought word to him that the enemy’s cavalry were visible there along the plain, but how many of them there were they could not guess. Accordingly he drew his army up in order and advanced prepared for battle. Other scouts again riding forward and taking more accurate observations told him that the cavalry did not seem to them to be more than 1,000 in number.

8. Alexander therefore took the royal squadron of cavalry, and one squadron of the Companions, together with the Paeonian scouts, and marched with all speed, having ordered the rest of his army to follow at leisure. The Persian cavalry, seeing Alexander advancing quickly, began to flee with all their might. Though he pressed close upon them in pursuit, most of them escaped; but a few, whose horses were fatigued by the flight, were slain, others were taken prisoners, horses and all. From these they ascertained that Darius with a large force was not far off. For the Indians who were adjacent to the Bactrians, as also the Bactrians themselves and the Sogdianians had come to the aid of
Darius, all being under the command of Bessus, the viceroy of the land of Bactria. They were followed by the Sacians, a Scythian tribe belonging to the Scythians who dwell in Asia. These were not subject to Bessus, but were in alliance with Darius. They were commanded by Mavaces, and were horse-bowmen. Barsaentes, the viceroy of Arachotia, led the Arachotians and the men who were called mountaineer Indians. Satibarzanes, the viceroy of Areia, led the Arians, as did Phrataphernes the Parthians, Hycranians, and Tapurians, all of whom were horsemen. Atropates commanded the Medes, with whom were arrayed the Cadusians, Albanians, and Sacesinians. The men who dwelt near the Red Sea[3] were marshalled by Ocondobates, Ariobarzanes, and Otanes. The Uxians and Susianians acknowledged Oxathres son of Aboulites as their leader, and the Babylonians were commanded by Boupares. The Carians who had been deported into central Asia and the Sitacenians had been placed in the same ranks as the Babylonians. The Armenians were commanded by Orontes and Mithraustes, and the Cappadocians by Ariaces. The Syrians from Coele-Syria and the men of Syria which lies between the rivers[4] were led by Mazaeus. The whole army of Darius was said to contain 40,000 cavalry, 1,000,000 infantry, and 200 scythe-bearing chariots. There were only a few elephants, about fifteen in number, belonging to the Indians who live this side of the Indus. With these forces Darius had encamped at Gaugamela, near the river Bumodus, about seventy miles from the city of Arbela, in a district everywhere level; for whatever ground thereabouts was unlevel and unfit for the evolutions of cavalry had long before been levelled by the Persians, and made fit for the easy rolling of chariots and for the galloping of horses. For there were some who persuaded Darius that he had got the worst of it in the battle fought at Issus from the narrowness of the battle-field; and this he was easily induced to believe.

9. When Alexander had received all this information from the Persian scouts who had been captured, he remained four days in the place where he had received the news; and gave his army rest after the march. He meanwhile fortified his camp with a ditch and stockade, as he intended to leave behind the baggage and all the soldiers who were unfit for fighting, and to go into the contest accompanied by his warriors carrying with them nothing except their weapons. Accordingly he took his forces by night, and began the march about the second watch, in order to come into collision with the foreigners at break of day. As soon as Darius was informed of Alexander’s approach, he at once drew out his army for battle; and Alexander led on his men drawn up in like manner. Though the armies were only seven miles from each other, they were not yet in sight of each other, for between the hostile forces some hills intervened. But when Alexander was only three and one-half miles from the enemy, and his army was already marching down from the hills just mentioned, catching sight of the foreigners, he caused his phalanx to halt there. Calling a council of the Companions, generals, cavalry officers, and leaders of the Grecian allies and mercenaries, he deliberated with them, whether he should at once lead on the phalanx without delay, as most of them urged him to do; or, whether, as Parmenio thought preferable, to encamp there for the present, to reconnoitre all the ground, in order to see if there was anything there to excite suspicion or to impede their progress, or if there were ditches or stakes firmly fixed in the earth out of sight, as well as to make a more accurate survey of the enemy’s tactical arrangements. Parmenio’s opinion prevailed, so they encamped there, drawn up in the order in which they intended to enter the battle. But Alexander took the light infantry and the cavalry Companions and went all round, reconnoitring the whole country where he was about to fight the battle. Having returned, he again called together the same leaders, and said that they did not require to
be encouraged by him to enter the contest; for they had been long before encouraged by their own valour, and by the gallant deeds which they had already so often achieved. He thought it expedient that each of them individually should stir up his own men separately; each infantry captain the men of his own company, the cavalry captain his own squadron, the colonels their various regiments, and each of the leaders of the infantry the phalanx intrusted to him. He assured them that in this battle they were going to fight, not as before, either for Coele-Syria, Phoenicia, or Egypt, but for the whole of Asia. For he said this battle would decide who were to be the rulers of the continent. It was not necessary for him to stir them up to gallant deeds by many words, since they had this encouragement by nature; but they should see that each man took care, so far as in him lay, to preserve discipline in the critical moment of action, and to keep perfect silence when it was expedient to advance in silence. On the other hand, they should see that each man uttered a sonorous shout, where it would be advantageous to shout, and to raise as terrible a battle-cry as possible, when a suitable opportunity occurred of raising the battle-cry. He told them to take care to obey his orders quickly, and to transmit the orders they had received to the ranks with all rapidity, each man remembering that both as an individual and in the aggregate he was increasing the general danger if he was remiss in the discharge of his duty, and that he was assisting to gain a victory if he zealously put forth his utmost exertions.

10. With these words and others like them he briefly exhorted his officers, and in return was exhorted by them to feel confidence in their valour. He then ordered the soldiers to take dinner and to rest themselves. It is said that Parmenio came to him in his tent, and urged him to make a night attack on the Persians, saying that thus he would fall upon them unprepared and in a state of confusion, and at the same time more liable to a panic in the dark. But the reply which he made to him, as others were listening to their conversation, was, that it would be mean to steal a victory, and that Alexander ought to conquer in open daylight, and without any artifice. This vaunting did not appear any arrogance on his part, but rather to indicate self-confidence amid dangers. To me, at any rate, he seems to have used correct reasoning in such a matter. For in the night many accidents have occurred unexpectedly to those who were sufficiently prepared for battle as well as to those who were deficiently prepared, which have caused the superior party to fail in their plans, and have handed the victory over to the inferior party, contrary to the expectations of both sides. Though Alexander was generally fond of encountering danger in battle, the night appeared to him perilous; and, besides, if Darius were again defeated, a furtive and nocturnal attack on the part of the Macedonians would relieve him of the necessity of confessing that he was an inferior general and commanded inferior troops. Moreover, if any unexpected defeat befell his army, the circumjacent country was friendly to the enemy, and they were acquainted with the locality, whereas the Macedonians were unacquainted with it, and surrounded by nothing but foes, of whom the prisoners were no small party. These would be likely to assist in attacking them in the night, not only if they should meet with defeat, but even if they did not appear to be gaining a decisive victory. For this way of reasoning I commend Alexander; and I think him no less worthy of admiration for his excessive liking for open action.

11. Darius and his army remained drawn up during the night in the same order as that in which they had first arrayed themselves; because they had not surrounded themselves with a completely entrenched camp, and, moreover, they were afraid that the enemy
would attack them in the night. The success of the Persians, on this occasion, was impeded especially by this long standing on watch with their arms, and by the fear which usually springs up before great dangers; which, however, was not then suddenly aroused by a momentary panic, but had been experienced for a long time, and had thoroughly cowed their spirits. The army of Darius was drawn up in the following manner; for, according to the statement of Aristobulus, the written scheme of arrangement drawn up by Darius was afterwards captured. His left wing was held by the Bactrian cavalry, in conjunction with the Daans and Arachotians; near these had been posted the Persians, horse and foot mixed together; next to these the Susians and then the Cadusians. This was the arrangement of the left wing as far as the middle of the whole phalanx. On the right had been posted the men from Coele-Syria and Mesopotamia. On the right again were the Medes; next to them the Parthians and Sacians; then the Tapurians and Hrycanians, and last the Albanians and Sacesinians, extending as far as the middle of the whole phalanx. In the centre where King Darius was had been posted the king's kinsmen, the Persian guards carrying spears with golden apples at the butt end, the Indians, the Carians who had been forcibly removed to Central Asia, and the Mardian archers. The Uxians, the Babylonians, the men who dwell near the Red Sea, and the Sitacenians had also been drawn up in deep column. On the left, opposite Alexander's right, had been posted the Scythian cavalry, about 1,000 Bactrians and 100 scythe-bearing chariots. In front of Darius's royal squadron of cavalry stood the elephants and fifty chariots. In front of the right wing the Armenian and Cappadocian cavalry with fifty scythe-bearing chariots had been posted. The Greek mercenaries, as alone capable of coping with the Macedonians, were stationed right opposite their phalanx, in two divisions close beside Darius himself and his Persian attendants, one division on each side.

Alexander's army was marshalled as follows: The right wing was held by the cavalry Companions, in front of whom had been posted the royal squadron, commanded by Clitus, son of Dropidas. Near this was the squadron of Glaurias, next to it that of Aristo, then that of Sopolis, son of Hermodorus, then that of Heraclides, son of Antiochus. Near this was that of Demetrius, son of Althaemenes, then that of Meleager, and last one of the royal squadrons commanded by Hegelochus, son of Hippostratus. All the cavalry Companions were under the supreme command of Philotas, son of Parmeno. Of the phalanx of Macedonian infantry, nearest to the cavalry had been posted first the select corps of shield-bearing guards, and then the rest of the shield-bearing guards, under the command of Nicanor, son of Parmeno. Next to these was the brigade of Coenus, son of Polemocrates; after these that of Perdicas, son of Orontes; then that of Meleager, son of Neoptolemus; then that of Polysperchon, son of Simmias; and last that of Amyntas, son of Andromenes, under the command of Simmias, because Amyntas had been despatched to Macedonia to levy an army. The brigade of Craterus, son of Alexander, held the left end of the Macedonian phalanx, and this general commanded the left wing of the infantry. Next to him was the allied Grecian cavalry under the command of Erigyius, son of Larichus. Next to these, towards the left wing of the army, were the Thessalian cavalry, under the command of Philip, son of Menelaus. But the whole left wing was led by Parmeno, son of Philotas, round whose person were ranged the Pharsalian horsemen, who were both the best and most numerous squadron of the Thessalian cavalry.

12. In this way had Alexander marshalled his army in front; but he also posted a second array, so that his phalanx might be a double one. Directions had been given to the
commanders of these men posted in the rear to wheel round and receive the attack of the foreigners, if they should see their own comrades surrounded by the Persian army. Next to the royal squadron on the right wing, half of the Agrianians, under the command of Attalus, in conjunction with the Macedonian archers under Briso’s command, were posted angular-wise in case they should be seized anyhow by the necessity of deepening the phalanx, or of closing up the ranks. Next to the archers were the men called the veteran mercenaries, whose commander was Cleander. In front of the Agrianians and archers were posted the light cavalry used for skirmishing, and the Paeonians, under the command of Aretes and Aristo. In front of all had been posted the Grecian mercenary cavalry under the direction of Menidas; and in front of the royal squadron of cavalry and the other Companions had been posted half of the Agrianians and archers, and the javelin-men of Balacrus who had been ranged opposite the scythe-bearing chariots. Instructions had been given to Menidas and the troops under him to wheel round and attack the enemy in flank, if they should ride round their wing. Thus had Alexander arranged matters on the right wing. On the left the Thracians under the command of Sitalces had been posted angular-wise, and near them the cavalry of the Grecian allies, under the direction of Coeranus. Next stood the Odrysian cavalry, under the command of Agatho, son of Tyrimmas. In this part, in front of all, were posted the auxiliary cavalry of the Grecian mercenaries, under the direction of Andromachus, son of Hiero. Near the baggage the infantry from Thrace were posted as a guard. The whole of Alexander’s army numbered 7,000 cavalry and about 40,000 infantry.

13. When the armies drew near each other, Darius and the men around him were observed: the apple-bearing Persians, the Indians, the Albanians, the Carians who had been forcibly transported into Central Asia, the Mardian archers ranged opposite Alexander himself and the royal squadron of cavalry. Alexander led his own army more towards the right, and the Persians marched along parallel with him, far out-flanking him upon their left. Then the Scythian cavalry rode along the line, and came into conflict with the front men of Alexander’s array; but he nevertheless still continued to march towards the right, and almost entirely got beyond the ground which had been cleared and levelled by the Persians. Then Darius, fearing that his chariots would become useless, if the Macedonians advanced into the uneven ground, ordered the front ranks of his left wing to ride round the right wing of the Macedonians, where Alexander was commanding, to prevent him from marching his wing any further. This being done, Alexander ordered the cavalry of the Grecian mercenaries under the command of Menidas to attack them. But the Scythian cavalry and the Bactrians, who had been drawn up with them, sallied forth against them, and being much more numerous they put the small body of Greeks to rout. Alexander then ordered Aristo at the head of the Paeonians and Grecian auxiliaries to attack the Scythians; and the barbarians gave way. But the rest of the Bactrians, drawing near to the Paeonians and Grecian auxiliaries, caused their own comrades who were already in flight to turn and renew the battle; and thus they brought about a general cavalry engagement, in which more of Alexander’s men fell, not only being overwhelmed by the multitude of the barbarians, but also because the Scythians themselves and their horses were much more completely protected with ar, or for guarding their bodies. Notwithstanding this, the Macedonians sustained their assaults, and assailing them violently squadron by squadron, they succeeded in pushing them out of rank. Meantime the foreigners launched their scythe-bearing chariots against Alexander himself, for the purpose of throwing his phalanx into confusion; but in this they were grievously deceived.
For as soon as they approached, the Agrianians and the javelin-men with Balacrus, who had been posted in front of the Companion cavalry, hurled their javelins at some of the horses; others they seized by the reins and pulled the drivers off, and standing round the horses killed them. Yet some got right through the ranks; for the men stood apart and opened their ranks, as they had been instructed, in the places where the chariots assaulted them. In this way it generally happened that the chariots passed through safely, and the men by whom they were driven were uninjured. But these also were afterwards overpowered by the grooms of Alexander’s army and by the royal shield-bearing guards.

14. As soon as Darius began to set his whole phalanx in motion, Alexander ordered Aretes to attack those who were riding completely round his right wing; and up to that time he was himself leading his men in column. But when the Persians had made a break in the front line of their army, in consequence of the cavalry sallying forth to assist those who were surrounding the right wing, Alexander wheeled round towards the gap, and forming a wedge as it were of the Companion cavalry and of the part of the phalanx which was posted here, he led them with a quick charge and loud battle-cry straight towards Darius himself. For a short time there ensued a hand-to-hand fight; but when the Macedonian cavalry, commanded by Alexander himself, pressed on vigorously, thrusting themselves against the Persians and striking their faces with their spears, and when the Macedonian phalanx in dense array and bristling with long pikes had also made an attack upon them, all things together appeared full of terror to Darius, who had already long been in a state of fear, so that he was the first to turn and flee. The Persians also who were riding round the wing were seized with alarm when Aretes made a vigorous attack upon them. In this quarter indeed the Persians took to speedy flight; and the Macedonians followed up the fugitives and slaughtered them. Simmias and his brigade were not yet able to start with Alexander in pursuit, but causing the phalanx to halt there, he took part in the struggle, because the left wing of the Macedonians was reported to be hard pressed. In this part of the field, their line being broken, some of the Indians and of the Persian cavalry burst through the gap towards the baggage of the Macedonians; and there the action became desperate. For the Persians fell boldly on the men, who were most of them unarmed, and never expected that any men would cut through the double phalanx and break through upon them. When the Persians made this attack, the foreign prisoners also assisted them by falling upon the Macedonians in the midst of the action. But the commanders of the men who had been posted as a reserve to the first phalanx, learning what was taking place, quickly moved from the position which they had been ordered to take, and coming upon the Persians in the rear, killed many of them there collected round the baggage. But the rest of them gave way and fled. The Persians on the right wing, who had not yet become aware of the flight of Darius, rode round Alexander’s left wing and attacked Parmenio in flank.

15. At this juncture, the Macedonians being at first in a state of confusion from being attacked on all sides, Parmenio sent a messenger to Alexander in haste, to tell him that their side was in a critical position and that he must send him aid. When this news was brought to Alexander, he turned back again from further pursuit, and wheeling round with the Companion cavalry, led them with great speed against the right wing of the foreigners. In the first place he assaulted the fleeing cavalry of the enemy, the Parthians, some of the Indians, and the most numerous and the bravest division of the Persians. Then ensued the most obstinately contested cavalry fight in the whole engagement. For
being drawn up by squadrons, the foreigners wheeled round in deep columns, and falling on Alexander’s men face to face, they no longer relied on the hurling of javelins or the dexterous deploying of horses, as is the common practice in cavalry battles, but every one of his own account strove eagerly to break through what stood in his way, as their only means of safety. They struck and were struck without quarter, as they were no longer struggling to secure the victory for another, but were contending for their own personal safety. Here about sixty of Alexander’s Companions fell; and Hephaestion himself, as well as Coenus and Menidas, was wounded. But these troops also were overcome by Alexander; and as many of them as could force their way through his ranks fled with all their might. And now Alexander had nearly come into conflict with the enemy’s right wing; but in the meantime the Thessalian cavalry in a splendid struggle, were not falling short of Alexander’s success in the engagement. For the foreigners on the right wing were already beginning to fly when he came on the scene of conflict; so that he wheeled round again and started off in pursuit of Darius once more, keeping up the chase as long as there was daylight. Parmenio’s brigade also followed in pursuit of those who were opposed to them. But Alexander crossed the river Lycus and pitched his camp there, to give his men and horses a little rest; while Parmenio seized the Persian camp with their baggage, elephants, and camels. After giving his horsemen rest until midnight, Alexander again advanced by a forced march towards Arbela, with the hope of seizing Darius there, together with his money and the rest of his royal property. He reached Arbela the next day, having pursued altogether about seventy miles from the battle field. But as Darius went on fleeing without taking any rest, he did not find him at Arbela. However the money and all the other property were captured, as was also the chariot of Darius a second time. His spear and bow were likewise taken, as had been the case after the battle of Issus. Of Alexander’s men-about 100 were killed, and more than 1,000 of his horses were lost either from wounds or from fatigue in the pursuit, nearly half of them belonging to the Companion cavalry. Of the foreigners there were said to have been about 300,000 slain, and far more were taken prisoners than were killed. The elephants and all the chariots which had not been destroyed in the battle were also captured. Such was the result of this battle, which was fought in the archonship of Aristophanes at Athens, in the month Pyanepson;[6] and thus Aristan der’s prediction was accomplished, that Alexander would both fight a battle and gain a victory in the same month in which the moon was seen to be eclipsed

16. Immediately after the battle, Darius marched through the mountains of Armenia towards Media, accompanied in his flight by the Bactrian cavalry, as they had then been posted with him in the battle; also by those Persians who were called the king’s kinsmen, and by a few of the men called apple-bearers. About 2,000 of his Grecian mercenaries also accompanied him in his flight, under the command of Paron the Phocian, and Glaucus the Aetolian. He fled towards Media for this reason, because he thought Alexander would take the road to Susa and Babylon immediately after the battle, inasmuch as the whole of that country was inhabited and the road was not difficult for the transit of baggage; and besides Babylon and Susa appeared to be the prizes of the war; whereas the road towards Media was by no means easy for the march of a large army. In this conjecture Darius was not mistaken...
# BLM 2.3 Data Organizer

Name: ___________________________ Date: ________________

## Inquiry Question

**Sample question:** What is the story of X?

## Source

**Sample questions:** What type of source is this? Who created it? When and where was it produced?

## Context

**Sample questions:** What other events or developments were happening at the time the source was created? How might they have influenced this source?

## Description

**Sample questions:** What do you notice that’s important about this source? What do you notice that’s interesting? What can’t you explain?

## Inferences about the perspective of the creator

**Sample questions:** To what groups might the creator have belonged? Why do you think he or she made this source? Who do you think was the audience for this? What do you think the audience wanted to hear or see? How might the background of the creator and the audience have influenced this source?

## Inferences to answer inquiry question

**Sample questions:** What can you learn from examining this source? How does this source help you answer your inquiry question? Does it confirm, extend, or contradict what you know? What does it not tell you? What further questions do you have?
Overview: Using a primary resource students will discover continuity and change in Alexander the Great’s Empire. Focusing on the cultural changes that Alexander caused throughout his empire, and how those cultural changes are still felt today. Drawing links between ancient Greek language, the renaissance and then scientific nomenclature today.

Learning Goal: Students will be able to identify cultural change and continuity. Students will draw parallels between the changes and consistencies they see today to illustrate continuity.

Curriculum Expectation:
- Describe the roles of selected individuals and groups in the process of change (e.g., Akhenaton, Nebuchadnezzar II, Socrates, Augustus, Peter the Apostle, Alexander the Great, Constantine I, Charlemagne, Jeanne d'Arc; the Aryans, the Babylonians, the Vikings, the Mongols);

Materials:
Map of Alexandrias (appendix) Greek Bible quote (appendix)
Section from Arrian (Appendix) Projector/Smartboard
Chart Paper Markers

Plan of Instruction:

Step 1: Warm-Up (5 minutes)
- Can students name any cities that are named for people? Were they named by those people, or in honour of them? Examples: Stalingrad and Leningrad in the old Soviet Union were named after Stalin and Lenin. Washington D.C. is named after George Washington (an already established settlement called Alexandria existed in the area to become D.C.). Columbia and Columbus Ohio are named after Christopher Columbus. What of Alexander?

Step 2: Discussion (5 minutes)
- Put map of Alexander's Greek Cities up on the projector or Smartboard. (appendix 3.1)
- Using the knowledge from the Evidence and Significance lessons, talk about what this map reveals to us about Alexander's character, and ambitions.
- Point out that some of these cities are still called Alexandria, and others are not. Why?
- Use on the board, write down some of the key terms students come up with. Such as: expansion, ambition, Greek culture etc.
- Ensure that the students note that these cities were used to export Greek culture and knowledge throughout the empire.

Step 3: Modeling (5 minutes)
• Using the key words that the students came up with, make a “Before, During, After and Continued” chart on the board (or chart paper).

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>During</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welsh culture was looked down upon</td>
<td>-Welsh culture was exported</td>
<td>-Welsh living became sought after</td>
<td>-the role of slaves and women did not change much. (Thebes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Start filling in the chart using the map of Alexandrias as a source.
• Terms written in the chart are to reference the lives of people before, during and after Alexander’s empire.
• “Before” would include things like “States were Persian” “spoke many languages.”
  During: “Greek rule” “Greek culture was taught”, “Greek Language”

**Step 4: Guided Practice (20 minutes)**
• Hand out section from Arrian on Alexander's wedding. (Appendix 3.2)
• Students will work in groups, making a “Before, During, After and Continued” chart on chart paper.
• In groups, students will read the section from Arrian, and pull out ideas of change and continuity, filling in the chart.
• Quick sharing of main ideas from the section, showing the class the chart.

**Step 5: Independent Activity (15 minutes)**
• Show image of primary resource, the Bible in Greek (Appendix 3.3)
• Give a context: The bible was written in the ancient eastern Mediterranean during the 1st and 2nd century CE.
• Key things: Location and Time period. The new testament was written in the common language of the eastern Mediterranean, Koine (or Alexandrian) Greek.
• Give students 5 minutes to write down in their notes ideas of how this resource can illustrate, continuity and/or change.

**Step 6: Sharing/ Discussing/ Teaching (20 minutes)**
• Discuss the ideas that the students came up with.
• Questions to ask include : Why was the new testament written in Greek? What made this possible?
• Draw a rough timeline on the board. Chalk is fine, a Smartboard timeline would be usefull as well.
• Discuss where to place the three “Turning points” discussed in class today.
• First would be Alexander's marriages, then the building of cities, then the bible in greek.
• Ask students for two more examples of the continuity of Alexander’s influence on the world. 1. The search for ancient Greek knowledge during the renaissance. 2. How today we use Greek words to classify scientific discoveries.

Assessment:
Continue working on Summative, including for today’s lesson a representation of continuity and change.

Appendix Lesson 3

3.1

Map of Alexander’s Greek style cities across the empire. (Alexandrias)

Alexandria Arachosia, Afghanistan (Kandahar)
Alexandria Ariana, Afghanistan
Alexandria Bucephalous, Pakistan
Alexandria in Orietai, Pakistan
Alexandria Carmania, Iran (unknown)
Alexandria Eschate, “The Farthest”, Tajikistan
Ghazni, formerly Alexandria in Opiana, Pakistan
Alexandria on the Caucasus, Afghanistan
Alexandria on the Indus, Pakistan.
Alexandria on the Oxus, Afghanistan
Alexandria Propthasia, Afghanistan
Alexandria Susiana, Iran
Alexandria Troas, Turkey
Alinda (Alexandria on the Latmos), Turkey
Cebrene (Formerly Alexandria), Turkey
Iskandariya, Iraq
Iskanderun, Turkey
Merv (sometimes called Alexandria), Turkmanistan.
Alexandria, Egypt.
3.2 Selection from Arrian – *The anabasis of Alexander*

“In Susa, he celebrated both his own wedding and those of his companions. He himself married Barsine, the eldest daughter of Darius, and according to Aristobulus, besides her another, Parysatis, the youngest daughter of Ochus. He had already married Roxana, daughter of Oxyartes the Bactrian. To Hephaestion he gave Drypetis, another daughter of Darius, and his own wife’s sister; for he wished Hephaestion’s children to be first cousins to his own. ... Likewise to the rest of his Companions he gave the choicest daughters of the Persians and Medes, to the number of eighty. The weddings were celebrated after the Persian manner, seats being placed in a row for the bridegrooms; and after the banquet the brides came in and seated themselves, each one near her own husband. The bridegrooms took them by the right hand and kissed them; the king being the first to begin, for the weddings of all were conducted in the same way. This appeared the most popular thing which Alexander ever did; and it proved his affection for his Companions. Each man took his own bride and led her away; and on all without exception Alexander bestowed dowries. He also ordered that the names of all the other Macedonians who had married any of the Asiatic women should be registered. They were over 10,000 in number; and to these Alexander made presents on account of their weddings.”

“The viceroy’s from the newly-built cities and the rest of the territory subdued in war came to him, bringing with them youths just growing into manhood to the number of 30,000, all of the same age, whom Alexander called Epigoni. They had been equipped with Macedonian arms, and exercised in military discipline after the Macedonian system. The arrival of these is said to have vexed the Macedonians, who thought that Alexander was contriving every means in his power to free himself from future need of their services...... All this offended the Macedonians, who thought that Alexander was becoming altogether Asiatic in his ideas, and was holding the Macedonians themselves as well as their customs in a position of contempt...... ”

“His adoption of the Persian mode of dressing also seems to me to have been a political device in regard to the foreigners, that the king might not appear altogether alien
to them; and in regard to the Macedonians, to show them that he had a refuge from their rashness of temper and insolence. For this reason I think, he mixed the Persian royal guards, who carried golden apples at the end of their spears, among the ranks of the Macedonians, and the Persian peers with the Macedonian body-guards. Aristobulus also asserts that Alexander used to have long drinking parties, not for the purpose of enjoying the wine, as he was not a great wine-drinker, but in order to exhibit his sociality and friendly feeling to his Companions. 

Arrian, *The anabasis of Alexander*. Luc.edu
3.3 Page from the Bible in Greek

Folio from [Papyrus 46](http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/5/5c/P46.jpg), containing 2 Corinthians 11:33-12:9

[http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/5/5c/P46.jpg](http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/5/5c/P46.jpg) accessed Nov 10\(^{th}\) 2013.
8 Lessons – Lesson #5
Course: CHW 3M
Topic/Unit: Alexander the Great/The Transition to Hellenistic Greece
Historical Thinking Concept: Cause and Consequence

Overview
In this lesson students will look at the causes and consequences of Alexander’s death, and how he did not declare an heir. The lesson will conclude with the growth of Hellenistic Greece as a consequence of Alexander’s empire.

Learning Goal
Students will learn about how events in history have multiple causes and multiple consequences. Causes can vary in effect of the event, and consequences can vary in being effected by the event. In this way, causes consequences can be ranked. Students will learn about how an event is not inevitable, in that by changing the outcome of one event, the course of history after it is also changed.

Curriculum expectations
- Describe the roles of selected individuals and groups in the process of change (e.g., Akhenaton, Nebuchadnezzar II, Socrates, Augustus, Peter the Apostle, Alexander the Great, Constantine I, Charlemagne, Jeanne d’Arc; the Aryans, the Babylonians, the Vikings, the Mongols);

Materials
- Chart Paper
- Markers
- Projector

Plan of Instruction

Step 1: Warm Up (10 minutes)
• On the projector, show the youtube clip about dominos.
  http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IXtDChNB3gc (Appendix 4.1)

Step 2: Discussion (10 minutes)
• Raise the concept of cause and consequence using the falling dominos as an example. Ask students the following question:
  What caused the event? (the first domino to fall).
  What were the consequences? Do each of them have a specific cause?
  Is there anything else that contributed to the first domino falling? (looking past the obvious cause, ex. Gravity)
• Write down some examples of cause and consequence on the board.

Step 3: Modeling (10 minutes)
• Now, rank the causes and consequences by importance. Some causes are more directly related than others. (Ex. Gravity is less directly related to the dominos falling than the actual initial push to have the event started. Gravity is already affecting the dominos without the push, but is still necessary.) Answers could include: economic ability to purchase dominos, a lifestyle permitting the time, etc.
• Show the clip from the youtube link here:
  http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=524NsuNR-l0 (Appendix 4.2) Alexander the Great – “Documentary” from 2:07:00 to the end.
• Have students take notes on important possible causes of Alexander’s death and consequences of Alexander’s death.

**Step 4: Guided Practice (20 minutes)**

• In groups (4 or 5 groups), students will make a time line on chart paper, with Alexander’s death as the “main event”. They must include causes, in the order that they occurred, and rank them as importance. Also, they must consequences of his death. Guessing is fine, as long as they are prepared to discuss it.

• Present ideas to class, with open discussion about how the groups ranked causes and consequences.

**Step 5: Independent Activity (25 Minutes)**


• Homework – According to the ideas expressed in the documentary on Hellenistic Greece, students find 5 examples of Alexander’s Greek culture present in their lives today.

**Step 6: Sharing/Discussing/Teaching (Next day - 15 minutes)**

• Next day, homework check and discussion of the examples.

**Assessment**

Homework Check tomorrow and Summative Assignment work.
Appendix

4.1

YouTube. "25,000 Dominoes!!." YouTube.

4.2


4.3

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KZCAI2eGGGUFind a website by URL or keyword... (accessed November 13, 2013).
Overview:
This lesson entails exploring the nature of historical perspectives, both between groups at a certain point in history (i.e. Macedonians and Persians) and between a historical period and today. It connects to the unit as a whole by having students engage with different historical sources and opinions to gain a fuller understanding of the events surrounding Alexander the Great’s invasion of Persia and its impact. Students will also be exploring the nature of greatness and the perspectives on which this label is based.

Learning Goal:
By the end of the lesson students will have gained a deeper understanding of the necessity of understanding multiple sides of a story or historical account and of the importance of avoiding presentism. They will also reflect critically on what their beliefs surrounding the concept of greatness and assess whether or not Alexander should be labeled as “Great” based on differing perspectives of the same events as presented in primary and secondary sources.

Curriculum Expectations:

Primary Specific Expectation: describe the roles of selected individuals and groups in the process of change

Secondary Curriculum Expectations:
Communities: Characteristics, Development and Interaction
• Overall Expectations:
  o Analyze the interaction between various societies from the time of the first communities to the sixteenth century.
• Specific Expectations:
  o Relations Between Societies: analyze the factors that influenced the nature of relationships between societies (e.g., defence, ethnicity, proximity, language, religion, trade and economic interchange)

Methods of Historical Inquiry and Communication
• Overall Expectations:
  o Interpret and analyze information gathered through research, employing concepts and approaches appropriate to historical inquiry
• Specific Expectations:
  o Interpretation and analysis: analyze historical events and issues from the perspectives of different participants in those events and issues
  o Research: select and use a wide variety of relevant primary and secondary sources (e.g., written, visual, oral, physical, electronic) that represent a diverse range of perspectives

Materials:
i. Primary Sources

- Plutarch: Selections from the *Life of Alexander* (Appendix 6.1)
- "Words of Darius the Great in Biston’s Inscription" (Appendix 6.2)
- "Alexander the Great and the Burning of Persepolis" with portions of primary source accounts by Diodorus Siculus, Quintus Curtius Rufus, Plutarch and Arrian (Appendix 6.3)

ii. Secondary Sources/Other Resources

- Ansari, Ali, "Alexander the Not so Great: History Through Persian Eyes" (Appendix 6.4)
- Worthington, Ian, "How 'Great' was Alexander?" (Appendix 6.5)
- Video: “Saddam Hussein has Weapons of Mass Destruction” on Youtube: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gMStCHtUNeY

Plan of Instruction:

Step 1: Warm up (5-10 minutes)
- Take up homework
  - Hook: Youtube video - George W. Bush claiming there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq
    - Discuss: What is missing? Do we have the whole story from these statements?

Step 2: Discussion (15 minutes)
- Mind map/list: What makes greatness?
  - Ask students to recall what they already know about Alexander
- Read some of the selections from Plutarch, Selections from the *Life of Alexander* (Appendix 6.1) as a class
  - Discuss – Do these selections reflect the list of characteristics of greatness?

Step 3: Modeling (15-20 minutes)
• Ask – Based on what has been studied up to this point what do you think of Darius, the Persian king and what kind of leader he was?

• Read as a class several selections from “Words of Darius the Great in Biston’s Inscription” (Appendix 6.2)
  o Point out the importance of looking for other sources to gain a fuller understanding of people and events
  o Based on this source, how does Darius measure up to the standards of greatness established by the class?

Step 4: Guided Practice (30 minutes)
• Divide the class into 4 or more groups (if groups are too large, more than one group can analyze each source) and give each group one of the primary source accounts of the burning of Persepolis (Diodorus Siculus, Quintus Curtius Rufus, Plutarch and Arrian: Appendix 6.3)
  o Students will read their assigned source and write a summary of the account on chart paper, then attach it to the wall
  o All the groups will circulate around the classroom to read the summaries of each source and see the similarities and differences between the sources. Discuss differences and similarities as a class.

Step 5: Independent Activity (15-20 minutes)
• Divide the class in half and hand out both readings to each group:
  o Ansari, Ali, “Alexander the Not so Great: History Through Persian Eyes” (Appendix 6.4)
  o Worthington, Ian, “How ‘Great’ was Alexander?” (Appendix 6.5)
• One side of the class will argue that Alexander was indeed a great historical figure and the other will argue that this is an inaccurate portrayal
  o Encourage students to use previous class readings to support their points

Step 6: Sharing (15-20 minutes)
• The two sides of the class will engage in a debate while the teacher moderates

Assessment:
• Each student will do a self-assessment with a short summary of how they contributed to their team for the debate so that the teacher is able to assess their participation without them being required to speak in the debate if they do not wish to do so.
• Students will add to their portrait of Alexander and take a picture of this stage with their (or the teacher’s) phone or device.

Plutarch, a Roman historian who lived during the first century AD (ca. 46-119), wrote his Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans intending to draw parallels between great figures of Greek antiquity and Romans of his own time. He chose to compare Alexander the Great with Julius Caesar. In his Life of Alexander, Plutarch tells some of the most famous stories related about Alexander.

Questions: 1. Plutarch tells about an important episode in Alexander’s life. What characteristics is it intended to show? 2. What, in Plutarch’s opinion, makes a "great man"? Is Alexander great?

When Philonieus, the Thessalian, offered the horse named Bucephalus in sale to Philip [Alexander’s father], at the price of thirteen talents, the king, with the prince and many others, went into the field to see some trial made of him. The horse appeared extremely vicious and unmanageable, and was so far from suffering himse$lf to be mounted, that he would not bear to be spoken to, but turned fiercely on all the grooms. Philip was displeased at their bringing him so wild and ungovernable a horse, and bade them take him away. But Alexander, who had observed him well, said, "What a horse they are losing, for want of skill and spirit to manage him!" Philip at first took no notice of this, but, upon the prince's often repeating the same expression, and showing great uneasiness, said, "Young man, you find fault with your elders, as if you knew more than they, or could manage the horse better." "And I certainly could," answered the prince. "If you should not be able to ride him, what forfeiture will you submit to for your rashness?" "I will pay the price of the horse."

Upon this all the company laughed, but the king and prince agreeing as to the forfeiture, Alexander ran to the horse, and laying hold on the bridle, turned him to the sun; for he had observed, it seems, that the shadow which fell before the horse, and continually moved as he moved, greatly disturbed him. While his fierceness and fury abated, he kept speaking to him softly and stroking him; after which he gently let fall his mantle, leaped lightly upon his back, and got his seat very safe. Then, without pulling the reins too hard, or using either whip or spur, he set him a-going. As soon as he perceived his uneasiness abated, and that he wanted only to run, he put him in a full gallop, and pushed him on both with the voice and spur.

Philip and all his court were in great distress for him at first, and a profound silence took place. But when the prince had turned him and brought him straight back, they all received him with loud acclamations, except his father, who wept for joy, and kissing him, said, "Seek another kingdom, my son, that may be worthy of thy abilities; for Macedonia is too small for thee..."

[Philip] sent for Aristotle, the most celebrated and learned of all the philosophers; and the reward he gave him for forming his son Alexander was not only honorable, but
remarkable for its propriety. He had formerly dismantled the city of Stagira, where that
philosopher was born, and now he re-built it, and reestablished the inhabitants, who had
either fled or been reduced to slavery... Aristotle was the man Alexander admired in his
younger years, and, as he said himself, he had no less affection for him than for his own
father...

[Alexander] was only twenty years old when he succeeded to the crown, and he found the
kingdom torn into pieces by dangerous parties and implacable animosities. The
barbarous nations, even those that bordered upon Macedonia, could not brook subjection,
and they longed for their natural kings... Alexander was of opinion, that the only way to
security, and a thorough establishment of his affairs, was to proceed with spirit and
magnanimity. For he was persuaded, that if he appeared to abate of his dignity in the least
article, he would be universally insulted. He therefore quieted the commotions, and put a
stop to the rising wars among the barbarians, by marching with the utmost expediency as
far as the Danube, where he fought a great battle...

The barbarians, we are told, lost in this battle twenty thousand foot and two thousand five
hundred horse, whereas Alexander had no more than thirty-four men killed, nine of which
were the infantry. To do honor to their memory, he erected a statue to each of them in
brass, the workmanship of Lysippus. And that the Greeks might have their share in the
glory of the day, he sent them presents out of the spoil: to the Athenians in particular he
sent three hundred bucklers. Upon the rest of the spoils he put this pompous inscription,
WON BY ALEXANDER THE SON OF PHILIP, AND THE GREEKS (EXCEPTING THE
LACEDAEMONIANS), OF THE BARBARIANS IN ASIA. The greatest part of the plate, the
purple furniture, and other things of that kind which he took from the Persians, he sent to
his mother.

1. I am Darius the Great King, King of Kings, King in Persia, King of countries, son of Hystaspes, grandson of Arsames, an Achaemenian.

2. Darius the King says: My father was Hystaspes; Hystaspes’ father was Arsames; Arsames’ father was Ariaramnes; Ariaramnes’ father was Teispes; Teispes’ father was Achaemenes.

3. Darius the King says: For this reason we are called Achaemenians. From long ago we have been noble. From long ago our family had been kings.

4. Darius the King says: there were 8 of our family who were kings before me; I am the ninth; 9 in succession we have been kings.

5. Darius the King says: By the favor of Ahuramazda I am King; Ahuramazda bestowed the kingdom upon me.

6. Darius the King says: These are the countries which came to me; by the favor of Ahuramazda I was king of them: Persia, Elam, Babylonia, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, (those) who are beside the sea, Sardis, Ionia, Media, Armenia, Cappadocia, Parthia, Drangiana, Aria, Chorasmia, Bactria, Sogdiana, Gandara, Scythia, Sattagydia, Arachosia, Maka: in all, 23 provinces.

7. Darius the King says: These are the countries which came to me; by the favor of Ahuramazda they were my subjects; they bore tribute to me; what was said to them by me either by night or by day, that was done.

8. Darius the King says: Within these countries, the man who was loyal, him I rewarded well; (him) who was evil, him I punished well; by the favor of Ahuramazda these countries showed respect toward my law; as was said to them by me, thus was it done.

9. Darius the King says: Ahuramazda bestowed the kingdom upon me; Ahuramazda bore me aid until I got possession of this kingdom; by the favor of Ahuramazda I hold this kingdom.

10. Darius the King says: This is what was done by me after I became king. A son of Cyrus, Cambyses by name, of our family -- he was king here of that Cambyses there was a brother, Smerdis by name, having the same mother and the same father as Cambyses. Afterwards, Cambyses slew that Smerdis. When Cambyses slew Smerdis, it did not become known to the people that Smerdis had been slain. Afterwards, Cambyses went to Egypt. When Cambyses had gone off to Egypt, after that the people became evil. After that the Lie waxed great in the country, both in Persia and in Media and in the other provinces.

11. Darius the King says: Afterwards, there was one man, a Magian, named Gaumata; he rose up from Paishiyauvada. A mountain named Arakadri -- from there 14 days of the month Viyakhna were past when he rose up. He lied to the people thus: "I am Smerdis, the son of Cyrus, brother of Cambyses." After that, all the people became rebellious from Cambyses, (and) went over to him, both Persia and Media and the other provinces. He seized the kingdom; of the month Garmapada 9 days were past, then he seized the kingdom. After that, Cambyses died by his own hand.
12. Darius the King says: This kingdom which Gaumata the Magian took away from Cambyses, this kingdom from long ago had belonged to our family. After that, Gaumata the Magian took (it) from Cambyses; he took to himself both Persia and Media and the other provinces, he made (them) his own possession, he became king.

13. Darius the King says: There was not a man, neither a Persian nor a Mede nor anyone of our family, who might make that Gaumata the Magian deprived of the kingdom. The people feared him greatly, (thinking that) he would slay in numbers the people who previously had known Smerdis; for this reason he would slay the people, "lest they know me, that I am not Smerdis the son of Cyrus." Nobody dared say anything about Gaumata the Magian, until I came. After that I sought help of Ahuramazda; Ahuramazda bore me aid; of the month Bagayadi 10 days were past, then I with a few men slew that Gaumata the Magian, and those who were his foremost followers. A fortress named Sikayauvati, a district named Nisaya, in Media -- here I slew him. I took the kingdom from him. By the favor of Ahuramazda I became king; Ahuramazda bestowed the kingdom upon me.

14. Darius the King says: The kingdom which had been taken away from our family, that I put in its Place; I re-established it on its foundation. As before, so I made the sanctuaries which Gaumata the Magian destroyed. I restored to the people the pastures and the herds, the household slaves and the houses which Gaumata the Magian took away from them. I re-established the people on its foundation, both Persia and Media and the other provinces. As before, so I brought back what had been taken away. By the favor of Ahuramazda this I did: I strove until I reestablished our royal house on its foundation as (it was) before. So I strove, by the favor of Ahuramazda, so that Gaumata the Magian did not remove our royal house.

15. Darius the King says: This is what I did after I became king.

16. Darius the King says: When I had slain Gaumata the Magian, afterwards one man, named Asina, son of Upadarma -- he rose up in Elam. To the people he said thus: "I am king in Elam." Afterwards the Elamites became rebellious, (and) went over to that Asina; he became king in Elam. And one man, a Babylonian, named Nidintu-Bel, son of Ainaira -- he rose up in Babylon; thus he deceived the people: "I am Nebuchadrezzar the son of Nabonidus." Afterwards the Babylonian people all went over to that Nidintu-Bel; Babylonia became rebellious; he seized the kingdom in Babylon.

17. Darius the King says: After that I sent (a message) to Elam. This Acina was led to me bound; I slew him.

18. Darius the King says: After that I went off to Babylon, against that Nidintu-Bel who called himself Nebuchadrezzar. The army of Nidintu-Bel held the Tigris; there it took its stand, and on account of the waters (the Tigris) was unfordable. Thereupon (some of) my army I supported on (inflated) skins, others I made camel-borne, for others I brought horses. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda we got across the Tigris. There I smote that army of Nidintu-Bel exceedingly; of the month Asiyadiya 26 days were past, then we fought the battle.

19. Darius the King says: After that I went off to Babylon. When I had not arrived at Babylon, a town named Zazana, beside the Euphrates -- there this Nidintu-Bel who called himself Nebuchadrezzar came with an army against me, to deliver battle. Thereupon we joined battle; Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda I smote that army of Nidintu-Bel exceedingly. The rest was thrown into the water, (and) the water carried it away. Of the month Anamaka 2 days were past, then we fought the battle.
20. Darius the King says: After that, Nidintu-Bel with a few horsemen fled; he went off to Babylon. Thereupon I went to Babylon. By the favor of Ahuramazda both I seized Babylon and I took that Nidintu-Bel prisoner. After that, I slew that Nidintu-Bel at Babylon.

21. Darius the King says: While I was in Babylon, these are the provinces which became rebellious from me: Persia, Elam, Media, Assyria, Egypt, Parthia, Margiana, Sattagydia, Scythia.

22. Darius the King says: One man, named Martiya, son of Cincikhri -- a town named Kuganaka, in Persia -- there he abode. He rose up in Elam; to the people thus he said, "I am Imanish, king in Elam."

23. Darius the King says: At that time I was near Elam. Thereupon the Elamites were afraid of me; they seized that Martiya who was their chief, and slew him.

24. Darius the King says: One man, named Phraortes, a Median -- he rose up in Media. To the people thus he said, "I am Khshathrita, of the family of Cyaxares." Thereafter the Median army which (was) in the palace, became rebellious from me, (and) went over to that Phraortem. He became king in Media.

25. Darius the King says: The Persian and Median army which was with me, this was a small (force). Thereupon I sent forth an army. A Persian named Hydarnes, my subject -- I made him chief of them; I said to them thus: "Go forth, smite that Median army which does not call itself mine!" Thereupon this Hydarnes with the army marched off. When he arrived in Media, a town named Maru, in Media -- there he joined battle with the Medes. He who was chief among the Medes, he at that time was not there. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly. Of the month Anamaka 27 days were past, then the battle was fought by them. Thereafter this army of mine, a district named Kampanda, in Media -- there it waited for me until I arrived in Media.

26. Darius the King says: An Armenian named Dadarshi, my subject -- I sent him forth to Armenia. I said to him: "Go forth, that rebellious army which does not call itself mine, that do you smite!" Thereupon Dadarshi marched off. When he arrived in Armenia, thereafter the rebels assembled (and) came out against Dadarshi to join battle. A place named Zuzahya, in Armenia -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; of the month Thuravahara 8 days were past, then the battle was fought by them.

27. Darius the King says: Again a second time the rebels assembled (and) came out against Dadarshi to join battle. A stronghold named Tigra, in Armenia -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; of the month Thuravahara 18 days were past, then the battle was fought by them.

28. Darius the King says: Again a third time the rebels assembled (and) came out against Dadarshi to join battle. A fortress named Uyama, in Armenia -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; of the month Thaigarci 9 days were past, then the battle was fought by them. Thereafter Dadarshi waited for me until I arrived in Media.

29. Darius the King says: Thereafter a Persian named Vaumisa, my subject-him I sent forth to Armenia. Thus I said to him: "Go forth; the rebellious army which does not call itself mine -- smite them!" Thereupon Vaumisa marched off. When he arrived in Armenia, then the rebels assembled (and) came out against Vaumisa to join battle. A district named Izala, in Assyria -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me
aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; of the month Anamaka 15 days were past, then the battle was fought by them.

30. Darius the King says: Again a second time the rebels assembled (and) came out against Vaumisa to join battle. A district named Autiyara, in Armenia -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; on the last day of the month Thuravaharâthen the battle was fought by them. After that, Vaumisa waited for me in Armenia until I arrived in Media.

31. Darius the King says: Thereafter I went away from Babylon (and) arrived in Media. When I arrived in Media, a town named Kunduru, in Media -- there this Phraortes who called himself king in Media came with an army against me to join battle. Thereafter we joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda that army of Phraortes I smote exceedingly; of the month Adukanaisha 25 days were past, then we fought the battle.

32. Darius the King says: Thereafter this Phraortes with a few horsemen fled; a district named Raga, in Media -- along there he went off. Thereafter I sent an army in pursuit; Phraortes, seized, was led to me. I cut off his nose and ears and tongue, and put out one eye; he was kept bound at my palace entrance, all the people saw him. Afterward I impaled him at Ecbatana; and the men who were his foremost followers, those at Ecbatana within the fortress I (flayed and) hung out (their hides, stuffed with straw).

33. Darius the King says: One man named Cisantakhma, a Sagartian -- he became rebellious to me; thus he said to the people, "I am king in Sagartia, of the family of Cyaxares." Thereupon I sent off a Persian and Median army; a Mede named Takhmaspada, my subject -- I made him chief of them. I said to them thus: "Go forth; the hostile army which shall not call itself mine, and smite them!" Thereupon Takhmaspada with the army went off; he joined battle with Cisantakhma. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army and took Cisantakhma prisoner, (and) led him to me. Afterwards I cut off both his nose and ears, and put out one eye, he was kept bound at my palace entrance, all the people saw him. Afterwards I impaled him at Arbela.

34. Darius the King says: This is what was done by me in Media.

35. Darius the King says: Parthia and Hyrcania became rebellious from me, called themselves (adherents) of Phraortes. Hystaspes my father -- he was in Parthia; him the people abandoned, became rebellious. Thereupon Hystaspes went forth with the army which was faithful to him. A town named Vishpauzati, in Parthia -- there he joined battle with the Parthians. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda Hystaspes smote that rebellious army exceedingly; of the month Viyakhna 22 days were past -- then the battle was fought by them.

36. Darius the King says: After that I sent forth a Persian army to Hystaspes, from Raga. When this army came to Hystaspes, thereupon Hystaspes took that army (and) marched out. A town by name Patigrabana, in Parthia - there he joined battle with the rebels. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda Hystaspes smote that rebellious army exceedingly; of the month Garmapada 1 day was past -- then the battle was fought by them.

37. Darius the King says: After that the province became mine. This is what was done by me in Parthia.

38. Darius the King says: A province named Margiana -- it became rebellious to me. One man named Frada,
a Margian -- him they made chief. Thereupon I sent forth against him a Persian named Dadarshi, my subject, satrap in Bactria. Thus I said to him: "Go forth, smite that army which does not call itself mine!" After that, Dadarshi marched out with the army; he joined battle with the Margians. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; of the month Asiyadiya 23 days were past -- then the battle was fought by them.

39. Darius the King says: After that the province became mine. This is what was done by me in Bactria.

40. Darius the King says: One man named Vahyazdata -- a town named Tarava, a district named Yautiya, in Persia -- there he abode. He made the second uprising in Persia. To the people he said thus: "I am Smerdis, the son of Cyrus." Thereupon the Persian army which (was) in the palace, (having come) from Anshan previously -- it became rebellious from me, went over to that Vahyazdata. He became king in Persia.

41. Darius the King says: Thereupon I sent forth the Persian and Median army which was by me. A Persian named Artavardiya, my subject -- I made him chief of them. The rest of the Persian army went forth behind me to Media. Thereupon Artavardiya with his army went forth to Persia. When he arrived in Persia, a town named Rakha, in Persia -- there this Vahyazdata who called himself Smerdis came with his army against Artavardiya, to join battle. Thereupon they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that army of Vahyazdata exceedingly; of the month Thuravaha 12 days were past -- then the battle was fought by them.

42. Darius the King says: After that, this Vahyazdata with a few horsemen fled; he went off to Paishiyauvada. From there he got an army; later he came against Artavardiya to join battle. A mountain named Parga -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that army of Vahyazdata exceedingly; of the month Garmapada 5 days were past -- then the battle was fought by them, and that Vahyazdata they took prisoner, and those who were his foremost followers they captured.

43. Darius the King says: After that I took that Vahyazdata and those who were his foremost followers -- a town named Uvadaicaya, in Persia -- there I impaled them.

44. Darius the King says: This is what was done by me in Persia.

45. The King says: This Vahyazdata who called himself Smerdis had sent an army to Arachosia -- a Persian named Vivana, my subject, satrap in Arachosia -- against him; and he had made one man their chief. Thus he said to them: "Go forth; smite Vivana and that army which calls itself King Darius's!" Thereupon this army marched off, which Vahyazdata had sent forth against Vivana to join battle. A fortress named Kapishakani -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; of the month Anamaka 13 days were past -- then the battle was fought by them.

46. Darius the King says: Again later the rebels assembled (and) came out against Vivana to join battle. A district named Gandutava -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; of the month Viyakhna 7 days were past -- then the battle was fought by them.

47. Darius the King says: After that, this man who was the chief of that army which Vahyazdata had sent
forth against Vivana -- he fled with a few horsemen (and) got away. A fortress named Arshada, in Arachosia -- past that he went. Afterwards Vivana with his army went off in pursuit of them; there he took him prisoner and the men who were his foremost followers, (and) slew (them).

48. Darius the King says: After that the province became mine. This is what was done by me in Arachosia.

49. Darius the King says: While I was in Persia and Media, again a second time the Babylonians became rebellious from me. One man named Arkha, an Armenian, son of Haldita -- he rose up in Babylon. A district named Dubala -- from there he thus lied to the people: "I am Nebuchadrezzar the son of Nabonidus." Thereupon the Babylonian people became rebellious from me, (and) went over to that Arkha. He seized Babylon; he became king in Babylon.

50. Darius the King says: Thereupon I sent forth an army to Babylon. A Persian named Intaphernes, my subject -- him I made chief of them. Thus I said to them: "Go forth; that Babylonian army smite, which shall not call itself mine!" Thereupon Intaphernes with the army marched off to Babylon. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda Intaphernes smote the Babylonians and led them in bonds; of the month Varkazana 22 days were past -- then that Arkha who falsely called himself Nebuchadrezzar and the men who were his foremost followers he took prisoner. I issued an order: this Arkha and the men who were his foremost followers were impaled at Babylon.

51. Darius the King says: This is what was done by me in Babylon.

52. Darius the King says: This is what I did by the favor of Ahuramazda in one and the same year after that I became king. 19 battles I fought; by the favor of Ahuramazda I smote them and took prisoner 9 kings. One was named Gaumata, a Magian; lied and said, "I am Smerdis, the son of Cyrus;" he made Persia rebellious. One, named Asina, an Elamite; lied and said, "I am king in Elam;" he made Elam rebellious to me. One, named Nidintu-Bel, a Babylonian; lied and said, "I am Nebuchadrezzar, the son of Nabonidus; he made Babylon rebellious. One, named Martiya, a Persian; lied and said, "I am Imanish, king in Elam;" he made Elam rebellious. One, named Phraortes, a Mede; lied and said, "I am Khshathrita, of the family of Cyaxares;" he made Media rebellious. One named Cisantakhma, a Sagartian; lied and said, "I am king in Sagartia, of the family of Cyaxares;" he made Sagartia rebellious. One, named Frada, a Margian; lied and said, "I am king in Margiana;" he made Margiana rebellious. One, named Vahyazdata, a Persian; lied and said, "I am Smerdis, the son of Cyrus;" he made Persia rebellious. One, named Arkha, an Armenian; lied and said: "I am Nebuchadrezzar, the son of Nabonidus;" he made Babylon rebellious.

53. Darius the King says: These 9 kings I took prisoner within these battles.

54. Darius the King says: These are the provinces which became rebellious. The Lie (druj) made them rebellious, so that these (men) deceived the people. Afterwards Ahuramazda put them into my hand; as was my desire, so I did to them.

55. Darius the King says: You who shall be king hereafter, protect yourself vigorously from the Lie; the man who shall be a Lie-follower, him do you punish well, if thus you shall think, "May my country be secure!"

56. Darius the King says: This is what I did; by the favor of Ahuramazda, in one and the same year I did (it). You who shall hereafter read this inscription let that which has been done by me convince you; do not think it a lie.
57. Darius the King says: I turn myself quickly to Ahuramazda, that this (is) true, not false, (which) I did in one and the same year.

58. Darius the King says: By the favor of Ahuramazda and of me much else was done; that has not been inscribed in this inscription; for this reason it has not been inscribed, lest whoso shall hereafter read this inscription, to him what has been done by me seem excessive, (and) it not convince him, (but) he think it false.

59. Darius the King says: Those who were the former kings, as long as they lived, by them was not done thus as by the favor of Ahuramazda was done by me in one and the same year.

60. Darius the King says: Now let that which has been done by me convince you; thus to the people impart, do not conceal it: if this record you shall not conceal, (but) tell it to the people, may Ahuramazda he a friend to you, and may family be to you in abundance, and may you live long!

61. Darius the King says: If this record you shall conceal, (and) not tell it to the people, may Ahuramazda be a smiter to you, and may family not be to you!

62. Darius the King says: This which I did, in one and the same year by the favor of Ahuramazda I did; Ahuramazda bore me aid, and the other gods who are.

63. Darius the King says: For this reason Ahuramazda bore aid, and the other gods who are, because I was not hostile, I was not a Lie-follower, I was not a doer of wrong -- neither I nor my family. According to righteousness I conducted myself. Neither to the weak nor to the powerful did I do wrong. The man who cooperated with my house, him I rewarded well; whoso did injury, him I punished well.

64. Darius the King says: You who shall be king hereafter, the man who shall be a Lie-follower or who shall be a doer of wrong -- to them do not be a friend, (but) punish them well.

65. Darius the King says: You who shall thereafter behold this inscription which I have inscribed, or these sculptures, do not destroy them, (but) thence onward protect them, as long as you shall be in good strength!

66. Darius the King says: If you shall behold this inscription or these sculptures, (and) shall not destroy them and shall protect them as long as to you there is strength, may Ahuramazda be a friend to you, and may family be to you in abundance, and may you live long, and what you shall do, that may Ahuramazda make successful for you!

67. Darius the King says: If you shall behold this inscription or these sculptures, (and) shall destroy them and shall not protect them as long as to you there is strength, may Ahuramazda be a smiter to you, and may family not be to you, and what you shall do, that for you may Ahuramazda utterly destroy!

68. Darius the King says: These are the men who were there at the time when I slew Gaumata the Magian who called himself Smerdis; at that time these men cooperated as my followers: Intaphernes by name, son of Vayaspara, a Persian; Otanes by name, son of Thukhra, a Persian; Gobryas by name, son of Mardonius, a Persian; Hydarnes by name, son of Bagabigna, a Persian; Megabyzus by name, son of Datuvahya, a Persian; Ardumanish by name, son of Vahauka, a Persian.
69. Darius the King says: You who shall be king hereafter, protect well the family of these men.

70. Darius the King says: By the favor of Ahuramazda this is the inscription which I made. Besides, it was in Aryan, and on clay tablets and on parchment it was composed. Besides, a sculptured figure of myself I made. Besides, I made my lineage. And it was inscribed and was read off before me. Afterwards this inscription I sent off everywhere among the provinces. The people unitedly worked upon it.

71. Darius the King says: This is what I did in both the second and the third year after I became king. A province named Elam became rebellious. One man named Atamaita, an Elamite -- they made him chief. Thereupon I sent forth an army. One man named Gobryas, a Persian, my subject -- I made him chief of them. After that, Gobryas with the army marched off to Elam; he joined battle with the Elamites. Thereupon Gobryas smote and crushed the Elamites, and captured the chief of them; he led him to me, and I killed him. After that the province became mine.

72. Darius the King says: Those Elamites were faithless and by them Ahuramazda was not worshipped. I worshipped Ahuramazda; by the favor of Ahuramazda, as was my desire, thus I did to them.

73. Darius the King says: Who so shall worship Ahuramazda, divine blessing will be upon him, both (while) living and (when) dead.

74. Darius the King says: Afterwards with an army I went off to Scythia, after the Scythians who wear the pointed cap. These Scythians went from me. When I arrived at the sea, beyond it then with all my army I crossed. Afterwards, I smote the Scythians exceedingly; another (leader) I took captive; this one was led bound to me, and I slew him. The chief of them, by name Skunkha -- him they seized and led to me. Then I made another their chief, as was my desire. After that, the province became mine.

75. Darius the King says: Those Scythians were faithless and Ahuramazda was not worshipped by them. I worshipped Ahuramazda; by the grace of Ahuramazda I did unto them according to my will.

76. Darius the King says: Whoso shall worship Ahuramazda, divine blessing will be upon him, both while living and when dead.
Appendix 6.3: “Alexander the Great and the Burning of Persepolis” with portions of primary source accounts by Diodorus Siculus, Quintus Curtius Rufus, Plutarch and Arrian from Ancient History Encyclopedia

One most famous accounts of the burning of the great city comes from the historian Diodorus Siculus (90-21 BCE) who gives the following account of the destruction of the city:

As for Persepolis, the capital of the Persian Empire, Alexander described it to the Macedonians as their worst enemy among the cities of Asia, and he gave it over to the soldiers to plunder, with the exception of the royal palace. It was the wealthiest city under the sun and the private houses had been filled for a long time with riches of every kind. The Macedonians rushed into it, killing all the men and plundering the houses, which were numerous and full of furniture and precious objects of every kind. Here much silver was carried off and no little gold, and many expensive dresses, embroidered with purple or with gold, fell as prizes to the victors.

But the great royal palace, famed throughout the inhabited world, had been condemned to the indignity of total destruction. The Macedonians spent the whole day in pillage but still could not satisfy their inexhaustible greed. As for the women, they dragged them away forcibly with their jewels, treating as slaves the whole group of captives. As Persepolis had surpassed all other cities in prosperity, so she now exceeded them in misfortune. Alexander went up to the citadel and took possession of the treasures stored there. They were full of gold and silver, with the accumulation of revenue from Cyrus, the first king of the Persians, down to that time. Reckoning gold in terms of silver, 2,500 tons were found there. Alexander wanted to take part of the money with him, for the expenses of war and to deposit the rest at Susa under close guard. From Babylon, Mesopotamia and Susa, he sent for a crowd of mules, partly pack and partly draught animals, as well as 3,000 pack camels, and with these he had all the treasure conveyed to the chosen places. He was very hostile to the local people and did not trust them, and wished to destroy Persepolis utterly.

Alexander held games to celebrate his victories; he offered magnificent sacrifices to the gods and entertained his friends lavishly. One day when the Companions were feasting, and intoxication was growing as the drinking went on, a violent madness took hold of these drunken men. One of the women present, Thais, the Athenian lover of the Macedonian commander Ptolemy, declared that it would be Alexander’s greatest achievement in Asia to join in their procession and set fire to the royal palace, allowing women’s hands to destroy in an instant what had been the pride of the Persians.

These words were spoken to young men who were completely out of their minds because of drink, and someone, as expected, shouted to lead off the procession and light torches, exhorting them to punish the crimes committed against the Greek sanctuaries. Others joined in the cry and said that only Alexander was worthy of this deed. The king was excited with the rest by these words. They all leaped out from the banquet and passed the word around to form a triumphal procession in honour of Dionysus.

A quantity of torches was quickly collected, and as female musicians had been invited to the banquet, it was to the sound of singing and flutes and pipes that the king led them to the revel, with Thais the courtesan conducting the ceremony. She was the first after the king to throw her blazing torch into the palace. As the others followed their example the whole area of the royal palace was quickly engulfed in flames.

The Roman historian Quintus Curtius Rufus (41-54 CE) in his History of Alexander the Great, also cites Thais as the instigator of the fire which consumed Persepolis:
Thais had drunk as much as the others when she declared that if Alexander gave the order to burn the Persian palace, he would earn the deepest gratitude among all the Greeks. This was what the people whose cities the Persians had destroyed were expecting she said. As the drunken whore gave her opinion on a matter of extreme importance, one or two who were themselves the worse for drink agreed with her. The king, too, was enthusiastic rather than acquiescent. Why do we not avenge Greece, then and put the city to the torch?" he asked. They were all flushed with wine, and they got up, drunk, to burn a city which they had spared while under arms. Alexander took the lead, setting fire to the palace, to be followed by his drinking companions, his attendants and the courtesans. Large sections of the palace had been made of cedar, so they quickly took flame and spread the conflagration over a large area [one to three feet of cedar ash were found in the excavation]. The army, encamped not far from the city, caught sight of the fire. Thinking it was accidental, came running in a body to help. But when they reached the palace portico, they saw their king himself, still piling on torch-wood, so they dropped what they had brought and began throwing dry wood into the blaze themselves. Such was the end of the palace that had ruled all the East.

Plutarch (46-120 CE) in his Life of Alexander, gives a similar account of the incident:

As the drinking went on, Thais delivered a speech which was intended partly as a graceful compliment to Alexander and partly to amuse him. What she said was typical of the spirit of Athens, but hardly in keeping with her own situation. She declared that all the hardships she had endured in wandering about Asia had been amply repaid on that day, when she found herself reveling luxuriously in the splendid palace of the Persians, but that it would be an even sweeter pleasure to end the party by going out and setting fire to the palace of Xerxes, who had laid Athens in ashes. She wanted to put a torch to the building herself in full view of Alexander, so that posterity should know that the women who followed Alexander had taken a more terrible revenge for the wrongs of Greece than all the famous commanders of earlier times by land or sea. Her speech was greeted with wild applause and the king's companions excitedly urged him on until at last he allowed himself to be persuaded, leaped to his feet, and with a garland on his head and a torch in his hand led the way.

The historian Arrian of Nicomedia (87-160 CE, the same who studied with Epictetus) disagreed with these others, however and, in his account, drew upon the primary sources of Ptolemy and Aristobulus, both of whom were allegedly eye witnesses to the event. Arrian claimed that “
Ptolemy and Aristobulus are the most trustworthy writers on Alexander’s conquests, because the latter shared Alexander’s campaigns, and the former-Ptolemy- in addition to this advantage, was himself a king, and it is more disgraceful for a king to tell lies than for anybody else.” According to Arrian, Persepolis was deliberately and soberly burned as retribution for the Persian burning of Athens in 480. Arrian writes, "Alexander burnt up the palace at Persepolis to avenge the Greeks because the Persians had destroyed both temples and cities of the Greeks by fire and sword." Since neither Ptolemy nor Aristobulus claim any knowledge of a drunken party leading to the fire, Arrian assumes no such party existed. Yet he, himself, says, “even the most trustworthy writers, men who were actually with Alexander at the time, have given conflicting accounts of notorious events with which they must have been perfectly familiar” and admits that the possibility of ever knowing what actually prompted the burning of Persepolis may never be known."
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Alexander the not so Great: History through Persian eyes
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Alexander the Great is portrayed as a legendary conqueror and military leader in Greek-influenced Western history books but his legacy looks very different from a Persian perspective.

Any visitor to the spectacular ruins of Persepolis - the site of the ceremonial capital of the ancient Persian Achaemenid empire, will be told three facts: it was built by Darius the Great, embellished by his son Xerxes, and destroyed by that man, Alexander.

That man Alexander, would be the Alexander the Great, feted in Western culture as the conqueror of the Persian Empire and one of the great military geniuses of history. Indeed, reading some Western history books one might be forgiven for thinking that the Persians existed to be conquered by Alexander.

A more inquisitive mind might discover that the Persians had twice before been defeated by the Greeks during two ill-fated invasions of Greece, by Darius the Great in 490BC and then his son, Xerxes, in 480BC - for which Alexander's assault was a justified retaliation.

Alexander the Great razed the ancient city of Persepolis
But seen through Persian eyes, Alexander is far from "Great". He razed Persepolis to the ground following a night of drunken excess at the goading of a Greek courtesan, ostensibly in revenge for the burning of the Acropolis by the Persian ruler Xerxes. Persians also condemn him for the widespread destruction he is thought to have encouraged to cultural and religious sites throughout the empire. The emblems of Zoroastrianism - the ancient religion of the Iranians - were attacked and destroyed. For the Zoroastrian priesthood in particular - the Magi - the destruction of their temples was nothing short of a calamity.

The influence of Greek language and culture has helped establish a narrative in the West that Alexander's invasion was the first of many Western crusades to bring civilisation and culture to the barbaric East. But in fact the Persian Empire was worth conquering not because it was in need of civilising but because it was the greatest empire the world had yet seen, extending from Central Asia to Libya. Persia was an enormously rich prize.

Look closely and you will find ample evidence that the Greeks admired the Persian Empire and the emperors who ruled it. Much like the barbarians who conquered Rome, Alexander came to admire what he found, so much so that he was keen to take on the Persian mantle of the King of Kings.

And Greek admiration for the Persians goes back much earlier than this. Xenophon, the Athenian general and writer, wrote a paean to Cyrus the Great - the Cyropaedia - showering praise on the ruler who showed that the government of men over a vast territory could be
achieved by dint of character and force of personality:

"Cyrus was able to penetrate that vast extent of country by the sheer terror of his personality that the inhabitants were prostrate before him…," wrote Xenophon, "and yet he was able at the same time, to inspire them all with so deep a desire to please him and win his favour that all they asked was to be guided by his judgment and his alone.

"Thus he knit to himself a complex of nationalities so vast that it would have taxed a man's endurance merely to traverse his empire in any one direction."

Later Persian emperors Darius and Xerxes both invaded Greece, and were both ultimately defeated. But, remarkably, Greeks flocked to the Persian court. The most notable was Themistocles, who fought against Darius's invading army at Marathon and masterminded the Athenian victory against Xerxes at Salamis. Falling foul of Athenian politics, he fled to the Persian Empire and eventually found employment at the Persian Court and was made a provincial governor, where he lived out the rest of his life.

In time, the Persians found that they could achieve their objectives in Greece by playing the Greek city states against each other, and in the Peloponnesian War, Persian money financed the Spartan victory against Athens. The key figure in this strategy was the Persian prince and governor of Asia Minor, Cyrus the Younger, who over a number of years developed a good relationship with his Greek interlocutors such that when he decided to make his fateful bid for the throne, he was able to easily recruit some 10,000 Greek mercenaries. Unfortunately for him, he died in the attempt.

Soldier, historian and philosopher Xenophon was among those recruited, and he was full of praise for the prince of whom he said: "Of all the Persians who lived after Cyrus the Great, he was most like a king and the most deserving of an empire."

There is a wonderful account provided by Lysander, a Spartan general, who happened to visit Cyrus the Younger in the provincial capital at Sardis. Lysander recounts how Cyrus treated him graciously and was particularly keen to show him his walled garden - paradisios, the origin of our word paradise - where Lysander congratulated the prince on the beautiful design. When, he added, that he ought to thank the slave who had done the work and laid out the plans, Cyrus smiled and pointed out that he had laid out the design and even planted some of the trees. On seeing the Spartan's reaction he added: "I swear to you by Mithras that, my health permitting, I never ate without having first worked up a sweat by undertaking some activity relevant either to the art of war or to agriculture, or by stretching myself in some other way." Astonished, Lysander applauded Cyrus and said: "You deserve your good fortune Cyrus - you have it because you are a good man."

Alexander would have been familiar with stories such as these. The Persian Empire was not something to be conquered as much as an achievement to be acquired. Although Alexander is characterised by the Persians as a destroyer, a reckless and somewhat feckless youth, the evidence suggests that he retained a healthy respect for the Persians themselves. Alexander came to regret the destruction his invasion caused. Coming across the plundered tomb of Cyrus the Great in Pasargad, a little north of Persepolis, he was much distressed by what he found and immediately ordered repairs to be made. Had he lived beyond his 32 years, he may yet have restored and repaired much more. In time, the Persians were to come to terms with their Macedonian conqueror, absorbing him, as other conquerors after him, into the fabric of
national history.

And thus it is that in the great Iranian national epic, the Shahnameh, written in the 10th Century AD, Alexander is no longer a wholly foreign prince but one born of a Persian father. It is a myth, but one that perhaps betrays more truth than the appearance of history may like to reveal. Like other conquerors who followed in his footsteps even the great Alexander came to be seduced and absorbed into the idea of Iran.

Ali Ansari is a professor in modern history and director of The Institute of Iranian Studies at The University of St Andrews, Scotland.
Appendix 6.5: Worthington, Ian, “How ‘Great’ was Alexander?” from University of Texas: http://www.utexas.edu/courses/citylife/readings/great1.html

Why was Alexander III of Macedon called ‘Great’? The answer seems relatively straightforward: from an early age he was an achiever, he conquered territories on a superhuman scale, he established an empire until his times unrivalled, and he died young, at the height of his power. Thus, at the youthful age of 20, in 336, he inherited the powerful empire of Macedon, which by then controlled Greece and had already started to make inroads into Asia. In 334 he invaded Persia, and within a decade he had defeated the Persians, subdued Egypt, and pushed on to Iran, Afghanistan and even India. As well as his vast conquests Alexander is credited with the spread of Greek culture and education in his empire, not to mention being responsible for the physical and cultural formation of the hellenistic kingdoms -- some would argue that the hellenistic world was Alexander’s legacy.[2] He has also been viewed as a philosophical idealist, striving to create a unity of mankind by his so-called fusion of the races policy, in which he attempted to integrate Persians and Orientals into his administration and army. Thus, within a dozen years Alexander’s empire stretched from Greece in the west to India in the far east, and he was even worshipped as a god by many of his subjects while still alive. On the basis of his military conquests contemporary historians, and especially those writing in Roman times who measured success by the number of body-bags used, deemed him great.[3] However, does a man deserve to be called ‘The Great’ who was responsible for the deaths of tens of thousands of his own men and for the unnecessary wholesale slaughter of native peoples? How ‘great’ is a king who prefers constant warfare over consolidating conquered territories and long-term administration? Or who, through his own recklessness, often endangered his own life and the lives of his men? Or whose violent temper on occasion led him to murder his friends and who towards the end of his life was an alcoholic, paranoid, megalomaniac, who believed in his own divinity? These are questions posed by our standards of today of course, but nevertheless they are legitimate questions given the influence which Alexander has exerted throughout history - an influence which will no doubt continue.[4] The aims of this paper are to trace some reasons for questioning the greatness of Alexander as is reflected in his epithet, and to add potential evidence dealing with the attitude of the Macedonians, Alexander’s own people, in their king’s absence. It is important to stress that when evaluating Alexander it is essential to view the ‘package’ of king as a whole; i.e., as king, commander and statesman. All too often this is not the case. There is no question that Alexander was spectacularly successful in the military field, and had Alexander only been a general his epithet may well have been deserved. But he was not just a general; he was a king too, and hence military exploits form only a percentage of what Alexander did, or did not do -- in other words, we must look at the ‘package’ of him as king as a whole. By its nature this paper is impressionistic, and it can only deal rapidly with selected examples from Alexander’s reign and discuss points briefly. However, given the unequalled influence Alexander has played in cultures and history from the time of his death to today, it is important to stress that there is a chasm of a difference between the mythical Alexander, which for the most part we have today, and the historical. Alexander died in 323, and over the course of time the mythical king and his exploits sprang into being. Alexander himself was not above embellishing his own life and achievements. He very likely told the court historian Callisthenes of Olynthus what to say about his victory over Darius III at the battle of Issus in 333, for example.[5] Contemporary Attic oratory also exaggerated his achievements,[6] and so within a generation of his death erroneous stories were already being told. As time continued we move into the genre of pulp fiction. In the third or second century BC Alexander’s exploits formed the plot of the story known as the Alexander Romance, which added significantly to the Alexander legend and had such a massive influence on many cultures into the Middle Ages.[7] Given its life-span, deeds were attributed to Alexander which are unhistorical, such as his encounters with the tribe of headless men, his flying exploits in a basket borne by eagles, and the search for the Water of Life, which ended with his transformation into a mermaid. These stories became illustrative fodder for the various
manpower. Did Alexander's demands for reinforcement make them feel this way? In addressing this, we can begin with the vexed question of Macedonian Macedonians themselves is that Alexander was far from their idea of an ideal king. Why might their attitude to their king and he to them. At the same time a consideration of the Macedonian background also lends further weight to questioning the aptness of Alexander's title as king, whose mission was to impose Greek civilisation on the 'barbarian' Persians. Plutarch's work is essentially a rhetorical exercise, but as time continued The Alexander legend was a ready feeding ground for artists throughout the centuries as well. When Alexander invaded Persia in 334 he detoured to Troy to sacrifice at the tomb of his hero Achilles. This was a stirring story, which became a model for heroic piety in the Renaissance and later periods; thus, for example, we have Fontebasso's painting of Alexander's sacrifice at Achilles' tomb in the eighteenth century. In modern Greece Alexander became both an art-work and a symbol, as seen in the painting by Engonopoulos in 1977 of the face-less Alexander standing with his arm around the face-less Pavlos Melas, a modern hero of the struggle for Macedonian independence. Thus, we can see how the historical Alexander has faded into the invincible general, the great leader, explorer and king, as time continued, especially in the Middle Ages with its world of chivalry, warriors and great battles: a superb context into which to fit Alexander, even if this meant distortion of the truth, and history subsumed to legend. Indeed, during the Middle Ages was regarded as one of the four great kings of the ancient world. Let us now consider some specific aspects of Alexander's reign in support of this. In 334 Alexander III left home for Asia, entrusting to Antipater as guardian (epitropos) a stable -- for a while -- Greece and Macedon (Arr. 1.11.3). The king also unilaterally made Antipater deputy hegemon in the League of Corinth. Alexander's 'mandate' or prime directive, as inherited from his father Philip II and endorsed by the League of Corinth, was to pursue his father's plan of punishing the Persians for their sacrilegious acts of 150 years ago and to 'liberate' (whatever that meant) the Greek cities of Asia Minor. In other words, a panhellenic mandate. After he had fulfilled it, people quite rightly would have expected him to return home. People were wrong: the king would soon disregard the prime directive for personal reasons, causing discontent amongst the army with him and also, even more ominously, with his countrymen back home. We have a fair amount of information for events in mainland Greece, especially Athens, during the reign of Alexander, however events in Macedon in this period are undocumented and largely unknown. We certainly cannot say that there was a hiatus in Macedonian history, for Antipater kept Macedon powerful and united while Alexander was absent, so much so that there was economic growth, and education and military training, for example, remained at a high standard.[9] However, appearance is not likely to reflect reality. Macedon in this period may well have been fraught with discontent, and it provides insights into the Macedonians' attitude to their king and he to them. At the same time a consideration of the Macedonian background also lends further weight to questioning the aptness of Alexander's title 'Great'. Alexander's military successes throughout his reign were spectacular to a very large degree -- and certainly manufactured by the king to be great (see below) -- and we should expect his people back home to feel proud of their king at the head of his panhellenic mission of punishment and liberation, and to proclaim his victories to all and sundry. His deeds and the geographical extent of his conquests were certainly known for we have references to them in contemporary Attic oratory.[10] However, the impression which strikes us about the Macedonians themselves is that Alexander was far from their idea of an ideal king. Why might they feel this way? In addressing this, we can begin with the vexed question of Macedonian manpower. Did Alexander's demands for reinforcements from the mainland seriously deplete the
fighting strength of the army under Antipater? Did he make these demands regardless of the pressure under which he was putting Antipater and without regard for the lives of his people and the security of his kingdom from external threat? And if so, how did the people feel and how did they react? I take as my example the abortive war of Agis III of 331. This is the only Greek attempt at the overthrow of the Macedonian hegemony which we know about from the time Alexander left for Persia until his death, and therefore it is significant. It is impossible to determine the fighting strength of Macedon at this time,[11] and Badian’s most recent discussion of this complex issue, which effectively rebuts the views of others, will no doubt be itself challenged at some point.[12] While Billows and Badian argue that the fighting strength of Macedon was never depleted to the extent that there was a serious manpower problem, numerical accuracy is not the issue here. It has to be said that Agis III had posed no small threat to Antipater, and that the latter’s forces were not at full strength (Diodorus 18.12.2 says that Antipater was short of ‘citizen soldiers’, i.e. Macedonians proper), and he had just sent 6,500 Macedonians to Alexander. Alexander had left Antipater with only 13,500 Macedonians (12,000 infantry and 1500 cavalry), and when the king needed reinforcements the first year he crossed into Asia he had had to resort to somewhat hastily-levied local troops (Arr. 1.24.2). In 332 Alexander needed more men (Diod. 17.49.1, Curt. 4.6.30), this time from the Greek mainland; in 331, 500 cavalry and 6000 infantry arrived after the battle of Gaugamela (Diod. 17.65.1, Curt. 5.1.40), and as late as 324 Antipater had orders to bring more men to him (Arr. 7.12.4). Antipater was never able to rebuild his manpower significantly. Even in the so-called Lamian War, which broke out on Alexander’s death and lasted about a year, he had only 600 cavalry and 13,000 infantry and was forced to recruit soldiers from elsewhere -- and we know what a detrimental impact on his forces the desertion of the 2,000 strong contingent of Thessalian cavalry was and how Antipater only just managed to struggle to Lamia for refuge (Diod. 18.12.3-4). Moreover, it was only the timely arrivals of Leonnatus and then Craterus with several thousand Macedonian veterans that saved the day. Agis III had accepted ten ships and money from Persia to hire 8,000 mercenaries (Diod. 17.48.1, Curt. 4.1.39), with which he occupied Crete, and so in late 331 Sparta was able to mobilise a fairly formidable force. Then in the same year Memnon, the general of Thrace, and in command of a powerful army (Diod. 17.62.5), leagued with some Thracians and rose in revolt, thereby stretching Antipater’s own army further. Antipater had to lead all his army into Thrace to put down this rising (Diod. 17.62.6). This episode shows not only the ever-present danger of external threats to the kingdom’s security but also the need for an adequate army -- something denied to Antipater. Although Antipater dealt with Memnon and with Agis successfully, his manpower reserve had been depleted since he had need of a large sum from Alexander (Arr. 3.16.10) to boost his small force of 1500 cavalry and 12,000 infantry (Diod. 17.17.5), and we later find -- in 325 -- Memnon leading 5,000 Thracian cavalry to Alexander in Asia since Macedon could not then have raised such a large force of cavalry. Alexander’s money on this occasion had helped to save the day, but money cannot be the answer to solving problems: the king should not have continued to demand troops which could, and did, weaken Antipater’s position. Take the Thracian discontent at this time, Agis’ insurrection, Peloponnesian stirrings, and throw in a potential revolt of the Greek states (as Agis must have intended) and we have a recipe for disaster.[13] These threats would not have been lost on the Macedonians, and we simply cannot imagine they would not have been worried by them. Perhaps Alexander relied too much on money buying his way out of trouble. Whilst he may be acclaimed for rewarding his men with high pay, various bonuses, remission of taxes in certain cases, cancellation of soldiers’ debts and various signs of royal favour (Arr. 1.16.5, 7.5.1-3, 12.1-2), the argument can be made that such measures were to ensure the loyalty of his men, especially as he pushed further eastwards after defeating the Persians so decisively. And the question is, what happened when money and favour were no longer enough, especially when we consider the ‘down side’ such as the huge numbers of casualties stemming from Alexander’s battles,[14] the numerous demands for reinforcements, and especially the forced settlement from Macedon and Greece to the newly-founded cities at the farthest ends of the world?[15] There was also the worrying news from those who did return home of Alexander’s drunken rages which resulted in
him killing -- either by his own hands or from false implication in conspiracies -- some of those close to him, his paranoia, his orientalism, and even his belief that he was divine as a son of Zeus. Another factor too is that his people back home did not know Alexander as a man and a king: he had only been home as king for about two years before he left his country, and he showed no signs of coming back until his men forced the issue with a mutiny (see below). Macedon needed a king, and Alexander was not there.

That Alexander's money and favour proved insufficient and discontent grew are proved by the two mutinies which he faced in 326 at the Hyphasis (Beas) river and in 324 at Opis (on the use of the term 'mutiny' see below). In 326 while at Taxila Alexander heard that the Indian prince Porus was defying him, and so marched to do battle at the Hydaspes river. He was successful, and Porus was defeated. Rather than return to Taxila to recuperate and more importantly sit out the monsoon weather, Alexander ordered his men to continue their advance into India. His pothos -- personal longing (note again the personal element) -- to conquer more territory was frustrated when his men mutinied at the Hyphasis river.[16] Perhaps more than just seventy days of marching endlessly through monsoon rains into more unknown territory was at the heart of the issue. After all, Curtius says (9.2.3) that King Aggrammes (sic) was reported to be waiting at the Delhi gap with a force which included 3,000 elephants. Curtius believed this was true, and we know that the Nanda kings of Magadha had a more powerful state than any of the ones Alexander tangled with so far. Thus, another battle loomed, one in which Alexander's men had no desire to participate, and they refused to follow him further. Alexander sulked in his tent like his Homeric hero Achilles for three days, but to no avail. His bluff was called and Coenus, representing the views of the men, prevailed. Alexander was forced to turn back, and by late September 326 he was once again at the Hydaspes. Coenus' defiance of Alexander earned him little in the way of reward as a few days after the Hyphasis mutiny he was found dead in suspicious circumstances (Arr. 6.2.1, Curt. 9.3.20). The coincidence is too much, and, as with others who flouted Alexander (see below), we can see the hand of a furious and spiteful king at work here. Although Alexander might try to disguise the lack of advance at the Hyphasis river as due to unfavourable omens (Arr. 5.3.6), no one would be unaware that the real reason was that the army en masse simply did not want to go further.[17] Again needless risk-taking followed: instead of retracing his steps he went for another route, through the Gedrosian desert.[18] Starvation, heat, little water, and flash flooding had their effects, and as the march continued the baggage animals had to be slaughtered for food (Arr. 6.25.2). Plutarch (Alexander 66.4-5) talks of the army reduced to a quarter of its original size; although this is over-exaggeration, there is no doubt that this march was a major logistical blunder on the part of Alexander, and that it unnecessarily cost many lives. A few years later in 324 Alexander was faced with another mutiny, this time at Opis, not far from Babylon. At Opis Alexander announced that his veteran soldiers and those injured were to be discharged and that he had ordered new blood from Macedon.[19] For some reason the older soldiers saw Alexander's move as tantamount to a rejection of them and of their capabilities, and the remaining soldiers had no wish to remain and fight with Persians and Iranians. For the second time in his reign Alexander was hit with a mutiny, this time over his orientalising policy. Once again, Alexander sulked in his tent for two days, and then he called his men's bluff by announcing that Macedonian military commands and titles were to be transferred to selected Persians. His men capitulated at once, and the clash was resolved with the famous banquet, in which Macedonian, Greek, Persian and Iranian sipped from the same cup and Alexander prayed for homonoia or concord (Arr. 7.11.9).[20] The term 'mutiny' for the army's resistance to Alexander on both occasions has lately been queried. For example, Bosworth has this to say on the Opis incident: 'This protest can hardly be dignified with the term mutiny that is universally applied to it. The troops confined themselves to verbal complaints, but they were contumacious and wounding.'[21] It is important to look beyond the immediate context of both 'protests' to their full implications. The degree to which the men mouthed insults at the king or criticised his behaviour and plans is irrelevant. The crucial point is that in both instances the army as a whole stood fast against the orders of Alexander. This
was outright rebellion against the king and commander; refusal to obey the orders of a superior in this manner is mutiny. The 326 incident ended only when Alexander agreed to his army's demands to turn back. Although Alexander's bluff was successful at Opis, it was only when he cunningly played on the racial tensions that his men capitulated. Until that time they had stood fast against him, and there is no indication of a change of mood until Alexander adopted the strategy he did. The Macedonians might well have needed Alexander in the far east (cf. Arr. 6.12.1-3), but this did not stop them from defying him when they felt the situation demanded it. Both incidents were quite simply mutinies, and as such votes of no confidence in Alexander as a military commander and as a king.[22] Alexander's generalship and actual military victories may be questioned in several key areas. For example, after the battle of Issus in 333 Darius fled towards Media, but Alexander pressed on to Egypt. He did not pursue Darius, as he surely ought to have done and thus consolidate his gains, especially when so far from home and with the mood of the locals so prone to fluctuation, but left him alone. He was more interested in what lay to the south: the riches of Babylon and then Susa, or as Arrian describes them (3.16.2) the 'prizes of the war'. However, a war can hardly be seen as won if the opposing king and commander remains at large and has the potential to regroup. Alexander's action was lucky for Darius, then, as he was able to regroup his forces and bring Alexander to battle again almost two years later, at Gaugamela (331). It was not lucky for Alexander, though, and especially so for those men on both sides who fell needlessly that day in yet another battle. We have also the various sieges which Alexander undertook and which were often lengthy, costly, and questionable. A case in point is that of Tyre in 332 as Alexander made his way to Egypt after his victory at Issus. In Phoenicia Byblos and Sidon surrendered to Alexander, as did the island town (as it was then) of Tyre until the king expressed his personal desire to sacrifice in the main temple there. Quite rightly considering his demand sacrilegious, the Tyrians resisted him and Alexander, his ego affronted and refusing to back down, laid siege to the town.[23] The siege itself lasted several months, cost the king a fortune in money and manpower, and resulted in the slaughter of the male Tyrians and the selling of the Tyrian women and children into slavery. There is no question that control of Tyre was essential since Alexander could not afford a revolt of the Phoenician cities, given their traditional rivalries, as he pushed on to Egypt. Nor indeed, if we believe his speech at Arrian 2.17, could he allow Tyre independence with the Persian navy a threat and the Phoenician fleet the strongest contingent in it. However, there was no guarantee that the destruction of Tyre would result in the Phoenician fleet surrendering to him as he only seems to have expected it would (Arr. 2.17.3). Moreover, laying siege to Tyre was not necessary: he could simply have left a garrison, for example, on the mainland opposite the town to keep it in check. Another option, given that the Tyrians had originally surrendered to him, would have been the diplomatic one: to recognise the impiety of his demand in their eyes and thus relinquish it, thereby continuing on his way speedily and with their goodwill. Ultimately no real gain came from his siege except to Alexander on a purely personal level again: his damaged ego had been repaired; the cost in time, manpower and reputation mattered little. Alexander’s great military victories over his Persian and Indian foes which have so long occupied a place in popular folklore and been much admired throughout the centuries are very likely to have been embellished and nothing like the popular conceptions of them. A case in point is the battle of Issus in 333. Darius threw victory away at that battle and he was, to put it bluntly, a mediocre commander -- the battle might have been very different if Alexander had faced a more competent commander such as Memnon, for example. Alexander was lucky, but this does not come in the 'official' account we have of the battle, probably since he told Callisthenes, the court historian, what to write about it. Luck again is the principal factor in Alexander’s victory at Granicus the previous year (334). His river crossing is commendable, no doubt against that, but against an outnumbered and hastily-levied Persian contingent, and with no Great King present in order to exhort and to lead the troops in person, it comes as no surprise that the Macedonians and their superbly drilled phalanx were victorious. Similarly embellished, perhaps distorted out of all proportion even, is the 'great' battle against Porus in India at the Hydaspes river in 326.[24] Alexander effected a brilliant river crossing against his Indian foe,
given the swelling of that river by the seasonal rains and melting of the snow in the Himalayas, but in reality the battle was over before it began. Porus was outnumbered and outclassed, and he and his army never stood a chance. However, we would never know this from our sources or indeed from the commemorative coinage which Alexander struck to mark his defeat of Porus, and which are pure propaganda to exaggerate that defeat.[25] The king’s own men would know. And word would filter through to the Macedonians back home. Alexander’s growing orientalism, as seen in his apparent integration of foreigners into his administration and army, was a cause of great discontent as the traditional Macedonian warrior-king transformed himself into something akin to a sultan. He began to change his appearance, preferring a mixture of Persian and Macedonian clothing, despite the obvious displeasure of his troops (Arr. 7.8.2), and he had also assumed the upright tiara, the symbol of Persian kingship (Arr. 4.7.4). Some saw the writing on the wall and duly pandered to the king. Thus, Peucetas, the Macedonian satrap of Persis, was well rewarded by the king for adopting Persian dress and learning the Persian language (Arr. 6.30.2-3). However, he was the only Macedonian to do so according to Arrian. Significant also was Alexander’s attempt to adopt the Persian custom of proskynesis -- genuflection -- at his court in Bactra in 327, and his expectation that his men would follow suit.[26] Proskynesis was a social act which had long been practised by the Persians and involved prostrating oneself before the person of the king in an act of subservience, and thereby accepting his lordship. The custom however was regarded as tantamount to worship and thus sacrilegious to the Greeks -- worship of a god or a dead hero was one thing, but worship of a person while still alive quite another. Callisthenes thwarted Alexander’s attempt (Arr. 4.10.5-12.1), something which the king never forgot and which would soon cost Callisthenes his life in sadistic circumstances (Arr. 4.14.1-3, Curt. 8.6.24). Why Alexander tried to introduce proskynesis is unknown. Perhaps he was simply attempting to create a form of social protocol common to Macedonians, Greeks and Persians. However, he would have been well aware of the religious connotations associated with the act and hence its implications for his own being. It was plain stupidity on his part if he thought his men would embrace the custom with relish, and his action clearly shows that he had lost touch with his army and the religious beliefs on which he had been raised. Evidence for this may be seen in the motives for the Pages’ Conspiracy, a serious attempt on Alexander’s life, which occurred not long after Alexander tried to enforce proskynesis on all. A more likely explanation for the attempt to introduce proskynesis is that Alexander now thought of himself as divine (cf. Arr. 4.9.9, Curt. 8.5.5), and thus proskynesis was a logical means of recognising his divine status in public by all men (see below). Indeed, Alexander’s belief that he was divine impacts adversely on any evaluation of him. History is riddled with megalomaniacs who along the way suffered from divine pretensions, and the epithet ‘Great’ is not attached to them. Regardless of whether his father Philip II was worshipped as a god on his death,[27] Alexander seems not to have been content with merely following in his footsteps but to believe in his own divine status while alive.[28] Alexander had visited the oracle of Zeus Ammon in the oasis at Siwah in the winter of 332, shortly after his entry into Egypt, and there he apparently received confirmation from the priests that he was a son of Zeus.[29] From that time onwards he openly called himself son of Zeus as opposed to descendant of Zeus. It is important to stress the distinction since he was technically a descendant of Zeus through Heracles. That sort of association the people would have accepted, but they baulked at Alexander at first setting himself up as a son of a god even though born from a mortal mother. Later, as his megalomania increased, he would believe he was divine while alive. Thus, during the Opis mutiny Arrian indicates that his men mocked their king’s association with Zeus Ammon (Arr. 7.8.3). This took place in 324, so obviously over the intervening years the situation had grown from bad to worse, with little or nothing on the part of Alexander to pour oil on troubled waters. If anything, Alexander ignored the displeasure of his men if his move to introduce proskynesis at his court in 327, as noted above, was meant to be a means of recognising his divinity. The setback here was soon forgotten as in 326 Alexander was again adamant about his divine status (Arr. 7.2.3). Moreover, Alexander did not restrict his superhuman status to the army with him; by 324 we know from our sources that the Greeks of the mainland were debating his
deification,[30] and that there was widespread resistance to it.[31] Evidently his divine status was a serious source of contention amongst his people back home and those with him, yet Alexander ignored it -- hardly the mark of a great king, commander and statesman intent on maintaining the loyalty of his troops and indeed of his people.

That Alexander’s money and favour proved insufficient and discontent grew are proved by the two mutinies which he faced in 326 at the Hyphasis (Beas) river and in 324 at Opis (on the use of the term 'mutiny' see below). In 326 while at Taxila Alexander heard that the Indian prince Porus was defying him, and so marched to do battle at the Hydaspes river. He was successful, and Porus was defeated. Rather than return to Taxila to recuperate and more importantly sit out the monsoon weather, Alexander ordered his men to continue their advance into India. His pothos -- personal longing (note again the personal element) -- to conquer more territory was frustrated when his men mutinied at the Hyphasis river.[16] Perhaps more than just seventy days of marching endlessly through monsoon rains into more unknown territory was at the heart of the issue. After all, Curtius says (9.2.3) that King Aggrammes (sic) was reported to be waiting at the Delhi gap with a force which included 3,000 elephants. Curtius believed this was true, and we know that the Nanda kings of Magadha had a more powerful state than any of the ones Alexander tangled with so far. Thus, another battle loomed, one in which Alexander’s men had no desire to participate, and they refused to follow him further. Alexander sulked in his tent like his Homeric hero Achilles for three days, but to no avail. His bluff was called and Coenus, representing the views of the men, prevailed. Alexander was forced to turn back, and by late September 326 he was once again at the Hydaspes. Coenus’ defiance of Alexander earned him little in the way of reward as a few days after the Hyphasis mutiny he was found dead in suspicious circumstances (Arr. 6.2.1, Curt. 9.3.20). The coincidence is too much, and, as with others who flouted Alexander (see below), we can see the hand of a furious and spiteful king at work here. Although Alexander might try to disguise the lack of advance at the Hyphasis river as due to unfavourable omens (Arr. 5.3.6), no one would be unaware that the real reason was that the army en masse simply did not want to go further.[17] Again needless risk-taking followed: instead of retracing his steps he went for another route, through the Gedrosian desert.[18] Starvation, heat, little water, and flash flooding had their effects, and as the march continued the baggage animals had to be slaughtered for food (Arr. 6.25.2). Plutarch (Alexander 66.4-5) talks of the army reduced to a quarter of its original size; although this is over-exaggeration, there is no doubt that this march was a major logistical blunder on the part of Alexander, and that it unnecessarily cost many lives. A few years later in 324 Alexander was faced with another mutiny, this time at Opis, not far from Babylon. At Opis Alexander announced that his veteran soldiers and those injured were to be discharged and that he had ordered new blood from Macedon.[19] For some reason the older soldiers saw Alexander’s move as tantamount to a rejection of them and of their capabilities, and the remaining soldiers had no wish to remain and fight with Persians and Iranians. For the second time in his reign Alexander was hit with a mutiny, this time over his orientalising policy. Once again, Alexander sulked in his tent for two days, and then he called his men’s bluff by announcing that Macedonian military commands and titles were to be transferred to selected Persians. His men capitulated at once, and the clash was resolved with the famous banquet, in which Macedonian, Greek, Persian and Iranian sipped from the same cup and Alexander prayed for homonoia or concord (Arr. 7.11.9).[20] The term 'mutiny' for the army’s resistance to Alexander on both occasions has lately been queried. For example, Bosworth has this to say on the Opis incident: 'This protest can hardly be dignified with the term mutiny that is universally applied to it. The troops confined themselves to verbal complaints, but they were contumacious and wounding.'[21] It is important to look beyond the immediate context of both 'protests' to their full implications. The degree to which the men mouthed insults at the king or criticised his behaviour and plans is irrelevant. The crucial point is that in both instances the army as a whole stood fast against the orders of Alexander. This was outright rebellion against the king and commander; refusal to obey the orders of a superior in this manner is mutiny. The 326 incident ended only when Alexander agreed to his army’s
demands to turn back. Although Alexander’s bluff was successful at Opis, it was only when he cunningly played on the racial tensions that his men capitulated. Until that time they had stood fast against him, and there is no indication of a change of mood until Alexander adopted the strategy he did. The Macedonians might well have needed Alexander in the far east (cf. Arr. 6.12.1-3), but this did not stop them from defying him when they felt the situation demanded it. Both incidents were quite simply mutinies, and as such votes of no confidence in Alexander as a military commander and as a king.[22] Alexander’s generalship and actual military victories may be questioned in several key areas. For example, after the battle of Issus in 333 Darius fled towards Media, but Alexander pressed on to Egypt. He did not pursue Darius, as he surely ought to have done and thus consolidate his gains, especially when so far from home and with the mood of the locals so prone to fluctuation, but left him alone. He was more interested in what lay to the south: the riches of Babylon and then Susa, or as Arrian describes them (3.16.2) the ‘prizes of the war’. However, a war can hardly be seen as won if the opposing king and commander remains at large and has the potential to regroup. Alexander’s action was lucky for Darius, then, as he was able to regroup his forces and bring Alexander to battle again almost two years later, at Gaugamela (331). It was not lucky for Alexander, though, and especially so for those men on both sides who fell needlessly that day in yet another battle. We have also the various sieges which Alexander undertook and which were often lengthy, costly, and questionable. A case in point is that of Tyre in 332 as Alexander made his way to Egypt after his victory at Issus. In Phoenicia Byblos and Sidon surrendered to Alexander, as did the island town (as it was then) of Tyre until the king expressed his personal desire to sacrifice in the main temple there. Quite rightly considering his demand sacrilegious, the Tyrians resisted him and Alexander, his ego affronted and refusing to back down, laid siege to the town.[23] The siege itself lasted several months, cost the king a fortune in money and manpower, and resulted in the slaughter of the male Tyrians and the selling of the Tyrian women and children into slavery. There is no question that control of Tyre was essential since Alexander could not afford a revolt of the Phoenician cities, given their traditional rivalries, as he pushed on to Egypt. Nor indeed, if we believe his speech at Arrian 2.17, could he allow Tyre independence with the Persian navy a threat and the Phoenician fleet the strongest contingent in it. However, there was no guarantee that the destruction of Tyre would result in the Phoenician fleet surrendering to him as he only seems to have expected it would (Arr. 2.17.3). Moreover, laying siege to Tyre was not necessary: he could simply have left a garrison, for example, on the mainland opposite the town to keep it in check. Another option, given that the Tyrians had originally surrendered to him, would have been the diplomatic one: to recognise the impiety of his demand in their eyes and thus relinquish it, thereby continuing on his way speedily and with their goodwill. Ultimately no real gain came from his siege except to Alexander on a purely personal level again: his damaged ego had been repaired; the cost in time, manpower and reputation mattered little. Alexander’s great military victories over his Persian and Indian foes which have so long occupied a place in popular folklore and been much admired throughout the centuries are very likely to have been embellished and nothing like the popular conceptions of them. A case in point is the battle of Issus in 333. Darius threw victory away at that battle and he was, to put it bluntly, a mediocre commander -- the battle might have been very different if Alexander had faced a more competent commander such as Memnon, for example. Alexander was lucky, but this does not come in the ‘official’ account we have of the battle, probably since he told Callisthenes, the court historian, what to write about it. Luck again is the principal factor in Alexander’s victory at Granicus the previous year (334). His river crossing is commendable, no doubt against that, but against an outnumbered and hastily-levied Persian contingent, and with no Great King present in order to exhort and to lead the troops in person, it comes as no surprise that the Macedonians and their superbly drilled phalanx were victorious. Similarly embellished, perhaps distorted out of all proportion even, is the ‘great’ battle against Porus in India at the Hydaspes river in 326.[24] Alexander effected a brilliant river crossing against his Indian foe, given the swelling of that river by the seasonal rains and melting of the snow in the Himalayas, but in reality the battle was over before it began. Porus was outnumbered and outclassed, and he and
his army never stood a chance. However, we would never know this from our sources or indeed from the commemorative coinage which Alexander struck to mark his defeat of Porus, and which are pure propaganda to exaggerate that defeat.[25] The king's own men would know. And word would filter through to the Macedonians back home. Alexander's growing orientalism, as seen in his apparent integration of foreigners into his administration and army, was a cause of great discontent as the traditional Macedonian warrior-king transformed himself into something akin to a sultan. He began to change his appearance, preferring a mixture of Persian and Macedonian clothing, despite the obvious displeasure of his troops (Arr. 7.8.2), and he had also assumed the upright tiara, the symbol of Persian kingship (Arr. 4.7.4). Some saw the writing on the wall and duly pandered to the king. Thus, Peucetias, the Macedonian satrap of Persis, was well rewarded by the king for adopting Persian dress and learning the Persian language (Arr. 6.30.2-3). However, he was the only Macedonian to do so according to Arrian. Significant also was Alexander's attempt to adopt the Persian custom of proskynesis -- genuflection -- at his court in Bactra in 327, and his expectation that his men would follow suit.[26] Proskynesis was a social act which had long been practised by the Persians and involved prostrating oneself before the person of the king in an act of subservience, and thereby accepting his lordship. The custom however was regarded as tantamount to worship and thus sacrilegious to the Greeks -- worship of a god or a dead hero was one thing, but worship of a person while still alive quite another. Callisthenes thwarted Alexander's attempt (Arr. 4.10.5-12.1), something which the king never forgot and which would soon cost Callisthenes his life in sadistic circumstances (Arr. 4.14.1-3, Curt. 8.6.24). Why Alexander tried to introduce proskynesis is unknown. Perhaps he was simply attempting to create a form of social protocol common to Macedonians, Greeks and Persians. However, he would have been well aware of the religious connotations associated with the act and hence its implications for his own being. It was plain stupidity on his part if he thought his men would embrace the custom with relish, and his action clearly shows that he had lost touch with his army and the religious beliefs on which he had been raised. Evidence for this may be seen in the motives for the Pages' Conspiracy, a serious attempt on Alexander's life, which occurred not long after Alexander tried to enforce proskynesis on all. A more likely explanation for the attempt to introduce proskynesis is that Alexander now thought of himself as divine (cf. Arr. 4.9.9, Curt. 8.5.5), and thus proskynesis was a logical means of recognising his divine status in public by all men (see below). Indeed, Alexander's belief that he was divine impacts adversely on any evaluation of him. History is riddled with megalomaniacs who along the way suffered from divine pretensions, and the epithet 'Great' is not attached to them. Regardless of whether his father Philip II was worshipped as a god on his death,[27] Alexander seems not to have been content with merely following in his footsteps but to believe in his own divine status while alive.[28] Alexander had visited the oracle of Zeus Ammon in the oasis at Siwah in the winter of 332, shortly after his entry into Egypt, and there he apparently received confirmation from the priests that he was a son of Zeus.[29] From that time onwards he openly called himself son of Zeus as opposed to descendant of Zeus. It is important to stress the distinction since he was technically a descendant of Zeus through Heracles. That sort of association the people would have accepted, but they baulked at Alexander at first setting himself up as a son of a god even though born from a mortal mother. Later, as his megalomania increased, he would believe he was divine while alive. Thus, during the Opis mutiny Arrian indicates that his men mocked their king's association with Zeus Ammon (Arr. 7.8.3). This took place in 324, so obviously over the intervening years the situation had grown from bad to worse, with little or nothing on the part of Alexander to pour oil on troubled waters. If anything, Alexander ignored the displeasure of his men if his move to introduce proskynesis at his court in 327, as noted above, was meant to be a means of recognising his divinity. The setback here was soon forgotten as in 326 Alexander was again adamant about his divine status (Arr. 7.2.3). Moreover, Alexander did not restrict his superhuman status to the army with him; by 324 we know from our sources that the Greeks of the mainland were debating his deification,[30] and that there was widespread resistance to it.[31] Evidently his divine status was a serious source of contention amongst his people back home and those with him, yet Alexander
ignored it -- hardly the mark of a great king, commander and statesman intent on maintaining the loyalty of his troops and indeed of his people.
Lesson #7
Course: CHW 3M
Topic/Unit: Alexander the Great/The Transition to Hellenistic Greece
Historical Thinking Concept: The Ethical Dimension

Overview: This lesson will deal with the ethics of Alexander the Great’s military actions and conquests and will explore the issues surrounding moral judgments of history and historical figures like Alexander. It is linked very closely to the discussion of the nature of greatness in the previous lesson on historical perspectives. As such, students can be encouraged to return to the resources from that lesson when necessary and make connections with this lesson's resources to expand their understanding and incorporate ethics in historical thinking.

Learning Goal: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the challenges involved in making ethical judgments about history by limiting the imposition of modern ethics on historical situations. They will consider historical context as well as implicit and explicit ethical stances found within historical narratives in both primary and modern secondary sources. They will also analyze the implications of history on the present while also recognizing the limitations of the lessons that can be learned from historical events.

Curriculum Expectations:

Primary Specific Expectation: describe the roles of selected individuals and groups in the process of change

Secondary Curriculum Expectations:
Methods of Historical Inquiry and Communication
• Overall Expectations:
  o Interpret and analyze information gathered through research, employing concepts and approaches appropriate to historical inquiry
• Specific Expectations:
  o Interpretation and analysis: analyze historical events and issues from the perspectives of different participants in those events and issues

Materials:
i. Primary Sources:
• “The Execution of Philotas”, illustration from The Deeds of Alexander the Great (1468 copy of the work by Quintus Curtius Rufus) (Appendix 7.1)
• Plutarch, Alexander (section on the suppression of the rebellion in Thebes) (Appendix 7.2)
ii. Secondary Source:
   • Video: “Alexander: Ancients Behaving Badly”,
     http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VswFl2uIpaY

iii. Prompts for Students
   • BLM 6.7 (Appendix 7.3)

Plan of Instruction:

Step 1: Warm up (5 minutes)
   • Ask students: What do you think of Alexander’s actions and character so far?
     o Ask them to refer to the portrait of Alexander that they have been completing in stages.
   • Are there any times that have been discussed where Alexander’s actions could be seen as questionable or immoral?

Step 2: Discussion (10-15 minutes)
   • Explanation and discussion of key terms:
     o Debt of memory – an obligation to remember
     o Ethical judgment – a decision about the ethics of an historical action
     o Historical consciousness – awareness of the links among the past, present and future that prepare one to negotiate the present
     o Reparation – making amends for a wrong done
     o Restitution – restoration or replacement of something taken away
   • Discuss: Why is it important that we learn about Alexander the Great, recognizing both his positive and negative actions?
     o Brainstorm: Why is this relevant today?

Step 3: Modeling (20 minutes)
Show image in Appendix 7.1 – “The Execution of Philotas”
   • As a class discuss, while modeling historical thinking concept:
     o What moral judgments do you initially make upon seeing the picture?
     o What is the historical context? Does your moral judgment of what is happening in the picture change? How and why?
       • *This miniature shows the execution of Philotas, one of the many military officers who plotted against Alexander the Great. A beheaded co-conspirator lies in front of him.*
     o Consider any presentism that may be taking place in our assessment of the morality of what is happening in the image? Was this standard practice

---

during the historical period in question?
  o After fairly assessing this event as depicted in the source, do we have any responsibility to remember this event or respond in any way?
  o How can this representation of punitive justice help us make informed judgments about contemporary issues? What are the limitations of this source for the purpose of informing contemporary thinking?

Step 4: Guided Practice (20 minutes)

Hand out – Plutarch, *Alexander* (section on the suppression of the rebellion in Thebes), (Appendix 7.2)
  • Have students read the passage in pairs or small groups.
  • Each group member must choose the specific action that they find the most unethical and share with the group
  • Each group will come to an agreement of a ranking for the unethical actions each student chose from least unethical to most unethical with rationale for their order. Encourage students to consider the historical context of each selection while attempting to rank them.
  • The groups will share their rankings with each other and the entire class will discuss the similarities and differences of each group’s choices.

Step 5: Movie (45 minutes)
  • Watch “Alexander: Ancients Behaving Badly”:
    http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VswFl2ulpaY

Step 6: Independent Activity (30-45 minutes)
BLM 6.7 (Appendix 7.3)
  • Students will follow the prompts to develop an idea for a memorial for any of the events studied surrounding Alexander the Great
    o They should be encouraged to choose from any of the resources previously used and to consider historical perspectives (i.e. the battle of Gaugamela from the Persian perspective) and the historical significance of the event they choose.
  • This activity can be extended by asking students to create a visual representation of their monument using any medium.

Step 7: Sharing (30 minutes)
  • Students will show their monument to the class and explain their rationale for choosing the event they are commemorating and why it is historically significant, as well as what perspective their memorial represents.

Assessment: Students will add to their portrait of Alexander and take a picture of this stage with their (or the teacher’s) phone or device.
Appendix 7.1:


This miniature shows the execution of Philotias, one of the many military officers who plotted against Alexander the Great. A beheaded co-conspirator lies in front of him.
Appendix 7.2: "Alexander by Plutarch." The Internet Classics Archive.

And hearing the Thebans were in revolt, and the Athenians in correspondence with them, he immediately marched through the pass of Thermopylae, saying that to Demosthenes, who had called him a child while he was in Illyria and in the country of the Triballians, and a youth when he was in Thessaly, he would appear a man before the walls of Athens.

When he came to Thebes, to show how willing he was to accept of their repentance for what was past, he only demanded of them Phoenix and Prothytes, the authors of the rebellion, and proclaimed a general pardon to those who would come over to him. But when the Thebans merely retorted by demanding Philotas and Antipater to be delivered into their hands, and by a proclamation on their part invited all who would assert the liberty of Greece to come over to them, he presently applied himself to make them feel the last extremities of war. The Thebans indeed defended themselves with a zeal and courage beyond their strength, being much outnumbered by their enemies. But when the Macedonian garrison sallied out upon them from the citadel, they were so hemmed in on all sides that the greater part of them fell in the battle; the city itself being taken by storm, was sacked and razed. Alexander’s hope being that so severe an example might terrify the rest of Greece into obedience, and also in order to gratify the hostility of his confederates, the Phocians and Plataeans. So that, except the priests, and some few who had heretofore been the friends and connections of the Macedonians, the family of the poet Pindar, and those who were known to have opposed the public vote for the war, all the rest, to the number of thirty thousand, were publicly sold for slaves; and it is computed that upwards of six thousand were put to the sword.
BLM 6.7 Create a Memorial

Step 1: Choose the subject and decide the purpose of the memorial
- Why is this person or event worth remembering?
- Which of the following purposes will your memorial serve?
  (1) change the way people usually think about the subject
  (2) suggest a lesson to be learned
  (3) fulfill a duty of memory
  (4) inspire action on a contemporary issue
  (5) any other purpose you can think of
- What would you like people to feel or think about when they see your memorial?
- Who will your audience be?
- What story do you want to tell?
- In what ways might your memorial upset some people or cause controversy?

Step 2: Design the memorial
- Where should your memorial be displayed?
- What materials should be used?
- What will the memorial look like?
- What words or quotations might be inscribed on it?
- What should it be called?
- How will the memorial convey your chosen message or lesson, if any?
- How will the design achieve your purpose?

Step 3: Create the memorial

Step 4: Plan the unveiling
- When will you display the memorial, and for how long?
- Who will be invited to your unveiling?
- What publicity will you seek, and why?
- What will people do at the unveiling?
- What ceremony will be appropriate?

Step 5: Reflection
- What has this project taught you about the role of history?
- Why are some memorials controversial?
8 Lessons – Lesson #8
Course: CHW 3M
Topic/Unit: Alexander the Great/The Transition to Hellenistic Greece
Conclusion

Overview:
Students will demonstrate their summative knowledge of the unit through presentation and visual representation. A quick summary of the unit will be done.

Plan

Presentations (20-40 minutes)

• Start with presentations. Everyone presents for 1-2 minutes about each element that they added to their « portrait » of Alexander. Portraits are handed in at the end of class.

• Once presentations of over, show « The Bust of Alexander » (appendix 8.1) on projector.

• Take out “TkWl” charts from intro lesson.

• Complete them.

• Vote on if class would still give Alexander the title of Great. Discuss why.

• Take out definition of Greatness. Allow students to propose changes to the definition/criteria. Apply this definition to other historical figures. (ie. Hitler, Jean d’arc, Caesar, Columbus, Atilla.”

Unit over.
Appendix 8.1