

Klaudia Oczachowska

University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn
ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6486-0574>

Beloved Hephaestion – detested Hephaestion*

Introduction

The primary difficulty in establishing relationships in a military camp is rivalry. The culmination of unfavorable external factors provokes the externalization of antipathies and intensifies antagonism. The army's hierarchical system promotes the maintenance of discipline. Yet in some cases, a strict hierarchical structure can fuel, rather than prevent disputes, as demonstrated by Alexander the Great's expedition that lasted nearly eleven years. In Alexander's army conflicts have arisen and they intensified in successive years of the military campaign¹. Changes in Alexander's policies and military reforms contributed to the formation of various groups and encouraged rivalry among individuals. Competition took on various forms, always seeking to win Alexander's approval².

In historical sources, Hephaestion, Alexander's friend, is described against the backdrop of these events. Ancient authors show Hephaestion from two perspectives during military campaigns, and in the context of political events and relations with the representatives of the elites. This article aims to reconstruct the image of Hephaestion that was established by the elites in Alexander's milieu, most of whom were members of the *hetairoi*³. Selected source texts describing the relationship between Hephaestion and elite group in Alexander's immediate environment were analyzed for this purpose. Most

* Translation services were co-financed by the Ministry of Education and Science pursuant to agreement No. RCN/SP/0245/2021/1 of 1 November 2022; value of the grant awarded as part of the „Development of scientific journals” program – PLN 80 000.

¹ R. Strootman, *Courts and elites in the Hellenistic empires. The Near East after the Achaemenids, c. 330 to 30 BCE*, Edinburgh 2014, p. 177, footnote 66.

² T.S. Brown, *Callisthenes and Alexander*, „The American Journal of Philology” 1949, No. 70, p. 235.

³ For more information about the terminology applicable to Alexander's milieu, refer to J. Roisman, *Alexander's friends*, [in:] *Affective relations and personal bonds in Hellenistic antiquity: studies in honor of Elizabeth D. Carney*, eds. E.M. Anson, M. D'Agostini, F. Pownall, Oxford 2021, pp. 166–169.

historical sources focus on events involving the Macedonian ruler, whereas Hephaestion and other participants were portrayed only as background figures. Disputes and conflicts were a part of daily routine⁴ and source materials describe conflict situations which accentuated Alexander's role. The portrayal of personal antipathies resulting from differences in political views and the participants' ancestry play a particularly important role in the undertaken analysis because they provide valuable information about Alexander's environment. Due to the army's hierarchical structure and status of various military units, references to selected military events have to be made to paint a broader picture of the problem. Although the assessment of military competences and responsibilities is not the subject of this study, it is nevertheless necessary to draw attention to the commanders' attitudes towards promotion in Alexander's military camp it is significant in view of the work's aim of attempting to reconstruct Hephaestion's image. According to the assumptions of the work, some events of a military nature will be merely hinted at.

The analyzed historical sources have a relatively complex internal structure. Most of them focus on Alexander, while events and circumstances that were unrelated to or had no influence on the Macedonian king were largely omitted. In view of the above, the task at hand becomes even more difficult. The attempts to reconstruct Hephaestion's image also relied on historical information about Craterus and Eumenes to examine the impact of military relations on the way Hephaestion was portrayed in his environment. The lack of information on Hephaestion's relationship with lower-ranking soldiers makes it much more difficult to objectively assess Hephaestion.

Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* constitutes the main source of knowledge about the discussed problem. *Life of Eumenes* provides valuable information about the causes of the conflict between Eumenes of Cardia and Hephaestion. *Life of Alexander* describes Philotas' trial and provides important clues about the motives of Macedonian elites. Quintus Curtius Rufus sheds light on the causes of internal conflict that affected personal relations among the elites. Some information about Hephaestion's attitude towards Alexander, his character traits and reputation can be also gleaned from Diodorus Siculus' works. Special attention was paid to Arrian's account which discusses Alexander's influence on Hephaestion.

While attempting to analyze Hephaestion's character through his relations with friends, it should also be noted that the authors of historical sources did not pass judgement on Hephaestion's actions and behaviors. Hephaestion was the most important figure for Alexander, and most sources make a reference to the Macedonian general in the context of his affiliation with the king, but none of these accounts provide specific infor-

⁴ Plutarch also reported on long-lasting animosities between Eumenes and Antipater, Plut. *Eum.* 5, Craterus and Perdikkas, Plut. *Eum.* 5, Eumenes and Neoptolemus, Plut. *Eum.* 7. These hostilities could be attributed to Eumenes' Greek ancestry, although there is no evidence to substantiate this claim – E. Anson, *Eumenes of Cardia Greek among Macedonians*, Leiden 2004, p. 191.

mation about his character traits. However, his opponents are depicted in a completely different manner⁵.

Conflict with Eumenes

According to Curtius, around 324 BCE, a dispute erupted between Hephaestion and Eumenes in Bagistan. Eumenes' slaves occupied an inn in Bagistan to accommodate Eumenes, but they were driven out by Hephaestion who wished to occupy the quarters for his aulos player⁶. Curtius does not mention how the dispute was resolved, but reports that another conflict soon broke out between Hephaestion and Eumenes. This time, the dispute was arbitrated by Alexander himself⁷. Alexander threatened to punish Hephaestion for his reluctance to come to an agreement⁸. According to Curtius, Eumenes was willing to reconcile, but his behavior should be regarded as an attempt to win Alexander's grace. Subsequent events seem to confirm this observation⁹. Shortly after Hephaestion's death, Alexander, in an act of despair, attempted to preserve the memory of his closest friend. Eumenes was aware that the recent confrontation could hinder his position, and he decided to assure the king of his affection for Hephaestion. To achieve this goal, he made generous offerings for the funeral ceremony and urged others to do the same¹⁰. The main purpose of this gesture was to please Alexander, rather than to show sincere grief¹¹.

Conflicts with Hephaestion did not serve to building a positive image in the eyes of the king. According to one account, Hephaestion put up his flute player in inn quarters that had been reserved for Eumenes by his servants. Eumenes complained to Alexander and remarked in anger that it would be better to give up military career and become a flutist. Alexander initially sympathized with Eumenes, but later concluded that such bold behavior towards the king could not be tolerated¹². Only closest friends of Alexander could express their feelings freely (Eumenes was not one of them)¹³. According to Curtius, Hephaestion was more privileged than other members of the elite in that he was allowed to criticize the king. Hephaestion had also the right of freedom of expression¹⁴. However,

⁵ According to Cornelius Nepos, Eumenes was more intelligent and cunning than any other member of the elite, *Nep. Eum.* 1. Craterus was held in high esteem by Alexander and high-ranking officers, *Plut. Alex.* 47; *Curt.* 6.28.

⁶ *Curt.* 10.13.

⁷ Disputes between military commanders posed a threat to Alexander's plans. The king assumed the role of an arbiter to pacify aggressive attitudes and prevent the opponents from becoming embroiled in a full-scale conflict – J. Roisman, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

⁸ *Curt.* 10.13.

⁹ Conflict with Antigonos after Alexander's death, *Diod.* 18.41.

¹⁰ *Curt.* 10.13.

¹¹ K. Nawotka, *Aleksander Wielki*, Wrocław 2004, p. 492.

¹² *Plut. Eum.* 2; J. Roisman, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

¹³ J. Roisman, *op. cit.*, p. 180; J. Rzepka, *Monarchia macedońska*, Grodzisk Mazowiecki 2006, pp. 45–46.

¹⁴ Olympias openly criticized Alexander's generosity in her correspondence, *Diod.* 17.114.

his remarks were always skillfully formulated to give the impression that he spoke only when encouraged by Alexander¹⁵.

Eumenes and Hephaestion also waged a dispute over a certain gift¹⁶, but detailed information about the source of this conflict cannot be found in ancient sources. Alexander's exceptional generosity, which, according to Olympias, it could bring him a downfall¹⁷, combined with the events presented by Plutarch and Harpalus' trial¹⁸, seem to confirm that the dispute between Eumenes and Hephaestion may have stemmed from financial issues. The increasing wealth of royal coffers resulting from successive military conquests gave rise to new financial claims.

According to Plutarch, Alexander held Eumenes in equally high esteem after the dispute with Hephaestion, but the king became more suspicious after his friend's death. Alexander reproached everyone for being jealous of Hephaestion and gaining satisfaction from his death. The king reminded Eumenes of past disputes and the insults he had directed toward Hephaestion. To appease the king, Eumenes provided Alexander with new ideas for honoring his friend's memory and promised to make a generous donation for the construction of a tomb¹⁹.

An important clue was provided by Plutarch who reported on a situation in which Alexander asked Eumenes for three hundred talents, but was offered only one hundred. Eumenes' lie was quickly exposed²⁰, which convinced Alexander that Eumenes could not be trusted²¹. Despite the above, they maintained good relations because the king considered Eumenes to be "useful"²². This event and the dispute with Hephaestion over a mysterious gift shed some light on Eumenes' character.

The root cause of the dispute between Eumenes and Hephaestion cannot be clearly identified due to a gap in Arrian's narrative. The beginning of the thirteenth chapter, where Hephaestion is persuaded to shake Eumenes' willingly given hand²³, suggests that the previous chapter may have contained a more extensive description of this conflict²⁴. According to Arrian, Hephaestion's reticence indicates that he was not interested in reaching an agreement, but the reasons for his reluctance are not explained. After Hephaestion's sudden death, Eumenes wanted to assure Alexander that he did not gain

¹⁵ Curt. 3.31.

¹⁶ Plut. *Eum.* 2.

¹⁷ Plut. *Alex.* 39.

¹⁸ Arr. *Anab.* 3.6; I. Worthington, *Aleksander Wielki*, Wrocław 2007, p. 97.

¹⁹ Plut. *Eum.* 2; E. Anson, op. cit., p. 47.

²⁰ Plut. *Eum.* 2; J. Roisman, op. cit., p. 181.

²¹ J. Roisman, op. cit., p. 180.

²² *Ibidem*, 181.

²³ Arr. *Anab.* 7.13.

²⁴ J. Wolski, [in:] Flawiusz Arrian, *Wyprawa Aleksandra Wielkiego*, transl. H. Gesztoft-Gasztold, ed. J. Wolski, Wrocław 1963, p. 196.

any satisfaction from his companion's demise²⁵. This ancient account clearly points to Arrian's bias in favor of Eumenes.

According to historical sources, the dispute between Hephaestion and Eumenes occurred around 324 BCE, although the conflict could have erupted earlier. Eumenes was placed under Hephaestion's command after the reorganization of the army. Eumenes had been the chief secretary since Philip's rule, and this reduction in rank came a serious personal blow²⁶. The military reform had been orchestrated by Alexander, but his subjects lacked the audacity to question his decisions. It is possible that Eumenes waged a dispute with Hephaestion to manifest his dissatisfaction²⁷. The described conflict was not a one-off event. Eumenes sincerely disliked Hephaestion²⁸, and this animosity was fueled by an overlap of personal and political antipathies²⁹, resulting from Hephaestion's promotion and Eumenes' decline in rank³⁰.

Craterus and Hephaestion – a difficult relationship

Literary account clearly indicate that the conflict between Craterus and Hephaestion was deeply rooted in jealousy and competition. However, none of the authors provide detailed information about the time when these animosities came to the surface. Craterus was jealous of Alexander's favoritism towards Hephaestion. The king's admiration was obvious, and one of his companions remarked that Alexander loved Hephaestion more than Craterus³¹. The reason for the above could be that Craterus loved the king, whereas Hephaestion loved Alexander³². According to J. Walsh, Craterus respected Alexander as a king and the monarchy as an institution. Hephaestion identified with and supported Alexander's policies. Hephaestion and Craterus became divided over ideology. Alexander was aware of these differences, and he entrusted each man with different tasks. Hephaestion was tasked with managing the conquered populations, whereas Craterus was placed in charge of Macedonian issues³³. Craterus had an easier task because he operated in an environment where he was respected and held in high esteem. In turn, Hephaestion's

²⁵ Arr. *Anab.* 7.14.

²⁶ If this assumption is correct, the vague powers vested in Olympias and Antipater posed a similar problem – E. Carney, *Women and basileia: legitimacy and female political action in Macedonia*, „The Classical Journal” 1995, No. 90, p. 377.

²⁷ J. Reames, *The cult of Hephaestion*, [in:] *Responses to Olivier Stone's "Alexander": film, history and cultural studies*, eds. P. Cartledge, F. Rose, Madison 2010, p. 205.

²⁸ E. Badian, *The administration of the Empire*, „Greece & Rome” 1965, No. 12, p. 176.

²⁹ E. Anson, op. cit., pp. 54–55; J. Roisman, op. cit., p. 181.

³⁰ J. Reames, op. cit., p. 205.

³¹ Diod. 17.114.

³² Plut. *Alex.* 47.

³³ J. Walsh, *The concept of dunasteia in Aristotle and the Macedonian monarchy*, „Acta Classica” 2014, No. 57, p. 179.

work required far greater diplomatic skills³⁴. Craterus was undeniably a more talented military strategist. At the time, combat skills were valued more than diplomatic or organizational abilities³⁵.

In some cases, the enmity between Hephaestion and Craterus turned into action. The conflict culminated during the campaign in India, and it nearly ended in a sword fight. Hephaestion's and Craterus' supporters drew their weapons, but the confrontation came to a stop when Alexander arrived at the scene³⁶. The fact that soldiers were willing to fight for Hephaestion shows that he was respected. The king publicly admonished Hephaestion and clearly push the message that he means nothing without Alexander³⁷. The main purpose of Alexander's reprimand was to accentuate his power over Hephaestion³⁸. However, this observation seems to be undermined by the events that took place after Hephaestion's death. The public rebuke was intended as a display of the king's objectivity and equal treatment of his companions.

Alexander also reprimanded Craterus in private³⁹. He assured the two men that he loved them both, ordered a truce, and, allegedly, Craterus and Hephaestion never quarreled again⁴⁰. To avoid any risks, the men were separated. Hephaestion was ordered to march on the east bank of the Indus, and Craterus – on the west bank of the river⁴¹.

Some contemporary researchers have emphasized that Hephaestion was strongly dependent on Alexander because his military skills were inadequate. They disregarded the fact that similarly to Hephaestion, Craterus owed his position to Alexander⁴². Antipater was replaced by Craterus as part of Alexander's strategy to curtail the influence of "old" commanders⁴³. In addition, Craterus did not support Alexander's policy, and its presence hindered the king to continue orientalizing policy.

Hephaestion's behaviour is harshly judged by historians, notably W. Heckel, who argued that Hephaestion's quarrelsome nature was the cause of his dispute with Craterus. It is said that Hephaestion had a pattern of high-conflict behavior and made many enemies. His friendship with Alexander gave him a sense of impunity and secured his position in the army, "but many of the *hetairoi* attributed his promotion to higher offices to Alexan-

³⁴ J. Reames, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

³⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 202.

³⁶ *Plut. Alex.* 47.

³⁷ *Ibidem*; J. Roisman, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

³⁸ J. Roisman, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

³⁹ *Plut. Alex.* 47.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*.

⁴¹ W. Heckel, *Who's who in the age of Alexander the Great*, Hoboken 2006, p. 135; P. Green, *Aleksander Wielki*, Warszawa 1978, p. 389.

⁴² See also: J. Guthrie, *Philia network in the Macedonian court and the long accession of Alexander the Great*, „*Karanos*” 2020, No. 3, p. 74.

⁴³ *Ibidem*.

der's personal favor rather than merit"⁴⁴. Alexander's friendship provided Hephaestion with an advantage over other commanders and an opportunity to explain and justify his behavior in private. According to Heckel, Hephaestion was directly responsible for the collapse of Craterus' authority after the incident in India⁴⁵. This "collapse" could be interpreted as Alexander's decision to separate Craterus from the army and prevent him from influencing his eastern policy.

The enigmatic correspondence between Hephaestion and Olympias, in which Hephaestion asserted that Alexander was the most important man in his life, sheds light on Hephaestion's hierarchy of values, as well as the fact that Hephaestion regarded his friendship with the Macedonian king as the most important relationship in his life⁴⁶. It suggests that Alexander and his policy could be the main cause of the conflict between Hephaestion and Craterus. Craterus' traditional values conflicted with Alexander's vision and Hephaestion's involvement in the implementation of these plans. Alexander chose Craterus and dispatched him to Greece to safeguard the royal image⁴⁷. Eumenes and Craterus were friends⁴⁸, but it is unlikely that this relationship had any bearing on the disputes waged with Hephaestion. The political situation and internal struggle after Alexander's death indicate that both men were guided solely by their own interests⁴⁹.

The Philotas conspiracy

The trial of Philotas, which involved several notable commanders (including Craterus and Hephaestion), sheds more light on personal relationships between high-ranking military officers. Mutual antipathies stemmed from immense rivalry which was allegedly provoked by Alexander himself⁵⁰. Fierce competition and constant struggle for the monarch's favor were commonplace⁵¹. A close relationship with the king provided commanders with an opportunity to advance in military rank and gain privilege⁵². Alexander's men shared common experiences, struggles, and a great sense of competitive pressure, which fueled mutual jealousy⁵³. Craterus disliked Philotas, which became evident al-

⁴⁴ W. Heckel, *The conquest of Alexander the Great*, Cambridge 2008, pp. 127–128.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 128.

⁴⁶ Diod. 17.114.

⁴⁷ I. Worthington, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

⁴⁸ *Nep. Eum.* 4; *Plut. Eum.* 5.

⁴⁹ Diod. 18.30.

⁵⁰ E. Badian, *Conspiracies*, [in:] *Alexander the Great in fact and fiction*, eds. A.B. Bosworth, E.J. Baynham, Oxford 2002, p. 64, footnote 25.

⁵¹ G. Weber, *The court of Alexander the Great*, [in:] *Alexander the Great. A new history*, eds. W. Heckel, L. Tritle, Oxford 2009, p. 87.

⁵² *Ibidem*, p. 88.

⁵³ G. Weber, *op. cit.*, pp. 91–92.

ready in Egypt, and the conflict mounted⁵⁴. Philotas' position in the army was the main reason behind hostile attitude towards Philotas⁵⁵. Hephaestion openly voiced his criticism of Philotas⁵⁶. Negative sentiment towards Parmenion's son led to collusion among top commanders who regarded him as an obstacle to their military careers⁵⁷. Craterus and Hephaestion played an important role in the Philotas affair, and Hephaestion derived greatest gain from the conspiracy.

Despite his virtues, Philotas was regarded as an arrogant and haughty man⁵⁸. However, it was his position in the army that attracted the greatest hostility⁵⁹. Having learned that Philotas was infatuated with Antigone and that he boasted and exalted his exploits, Craterus summoned Antigone and used all that he had heard against Philotas⁶⁰. Curtius emphasized Craterus' role in the affair. To eliminate his rival, Craterus delivered a speech in which he tried to persuade all gathered that Philotas was involved in conspiracy⁶¹. Eager to win the king's graces, Craterus and Hephaestion argued that Philotas should be tortured, and they conducted the interrogation⁶². Craterus and Hephaestion acted with the greatest cruelty⁶³. In addition to inflicting physical pain, Hephaestion ridiculed Philotas and belittled his accomplishments⁶⁴. Hephaestion, Craterus, and Coenus carried out the torture while Alexander stood behind a curtain. The following day, Alexander received the confession he had been expecting, but even then, the torture did not stop. The hatred these men felt towards Philotas was evident in their brutality. Philotas was unable to walk when he stood before the assembly and heard his death sentence⁶⁵. After his death, Alexander put Hephaestion and Cleitus the Black in charge of the cavalry⁶⁶. The king chose Hephaestion and Cleitus in an attempt to counterbalance opposing political forces⁶⁷. Cleitus was also promoted to dissipate hostilities after Parmenion's death⁶⁸.

⁵⁴ J. Guthrie, op. cit., p. 73.

⁵⁵ E. Baynham, *Alexander the Great: the unique history of Quintus Curtius*, Ann Arbor 1998, p. 131.

⁵⁶ W. Heckel, *Who's who...*, p. 133.

⁵⁷ W.L. Adams, *The episode of Philotas: an insight*, [in:] *Crossroads of history: the age of Alexander*, eds. W. Heckel, L.A. Tritle, Hoboken 2003, p. 120.

⁵⁸ Plut. *Alex.* 48.

⁵⁹ Curt. 6.29.

⁶⁰ Plut. *Alex.* 48.

⁶¹ Curt. 6.29.

⁶² Curt. 6.42.

⁶³ Curt. 6.29.

⁶⁴ Plut. *Alex.* 49.

⁶⁵ W. Heckel, *The conquest...*, p. 76.

⁶⁶ Arr. *Anab.* 3.27.

⁶⁷ I. Worthington, op. cit., p. 164.

⁶⁸ *Ibidem*.

Callisthenes affair

The last major event involving Hephaestion was a banquet during which Alexander attempted to introduce the ceremony of *proskynesis*. This event has been described in many historical sources, although the authors differed in their opinions regarding Hephaestion's role in the affair. Curtius Rufus and Justinus did not report on Hephaestion's presence at the banquet. Arrian asserted that Hephaestion's role was limited to a free conversation with Alexander⁶⁹. During the banquet, the philosopher declined to bow before the monarch, which displeased Alexander. According to Plutarch, Hephaestion claimed that Callisthenes had previously agreed to bow before the king⁷⁰. *Proskynesis* could not have been initiated by Alexander himself that is the reason Hephaestion participated in the attempts to implement the ceremony. Hephaestion played role a prime mover to implement the ritual, his task was to persuade and recruit men who were willing to prostrate themselves before the monarch, thus confirming public approval for the practice. Callisthenes' ostentatious refusal stifled the orchestrated attempt to unite the courts. To safeguard his interests, Hephaestion lied to Alexander that Callisthenes had agreed to humble himself before the king⁷¹. A. Collins points to Plutarch's account of the conversation between Hephaestion and Callisthenes during which the philosopher had allegedly consented to participate in *proskynesis*⁷². According to Collins, Hephaestion's involvement could be attributed to his role as chiliarch, an office that was modeled on the example of the Persian royal court⁷³ (Hephaestion was the first chiliarch appointed by Alexander⁷⁴). Hephaestion became Alexander's deputy and the second most important man in the empire⁷⁵. His duty was to popularize Persian customs. This was not an easy task, and it attracted criticism from senior commanders.

According to W. Heckel, Hephaestion's role in the attempts to introduce *proskynesis* was not obvious: "The setting for the *proskynesis* experiment was a drinking-party in Bactra, apparently restricted to a chosen group of *hetairoi* and members of the king's entourage. These had been instructed by Alexander's chamberlain and historian, Chares of Mitylene (who is believed to have organized the ceremony, perhaps in collusion with Hephaestion)"⁷⁶.

⁶⁹ Plut. *Alex.* 54; Arr. *Anab.* 4.12.

⁷⁰ Plut. *Alex.* 55; J. Roisman, op. cit., p. 189.

⁷¹ T.S. Brown, op. cit., p. 244; P. Cartledge, *Aleksander Wielki*, Warszawa 2005, p. 124.

⁷² Plut. *Alex.* 55.

⁷³ A. Collins, *Alexander and the Persian court chiliarchy*, „Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte” 2012, No. 61, p. 165.

⁷⁴ A. Meeus, *Some institutional problems concerning the succession to Alexander the Great: “Prostasia” and Chiliarchy*, „Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte” 2009, No. 58, p. 302.

⁷⁵ Ibidem, p. 306.

⁷⁶ W. Heckel, *The conquest...*, p. 109.

Hephaestion's loyalty to Alexander

Hephaestion's image is difficult to reconstruct because he was given command over few military projects, and his diplomatic abilities were marginalized⁷⁷ (Alexander put Hephaestion on a mission to choose the king of Sidon⁷⁸). It is possible that Hephaestion did not possess military talent. Hephaestion himself and other military officers were aware of these deficits⁷⁹. His promotion stirred considerable controversy among high-ranking commanders⁸⁰ because Hephaestion's promotion was attributed to his close friendship with the king⁸¹. This view is supported by some researchers⁸². According to P. Cartledge, Hephaestion's promotion was a reward for his loyalty to the king⁸³. However, it is highly unlikely that Alexander would entrust military missions to incompetent officers, even if they were his friends.

Hephaestion received many privileges and gifts from Alexander⁸⁴, which affected his image and reputation in the military. Alexander's unconstrained despair after his friend's untimely death gave credence to the speculations that Hephaestion was the king's favorite.

Conclusions

Primary sources from the ancient world indicate that personal relations in Alexander's court were often ephemeral. Strong rivalries and political differences stirred up dissension among military commanders and preclude lasting relationships. Craterus disliked Hephaestion because he was jealous of his close relationship with Alexander, and he was also averse to Philotas. The constant aspiring to win the king's respect accentuates the issue of priorities of relationships within Alexander's circle of commanders. Military commanders were ruthless in achieving a superior position, and they plotted elaborate intrigues to eliminate rivals. Hephaestion's involvement in the process of eradicating the opposition (the trial of Philotas, the Callisthenes affair) evoked distrust and fear among fellow commanders.

Hephaestion emerges as a rather negative character when he is portrayed from the perspective of Eumenes, Craterus. Hephaestion's boisterous nature becomes evident in his relationship with Eumenes. Hephaestion is portrayed quite differently in the context

⁷⁷ More about this: J. Reames, *op. cit.*, pp. 192–195.

⁷⁸ Diod. 17.47; R.L. Fox, *Alexander the Great*, London 2004, p. 180.

⁷⁹ W. Heckel, *The conquest...*, pp. 101–102.

⁸⁰ R.L. Fox, *op. cit.*, p. 291.

⁸¹ J. Reames, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

⁸² P. Green, *op. cit.*, p. 431.

⁸³ P. Cartledge, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

⁸⁴ Plut. *Alex.* 28; Diod. 17.114.

of his relationship with Alexander. Alexander's role as arbiter in conflicts involving Hephaestion accentuates the king's supremacy in all matters pertaining to his close friend. Hephaestion's public urging to make agreements seems to indicate that he was the main culprit. However, Alexander's suspicious attitude towards Eumenes after Hephaestion's death suggests that the former was not entirely free from blame.

Alexander clearly showed favoritism to Hephaestion by showering him with gifts, portraying his friend as a Homeric figure, and granting the right to freedom of expression to Hephaestion only, which was yet another major source of contention. Military commanders disliked Hephaestion because they feared that he could abuse the right to freely share his opinions with the king. Hephaestion was perceived as an ambiguous figure who enjoyed many privileges, but whose actions were limited by the king's will. Although Hephaestion's promotion was regarded as a sign of favoritism, its main purpose was to fulfill Alexander's political ambitions. Hephaestion's role was not limited to the military – he was a part of a larger political plan. Alexander bestowed the title of chiliarch on Hephaestion because he had confidence in his friend. This was not a popular decision, especially given Hephaestion's young age.

Craterus and Hephaestion became embroiled in mutual conflict for different reasons. The attitude of the Craterus was due to his ambition, he was hoping to secure a better position in the army. Hephaestion was driven to conflict for personal reasons. Mutual antipathies were so strong that they prevented both men from participating in joint military action. In turn, the nature of the dispute between Hephaestion and Eumenes continued to evolve. Initially, the conflict was purely personal, perhaps due to Eumenes' Greek ancestry. The events after Hephaestion's promotion suggests that the disagreement took on a political character as Hephaestion's powers were expanded and Eumenes' role was diminished.

References

Sources

Diodor Sycylijski, *Dzieje Aleksandra Macedońskiego*, ed. S. Dworacki, Poznań 2020.

Diodor Sycylijski, *Czas diadochów*, ed. S. Dworacki, Poznań 2020.

Flawiusz Arrian, *Wyprawa Aleksandra Wielkiego*, transl. H. Gesztoft-Gasztold, ed. J. Wolski, Wrocław 2004.

Korneliusz Nepos, *Żywoty wybitnych mężów*, transl. A. Mierzyński, Warszawa 1888.

Kwintus Kurcjusz Rufus, *Historia Aleksandra Wielkiego*, ed. L. Winniczuk, Warszawa 1976.

Plutarch, *Eumenes*, [in:] *Plutarch's Lives VIII: Sertorius and Eumenes, Phocion and Cato the Younger*, transl. B. Perrin, London 1959.

Plutarch z Cheronei, *Żywoty sławnych mężów*, transl. M. Brożek, vol. 1, Wrocław 2004.

Research articles and publications

- Adams W.L., *The episode of Philotas: an insight*, [in:] *Crossroads of history: the age of Alexander*, eds. W. Heckel, L.A. Tritle, Hoboken 2003.
- Anson E., *Eumenes of Cardia Greek among Macedonians*, Leiden 2004.
- Badian E., *Conspiracies*, [in:] *Alexander the Great in fact and fiction*, eds. A.B. Bosworth, E.J. Baynham, Oxford 2002.
- Badian E., *The administration of the Empire*, „Greece & Rome” 1965, No. 12.
- Baynham E., *Alexander the Great: the unique history of Quintus Curtius*, Ann Arbor 1998.
- Brown T.S., *Callisthenes and Alexander*, „The American Journal of Philology” 1949, No. 70.
- Carney E., *Women and basileia: legitimacy and female political action in Macedonia*, „The Classical Journal” 1995, No. 90.
- Cartledge P., *Aleksander Wielki*, Warszawa 2005.
- Collins A., *Alexander and the Persian court chiliarhy*, „Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte” 2012, No. 61.
- Green P., *Aleksander Wielki*, Warszawa 1978.
- Guthrie J., *Philia network in the Macedonian court and the long accession of Alexander the Great*, „Karanos” 2020, No. 3.
- Heckel W., *The conquest of Alexander the Great*, Cambridge 2008.
- Heckel W., *Who's who in the age of Alexander the Great*, Hoboken 2006.
- Meeus A., *Some institutional problems concerning the succession to Alexander the Great: “Prostasia” and Chiliarhy*, „Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte” 2009, No. 58.
- Nawotka K., *Aleksander Wielki*, Wrocław 2004.
- Reames J., *The cult of Hephaestion*, [in:] *Responses to Olivier Stone's “Alexander”: film, history and cultural studies*, eds. P. Cartledge, F. Rose, Madison 2010.
- Roisman J., *Alexander's friends*, [in:] *Affective relations and personal bonds in Hellenistic antiquity: studies in honor of Elizabeth D. Carney*, eds. E.M. Anson, M. D'Agostini, F. Pownall, Oxford 2021.
- Rzepka J., *Monarchia macedońska*, Grodzisk Mazowiecki 2006.
- Strootman R., *Courts and elites in the Hellenistic empires. The Near East after the Achaemenids, c. 330 to 30 BCE*, Edinburgh 2014.
- Walsh J., *The concept of dunasteia in Aristotle and the Macedonian monarchy*, „Acta Classica” 2014, No. 57.
- Weber G., *The court of Alexander the Great*, [in:] *Alexander the Great. A new history*, eds. W. Heckel, L. Tritle, Oxford 2009.
- Worthington I., *Aleksander Wielki*, Wrocław 2007.

Beloved Hephaestion – detested Hephaestion

Summary: The article discusses personal relations among high-ranking officers in Alexander the Great's army. The hierarchical structure of the military environment strongly influences the established relation-

ships. Mutual dependencies and factors that prevented the formation of collaborative relations in Alexander's camp were analyzed. The causes of the described conflicts were analyzed based on a review of historical sources and the literature. Selected texts referencing disputes in Alexander's army, with special emphasis on Hephaestion and other high-ranking officers, were examined. The analysis covered the period between 334 and 324 BCE.

Keywords: Hellenistic period, Hephaestion, Eumenes, Craterus

Hephaestion der Geliebte – Hephaestion der Gehasste

Zusammenfassung: Dieser Beitrag befasst sich mit dem Problem der Beziehungen im elitären Umfeld Alexanders des Großen. Die Funktionsweise eines Militärlagers ist durch bestimmte Merkmale gekennzeichnet, die den Aufbau von Beziehungen beeinflussen. Unter den analysierten Elementen wird das System der Abhängigkeiten hervorgehoben, Faktoren, die das Zusammenleben stören oder ein gemeinsames Funktionieren im Feldleben unmöglich machen. Die Analyse der Quellen und der Literatur zu diesem Thema hat zum Ziel, die Ursachen für das Auftreten von Konflikten aufzuzeigen. Zu diesem Zweck wurden ausgewählte Beispiele herangezogen, insbesondere der Fall Hephaestion und anderer Feldherren in hohen Ämtern. Der untersuchte Zeitraum umfasst die Jahre 334–324 v. Chr.

Schlüsselwörter: Hellenistische Zeit, Hephaestion, Eumenes, Krateros

Hefajstion ukochany – Hefajstion znienawdzony

Streszczenie: W niniejszej pracy poruszono problem relacji w środowisku elit Aleksandra Wielkiego. Sposób funkcjonowania w środowisku, jakim był obóz wojskowy, charakteryzował się pewnymi cechami wpływającymi na budowanie relacji. Wśród elementów poddanych analizie zwrócono uwagę na system zależności, czynniki zaburzające koegzystencję lub uniemożliwienie wspólnego funkcjonowania w polowym entourage. Implikacją analizy źródłowej i literatury przedmiotu jest przedstawianie podłoża występowania konfliktów. W tym celu posłużono się wybranymi egzemplifikacjami ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem przypadku Hefajstiona i innych dowódców zajmujących wysokie urzędy. Poddany badaniom okres przypada na lata 334–324 p.n.e.

Słowa kluczowe: okres hellenistyczny, Hefajstion, Eumenes, Krateros