

The Sexuality of Alexander the Great: From Arrian to Oliver Stone

Maggie Jonsson

The subject of Alexander the Great's sexuality has been a debate among scholars for decades. The definition of sexuality has changed over the years, and therefore Alexander's sexuality has been viewed differently as history has progressed; the ancient texts look at sexuality in a different manner than modern scholars, and thus the homosexual aspect of Alexander's relationships is a modern focus. Examining Alexander's relationships both heterosexual and homosexual reveals much about the great hero's life. The notion of sexuality as a defining characteristic of an individual is also a new concept in historical study, and one that is particularly intriguing when applied to Alexander the Great because of the stigmas associated with homosexuality. There are issues that arise when examining any aspect of Alexander's life, due to the fact that no primary sources remain. Therefore, all the information obtained by modern scholars has to come from secondary and tertiary sources that may have had access to these initial sources. These sources, as well as modern historical and popular depictions, demonstrate that understandings of Alexander's sexuality have changed greatly over time, reflecting broader shifts in social attitudes about sex, manhood, and leadership.

The definition of homosexuality, and sexuality as a whole, has evolved over the course of human existence. For the ancient Greeks, it meant something entirely different than it does to our modern, Christian society. K. J. Dover defines homosexuality as "the disposition to seek sensory pleasure through bodily contact with persons of one's own sex in preference to contact with the other sex."¹ This basic definition sets up what homosexuality means to a modern audience, and therefore puts the remainder of his examination into context. Dover's evidence is derived from his examination of artwork and popular texts from the period. The way in which these relationships were represented in artwork and textual evidence suggests that it was a common enough occurrence, and not a source

of shame. One of the issues that surfaces when examining ancient Greek homosexual relationships is the language barrier; there is a distinction between the "active" or assertive, and the "passive" or receptive partners in a homosexual relationship. In many texts, the passive partner is called *país*, or "boy," a word that also is used in several other contexts. Dover, however, has adopted the term *erōmenos*, the masculine passive participle of *erōō*, which is "be in love with" or "have a passionate desire for" when describing a sexual relationship where the age of the passive partner is unknown. For the senior partner he has chosen *erastō*, which is "lover."² Assigning these words when describing relationships gives a model for historians to base their further observations and creates an easy-to-recognize system. Furthermore, in establishing the history of homosexuality in Greece, Dover asserts that homosexual "courting" dates back to Crete. There is a bronze plaque from approximately 620–625 B.C.E. that depicts a man carrying a bow facing a youth, firmly grasping his forearm, where the youth's genitals are exposed.³ Giving a time frame for the beginning of homosexual relationships lets the audience know that it is a practice that has existed for thousands of years.

The stigmas of homosexuality did not exist when Alexander the Great was alive for several reasons, the first of which is that homosexuality was not viewed as a defined sexual preference, and the second being that the odium of homosexuality is a modern invention that was born with the development of the Christian faith. As history progressed, church groups, particularly the Roman Catholic church, interpreted biblical texts to mean that any relation between a man and a man was sinful, and therefore not allowed. However, there is speculation that this attitude has evolved even with Christianity, according to historian John Boswell: "None of the philosophical traditions upon which Christianity is known to have drawn would necessarily precluded homosexual behavior as an option

for Christians.”⁴ The condemnation by the Christian faith toward homosexuality has developed as the faith progressed, and the word homosexual did not even exist in writing until the nineteenth century.⁵ Therefore, when Alexander the Great was alive there was no defined homosexuality and subsequently no widespread disapproval; the meanings of whatever homosexual relations he may have had have changed throughout history.

Alexander the Great’s sexual orientation was not even a factor when considering his persona until 1948 when English historian W. W. Tarn included an appendix called “Alexander’s Attitude to Sex” at the conclusion of his biography. Tarn was clearly uncomfortable with the discussion of sex at all, with his first sentence in the appendix being an apology for the necessity to write it. His attempt is to explain the various relationships that Alexander was a part of, as well as attempting to explain any criticism that came from historians regarding his sex life. He mentions two theories regarding Alexander’s attitudes towards women, one by Aristotle’s successor Theophrastus that, according to Tarn, was based on personal bias. As stated by Tarn, “he branded Alexander as a tyrant, but he did more than that; he suggested that the tyrant was something less than a man.” The second explanation he states is by a contemporary of Theophrastus, Dicaearchus, who said that Alexander was homosexual.⁶ This is the first mention of Alexander’s sexuality by a historian, and Tarn’s Victorian views are evident in his disagreement with the homosexual theory. He suggests that any reference to his homosexual relationships is a work of fiction, implying that the eunuch Bagoas was an invention on the part of Dicaearchus in order to back up his theory. Tarn makes a point to find evidence to deny every claim made by the Greek philosophers, stating, “There is then not one scrap of evidence for calling Alexander homosexual.”⁷ Tarn’s bias is evident; despite historical evidence he chooses not to acknowledge the possibility that Alexander could have been a homosexual. This is largely due to the period in which he lived and wrote; when Tarn lived there was no public acceptance for homosexuality and sexuality at all was not a matter for public discussion. As a result he does not like to focus on any aspect of Alexander’s sexuality.

It cannot be denied or ignored that Alexander had relationships with women, although when examining those relationships on a more in-depth level, the motive behind his unions appears to be political in nature. The first relationship of Alexander’s was with a woman named Barsine, the daughter of a Persian noble whom he met around 322 B.C.E.⁸ He never married Barsine, and according to Plutarch,

“nor did he know any other before marriage, except Barsine. This woman, memnon’s widow, was taken prisoner at Damascus.... Alexander determined (at Paermenio’s instigation, as Aristobulus says) to attach himself to a woman of such high birth and beauty.”⁹ Therefore Alexander did have a relationship with Barsine, though it was apparently only a sexual relationship, and it never amounted to much beyond that. Plutarch goes on to say, regarding Alexander’s attitude towards women: “But as for the other captive women, seeing that they were surpassingly stately and beautiful, he merely said jestingly that Persian women were torments to the eyes. And displaying in rivalry with their fair looks the beauty of his own sobriety, and self-control, he passed them by as though they were lifeless images for display.”¹⁰

The fact that Alexander is able to simply admire the beauty of women is not inherently a claim that his desire lies in homosexual relationships, but rather that he had no inherent interest in meaningless sexual relationships, regardless of the beauty of the women involved.

Tarn also makes mention of Alexander’s attitude regarding women, stating that “apart from his mother, he apparently never cared for any woman; he apparently never had a mistress, and his two marriages were mere affairs of policy.”¹¹ To say that Alexander never had a mistress, despite there being historical evidence that he did in fact have a sexual relationship with Barsine that never resulted in marriage takes away any sexual identity Alexander may have had, which is further evidence that Tarn’s bias is toward extramarital sexuality as a whole and not necessarily strictly homosexuality. Because Tarn was the first to write on any aspect of Alexander’s sexuality, his unfavorable attitude towards any form of sexual identity set forth a negative precedent for future historians who chose to reference his work.

The main female figure who is used to disprove claims of the ruler’s homosexuality is his wife Roxane. Plutarch says of the marriage, “his marriage to Roxane, whom he saw in her youthful beauty taking part in a dance at a banquet, was a love affair, and yet it was thought to harmonize well with the matters which he had in hand.”¹² If a historian chooses to focus on his reference to the marriage as a love affair, then it is understandable perhaps how it could be seen as a true love story. However, the end of the sentence is clear in stating it was convenient for the matters Alexander was currently involved in. Simply put, it was a marriage that solved some of Alexander’s political issues, not necessarily a passionate love story. In fact, Plutarch’s only other mention of Roxane

is to say she was with child after the death of Alexander. Her general absence from Plutarch's text suggests that she was not of much importance as a figure in the king's life. Arrian takes a similar approach, stating, "Alexander fell in love with her at sight; but captive though she was, he refused, for all his passion, to force her to his will, and condescended to marry her."¹³ While she is mentioned slightly more often in Arrian's text, the references are still minimal, and she is largely used as a reference when speaking of other characters. Therefore, from these two sources, though they passingly say that Alexander was madly in love with his wife, there is no real mention of her elsewhere. While this does not necessarily suggest homosexuality as the alternative, it does show that Alexander's relationship with his wife was in all likelihood not a great love affair, as some historians would suggest.

Despite the feelings of Tarn, there are historians who would suggest that Alexander did in fact have homosexual relationships. The individuals who are often referenced as his potential relationships are his childhood friend and future figure in his military Hephaestion, the eunuch Bagoas, and possibly Hector, son of Parmenion, although according to historian Daniel Ogden the evidence depends on interpretations of Curtius. An additional figure, Excipinus is also mentioned by Curtius, though again there is no evidence elsewhere to support this. The historical context comes from examination of Arrian, Plutarch, Curtius, The Greek Alexander Romance, Justin, and Aelian. However, as with all sources, the interpretation of these sources largely depends on the historian who is doing the analysis.

The information obtained from Curtius regarding both Excipinus is largely taken with a grain of salt by the academic community, due to it coming solely from Curtius. Curtius describes Excipinus in a way that makes him appear as an almost replacement to Hephaestion: "Excipinus [was] still quite young and beloved to Alexander because of the flower of his youth. Although he equaled Hephaestion in the beauty of his body, he was certainly not equal to him in manly charm."¹⁴ This is the only reference to Excipinus in any of the ancient texts, which does not suggest much reliability in these statements. Tarn approaches the subject, stating "In fact, [Curtius] alludes to homosexuality again in connection with a certain Excipinus, another invented character whose name is neither Greek nor any other known language."¹⁵ Tarn's obvious bias is again showing through at this point, although he is not the only historian to agree that there is not much contextual evidence for Excipinus.

The same is to be said regarding the case for Alexander's supposed sexual relationship with Hector. The suggestion

that Alexander was *erastō* to Hector is almost entirely derived from a singular passage of Curtius. In 332-1 B.C.E., Alexander was sailing the Nile when a young boy, Hector, "in the very flower of his youth and particularly dear to Alexander jumped on board a small boat with a view to catching up with him." However, Curtius's story goes on, he took more men on board than the boat could hold, and it therefore sank. Hector, along with all the others, struggled against the current for a time before making it to the shore, where he died due to sustained injuries. Alexander was supposedly struck with extreme grief for his loss and had a magnificent funeral for him once they had his body back.¹⁶ The fact that Curtius uses language such as "in the flower of his youth" and "particularly dear to Alexander" does suggest a sexual relationship, but because there is not much evidence elsewhere to support this theory, it is largely considered by historians to not be of much importance when regarding the sexuality of Alexander.

The relationship between Alexander and Hephaestion is complex. There is much conjecture amongst historians regarding the extent of the relationship. There are a number of textual sources that suggest that Hephaestion was the *erōmenos* of Alexander, including Arrian, Justin, Curtius, and Diodorus Siculus. Justin states that Hephaestion was "very dear to the king both because of his gifts of beauty and boyishness, and because of the services he did for him."¹⁷ This description does imply sexual favors, although it is not the only interpretation and could imply something else entirely. Historian Daniel Ogden states that "Alexander's relationship with Hephaestion, who, as we have seen, was his exact contemporary and reared alongside him, is likely to have fallen more particularly into the pattern of homosexual relationships between age-peers that are typical of the military elites."¹⁸ Ogden, a modern historian, acknowledges that there was likely a homosexual relationship between Alexander and Hephaestion although it was not necessarily what was implied by the ancient sources.

There are particular aspects of the relationship where the implications of a deeper bond are heavily suggested. One is the reaction of Alexander to the death of Hephaestion. There is general agreement by the remaining ancient sources that Alexander was immensely distraught at the loss of his friend. Arrian states that the accounts vary, but that "all writers have agreed that it was great, but personal prejudice, for or against both Hephaestion and Alexander himself, has coloured the accounts of how he expressed it."¹⁹ However, the accounts that remain all paint a relatively similar portrait of the grief of Alexander. Plutarch states that his "grief at this loss knew no

bounds.”²⁰ Furthermore, Arrian goes on to say that “that for two whole days after Hephasteion’s death Alexander tasted no food and paid no attention in any ways to his bodily needs, but lay on his bed now crying lamentably, now in the silence of grief.”²¹ This description is incredibly intense and certainly suggests a deeper connection. Alexander went to great trouble to have a funeral for Hephasteion, sparing no cost and even implementing funeral games where three thousand men partook in the events. While this does not explicitly state that there was a sexual relationship between Alexander and Hephasteion, it does imply that there was something more than just platonic friendship between the two men.

There is comparison of Alexander’s intense reaction to the death of his friend with the famed hero Achilles’ reaction to the death of Patroklos. Waldemar Heckel stated that “those who saw in Alexander’s grief an emulation of Achilles reported that he shaved the manes of his horses and his mules, tore down city walls, and lay upon the corpse of his Patrokolos, refusing food and water.”²² Additionally, various sources give the cost of the funeral pyre as great, Arrian saying that it was 10,000 talents or more.²³ These comparisons create an interesting parallel for modern historians: Achilles is not inherently recognized today for partaking in a homosexual relationship with Patrokolos, but there is undoubtedly textual evidence that could suggest that it was indeed a reality. By comparing Alexander to Achilles, this not only depicts him as more than human, a de facto demi-god, but also it compares his relationship with Hephasteion to one of the greatest legends in history. Achilles is the archetypal tragic hero, and adding the homosexual twist when applying the Achilles comparison to Alexander paints the hero in a new light for modern audiences, creating the image of a heroic gay figure who was able to hold a position of incredible power and authority.

The relationship between Alexander and Hephasteion has evolved as views on sexuality have changed over time, particularly in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, including in Oliver Stone’s 2004 film *Alexander*. The prototype for a great historical hero is to be masculine, strong in battle, stoic, and overtly heterosexual. However, Stone took that model and discarded it when creating his version of Alexander the Great. He chose instead to portray Alexander as an emotional “mama’s boy” whose sexuality is ambiguous at best. This model, according to Jerry B. Pierce, follows closer to the way in which the villains in other ancient films have been depicted; “therefore, while these films present traditional masculinity and heterosexuality as positive, heroic,

and admirable, *Alexander* inverts these traits, challenging the typical representation both sexually and emotionally.”²⁴ Stone was clearly challenging established social norms in portraying Alexander in any way other than the archetypal male. Despite the historical context for Stone’s depiction of Alexander, he failed to realize, as Pierce states, that the qualities he assigned Alexander “have long been considered cinematic tropes of villains and tyrants.”²⁵ Even though there were no overtly homosexual encounters between Alexander and Hephasteion in the film, the mere suggestion was enough to make Stone’s Alexander appear less the traditional hero and more an effeminate tyrant that a modern audience would have difficulty relating to.

The chief historical advisor on Stone’s film was historian Robin Lane Fox, whose views on Alexander’s sexuality are not ambiguous in the slightest. In his 1974 biography on Alexander, he writes, “Hephasteion was the man whom Alexander loved, and for the rest of their lives their relationship remained as intimate as it is now irrevocable: Alexander was only defeated once, the Cynic philosophers said long after his death, and that was by Hephasteion’s thighs.”²⁶ Lane Fox’s blatant views on Alexander the Great’s homosexuality directly affected the way in which he was interpreted in Stone’s film. Fox’s openly homosexual analysis of Alexander’s character in his biography was once marketed, according to Daniel Ogden, as “the dashing story of the spellbinding young gay who conquered the world.”²⁷ Stone’s *Alexander* was not always received well by the public, due in part to the effeminate way in which he was portrayed, and this is a direct result of Fox’s interpretation.

Stone’s *Alexander* has indeed taken quite a bit of heat from the public, partly because, as Jeanne Reames stated, “given such divergent—and often violently conflicting—attitudes towards the conqueror, it would be quite impossible to please everyone, and any perspective taken would be bound to elicit strong condemnation from some quarter.”²⁸ Simply put, Stone’s interpretation was bound to evoke negative responses from some group, which is typical of any film interpretation. However, one of the biggest criticisms (other than Colin Farrell’s abysmal acting) stems from the portrayal of Alexander’s sexuality, a reflection of the global level of discomfort that exists regarding homosexuality. As a result, there was probably no possible way for Stone to interpret Alexander based off Lane Fox’s guidance that would not cause an uproar from rightwing groups.

The other major figure that comes into play when considering the sexuality of Alexander is the Persian eunuch Bagoas. Tarn originally thought he was a fictional character

in later Greek tradition. However, other historians, such as E. Badain, argue for his existence based on the evidence from Curtius and Plutarch. Tarn's rejection of the mere idea of Bagoas is a result of his dismissal of the theory that Alexander could have been a homosexual; it was his belief that Bagoas was created as means to discredit Alexander by his political enemies. However, the evidence suggests that Bagoas was in fact a real person; as stated by Badain: "we have seen that in the two incidents reported by Curtius there is no good reason for doubting the existence of Bagoas and, on the whole, the part he is said to have played in important events."²⁹ Badain accepts Curtius as a source: while still acknowledging that while he may not have the most reliable historical reputation, Badain believes that there was no reason for the creation of this character, and therefore he must be accepted. Furthermore, as previously stated, Tarn cites the creation of Bagoas to Dicearchus, claiming that he created the character to generate the story of Alexander's homosexuality. Badain however approaches this question with a logical retort, stating: "It is hard to see how he could have lied: he had, after all, a considerable and serious reputation; and he lived at a time when Alexander was still a familiar figure. What would his readers among Alexander's veterans—what would the surviving Successor Kings themselves—have thought of one who not only invented an incident like the one we are considering, but stupidly made it up about a character whom both he and they knew to be imaginary?"³⁰ This question rejects Tarn's proposal and accepts that Bagoas was undoubtedly a real person who played at least some role in Alexander's life. It cannot be concluded on a concrete basis that Alexander and Bagoas were deeply in love, but he did play a part that would later famously be recreated by the author Mary Renault in her novel *The Persian Boy*, which is the most popular source to examine the relationship between Alexander and Bagoas.

In addition to her novels, Mary Renault also wrote a biography on Alexander the Great in which she explores his sexuality, including mentions of Bagoas. She states that he was a prize won by Alexander after the death of Darius: "He had been loved by Darius, and was soon to be loved by Alexander." This attachment seems to have been lifelong.³¹ Renault does not deny the existence of Bagoas, even going so far as to claim that Alexander would hold a lifelong attachment to him, which is more than most authors would suggest. She cites her sources as Curtius, Plutarch, Athenaeus, and "doubtfully from Arrian," and then states that Ptolemy would have been "likely to have blue-penciled Alexander's Persian boy than his own Athenian mistress; not because

he was a boy, a matter of indifference in the Greek world, but because he was a 'barbarian eunuch.'"³² Renault has contextual sources for her claims while also interjecting her own opinions regarding sexuality. Renault is an openly lesbian writer and tends to focus on the homosexual aspect of Alexander's life. Furthermore, this is the only work of nonfiction published by Renault, her primary style being novels. Keeping that in mind, despite this being a biography on Alexander, there is a clear bias on the part of the author.

Public reactions to claims of Alexander the Great's homosexuality certainly vary largely depending on a group's end goal. Daniel Ogden describes a scene in modern Thessalonki, Greece, in 2002 where a riot ensued because a historical symposium contained papers that delved into the questions regarding Alexander's sexuality. A police force of forty had to be implemented in order to protect the delegates.³³ The mere fact that a contemporary group more than 2300 years after Alexander's death formed to protest the mere idea that a figure who lived thousands of years ago could have been a homosexual puts into perspective the public view on homosexuality that still exists today. It is widely unacceptable for many people to believe that beloved historical figure could have been gay; to them, it is detracting from his masculinity and therefore makes him less of a hero and unworthy of the praise and respect he has maintained for generations. This general backlash regarding homosexuality is found across the globe. In the United States, a republican state senator William Sharer used Alexander the Great as a means of defending his anti-gay rights argument, stating on his website "Alexander may have engaged in homosexual activity but he *married* a woman."³⁴ To use Alexander as a figure for the continued denial of gay rights in the United States is further proof of the public's inability to accept that a popular public figure could have held a genuine interest in the opposite sex.

On the other side of the spectrum, there is a large portion of the population that chooses to support Alexander as a homosexual and looks to him as a hero for the gay population. A simple Google search of "Alexander the Great homosexuality" brings up hundreds of hits for websites with titles such as "gayheroes" and "homohistory." The fact that these sites exist at all, and in such numbers, shows that Alexander has become a leading figure for the gay community as a means of demonstrating that even a strong historical figure, in fact arguably the greatest conqueror of all time, was indeed homosexual. These sites attempt, as Daniel Ogden states, "to appropriate historical figures or find role models of gravitas."³⁵ Authors like Renault contribute to the

gay community's perception of Alexander through her series of novels in which she paints a passionate love story between Alexander and Bagoas. Oliver Stone's depiction of Alexander was praised by the gay community for being the first film adaptation to show the homosexual side of Alexander the Great, which is the very reason for much of the criticism it received. The gay community, like the anti-gay rights community, is going to support the websites, film adaptations, and biographical information that contribute to their causes.

Sexuality has become a defining characteristic in determining a person's character, which when applied to an ancient historical figure, does not make sense. To call Alexander the Great a homosexual is anachronistic, simply because the terminology did not exist when he was alive. Because of the progression of history, historical interpretations have evolved. This is inevitable with any historical figure, and with Alexander, the focus has been in recent years on his sexuality. The necessity to constantly define a person by their sexual preference is a modern invention, and one that detracts from the figure as a whole. While sexuality may be a part of who that person is, it does not make up the entirety of their character. With Alexander, it is particularly ridiculous to constantly view him through the lens of his mysterious sexuality; he lived in a period where that was simply not an issue, and to project modern stigmas onto his character makes no sense. Alexander the Great was without a doubt one of the strongest leaders to ever live, and although there is a plethora of negative qualities that he possessed, his sexual preference was not one of them.

Endnotes

- ¹ K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (New York: MJF Books, 1979), 1
- ² *Ibid.*, 16
- ³ *Ibid.*, 205
- ⁴ John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 128.
- ⁵ Gary Greenberg, "Gay by Choice? The Science of Sexual Identity," *Mother Jones*, August 26, 2007, 2.
- ⁶ W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1948), 319-20.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, 323.
- ⁸ Daniel Ogden, "Alexander's Sex Life," in *Alexander the Great: A New History*, ed. Waldemar Heckel and Lawrence A. Tritle (Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 205.
- ⁹ Plutarch, *Lives: Demosthenes and Cicero Alexander and Caesar*, trans. Bernadotte Perrin (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999), 285.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, xxi.
- ¹¹ Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, 123.
- ¹² Plutarch, *Lives*, xlvii.
- ¹³ Arrian, *The Campaigns of Alexander*, trans. Aubrey de Sélincourt (London: Penguin Books., 1971), 234.
- ¹⁴ Curtius, 7.9.19, in Daniel Ogden "Alexander's Sex Life," 211.
- ¹⁵ Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, 321.
- ¹⁶ Curtius 4.8.7-9 in Daniel Ogden, *Alexander the Great: Myth, Genesis, and Sexuality* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2011), 171.
- ¹⁷ Justin 12.12.11 in Ogden, *Myth, Genesis, and Sexuality*, 159.
- ¹⁸ Ogden, *Myth, Genesis, and Sexuality*, 166.
- ¹⁹ Arrian, *The Campaigns of Alexander*, 7.14.
- ²⁰ Plutarch, *Lives*, lxxii.
- ²¹ Arrian, *Campaigns*, 7.15.
- ²² Waldemar Heckel, *The Marshalls of Alexander's Empire* (London: Routledge, 1992), 89
- ²³ Arrian, *The Campaigns of Alexander*, 7.15.
- ²⁴ Jerry B. Pierce, "Oliver Stone's Unmanning of Alexander the Great" in *Screening Love and Sex in the Ancient World* ed. Monica S. Cyrino (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 128.
- ²⁵ Pierce, "Oliver Stone's Unmanning of Alexander the Great," 139.
- ²⁶ Robin Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great* (London: Allen Lane, 1973), 56.
- ²⁷ Ogden, "Alexander's Sex Life," 203.
- ²⁸ Jeanne Reames, "The Cult of Hephaestion," in *Responses to Oliver Stone's Alexander: Film, History, and Cultural Studies*, ed. Paul Cartledge and Fiona Rose Greenland (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2010), 184.
- ²⁹ E. Badain, "The Eunuch Bagoas," *Classical Quarterly* (New Series), 8 (November 1958), 150-51.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, 153.
- ³¹ Mary Renault, *The Nature of Alexander* (London: Allen Lane, Penguin Books Ltd., 1975), 136.
- ³² *Ibid.*, 136.
- ³³ Ogden, "Alexander's Sex Life," 203.
- ³⁴ William Sharer, "Why Marriage?," accessed August 23, 2013, williamsharer.com.
- ³⁵ Ogden, "Alexander's Sex Life," 203.

Bibliography

- Arrian. *The Campaigns of Alexander*. Translated by Aubrey de Sélincourt. London: Penguin Books, 1971.
- Badain, E. "The Eunuch Bagoas." *Classical Quarterly* (New Series) 8 (November 1958).
- Boswell, John. *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Dover, K. J. *Greek Homosexuality*. New York: MJF Books, 1979.
- Fox, Lane Robin. *Alexander the Great*. London: Allen Lane, 1973.
- Greenberg, Gary. "Gay by Choice? The Science of Sexual Identity." *Mother Jones*, August 26, 2007.
- Heckel, Waldemar. *The Marshalls of Alexander's Empire*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Ogden, Daniel. "Alexander's Sex Life." In *Alexander the Great: A New History*, edited by Waldemar Heckel and Lawrence A. Tritle, 203–17. Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
- Ogden, Daniel. *Alexander the Great: Myth, Genesis, and Sexuality*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2011.
- Pierce, Jerry B. "Oliver Stone's Unmanning of Alexander the Great." In *Screening Love and Sex in the Ancient World*, edited by Monica S. Cyrino, 127–141. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Plutarch. *Lives: Demosthenes and Cicero Alexander and Caesar*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Reames, Jeanne. "The Cult of Hephaestion." In *Responses to Oliver Stone's Alexander: Film, History, and Cultural Studies*, edited by Paul Cartlidge and Fiona Rose Greenland, 183–219. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2010.
- Renault, Mary. *The Nature of Alexander*. London: Allen Lane, Penguin Books Ltd., 1975.
- Sharer, William. "Why Marriage?" August 23, 2013. Accessed December 17, 2013. williamsharer.com.
- Tarn, W. W. *Alexander the Great*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1948.