



(ATINER)

The Athens Journal of History



(ATINER)

Volume 5, Issue 4, October 2019

Articles

Front Pages

CARL ANTON PAUL RUCK

[The Beast Initiate: The Lycanthropy of Heracles](#)

MICHAEL J. LANGFORD

[The Great Tew Circle, 1630-1639](#)

HARRY TOLLEY

[The End of the Satrapies: The Date of Alexander IV's Death](#)

ALI MOHAMMAD TARAFDARI

[Contemplation on Jurisprudence Principles and Necessities of Sheikh
Fazlollah Nouri's Legitimate Constitutional Theory](#)



**ATHENS INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATION AND
RESEARCH**

*A World Association of Academics and Researchers
8 Valaoritou Str., Kolonaki, 10671 Athens, Greece.*

Tel.: 210-36.34.210 Fax: 210-36.34.209

Email: info@atiner.gr URL: www.atiner.gr

Established in 1995



(ATINER)

(ATINER)

Mission

ATINER is a *World Non-Profit Association* of Academics and Researchers based in Athens. ATINER is an independent **Association** with a **Mission** to become a forum where Academics and Researchers from all over the world can meet in Athens, exchange ideas on their research and discuss future developments in their disciplines, **as well as engage with professionals from other fields**. Athens was chosen because of its long history of academic gatherings, which go back thousands of years to *Plato's Academy* and *Aristotle's Lyceum*. Both these historic places are within walking distance from ATINER's downtown offices. Since antiquity, Athens was an open city. In the words of Pericles, *Athens "...is open to the world, we never expel a foreigner from learning or seeing"*. ("Pericles' Funeral Oration", in Thucydides, *The History of the Peloponnesian War*). It is ATINER's **mission** to revive the glory of Ancient Athens by inviting the World Academic Community to the city, to learn from each other in an environment of freedom and respect for other people's opinions and beliefs. After all, the free expression of one's opinion formed the basis for the development of democracy, and Athens was its cradle. As it turned out, the Golden Age of Athens was in fact, the Golden Age of the Western Civilization. *Education* and *(Re)searching* for the 'truth' are the pillars of any free (democratic) society. This is the reason why *Education* and *Research* are the two core words in ATINER's name.

The Athens Journal of History

ISSN NUMBER: 2407-9677 - DOI: 10.30958/ajhis

Volume 5, Issue 4, October 2019

Download the entire issue ([PDF](#))

Front Pages i-viii

The Beast Initiate: The Lycanthropy of Heracles 225

Carl Anton Paul Ruck

The Great Tew Circle, 1630-1639 247

Michael J. Langford

The End of the Satrapies: The Date of Alexander IV's Death 259

Harry Tolley

Contemplation on Jurisprudence Principles and Necessities of Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri's Legitimate Constitutional Theory 279

Ali Mohammad Tarafdari

Athens Journal of History

Editorial and Reviewers' Board

Editors

- **Dr. Steven Oberhelman**, Vice President of International Programs, ATINER & Professor of Classics, Holder of the George Sumey Jr Endowed Professorship of Liberal Arts, and Associate Dean, Texas A&M University.

Editorial Board

- Dr. Nicholas Pappas, Vice President of Academic Membership, ATINER & Professor of History, Sam Houston University, USA.
- Dr. David Philip Wick, Director, Humanities & Education Division, ATINER & Professor of History, Gordon College, USA.
- Dr. Jayoung Che, Head, History Unit, ATINER & Deputy Director of Research, Korean Academy of Greek Studies, South Korea.
- Dr. Edward Anson, Academic Member, ATINER & Professor, University of Arkansas, USA.
- Dr. Romeo-Victor Ionescu, Academic Member, ATINER & Professor, Dunarea de Jos University, Romania.
- Dr. George Kaloudis, Academic Member, ATINER & Professor, Rivier College, USA.
- Dr. Sara Estrella Gil-Ramos, Academic Member, ATINER & Adjunct Professor, Art & History Department, New Jersey City University, USA.
- Dr. Michael Eisman, Academic Member, ATINER & Associate Professor, Temple University, USA.
- Dr. Margit Linder, Academic Member, ATINER & Assistant Professor, Department of Ancient History and Archaeology, University of Graz, Austria.
- Dr. Moshe Gat, Professor Emeritus, Bar Ilan University, Israel.

- **General Managing Editor of all ATINER's Publications:** Ms. Afrodete Papanikou
- **ICT Managing Editor of all ATINER's Publications:** Mr. Kostas Spyropoulos
- **Managing Editor of this Journal:** Ms. Despina Katzoli ([bio](#))

Reviewers' Board

[Click Here](#)

President's Message

All ATINER's publications including the e-journals are open access without any costs (submission, processing, publishing, open access paid by authors, open access paid by readers etc) and are independent of the presentations made at any of the many small events (conferences, symposiums, forums, colloquiums, courses, roundtable discussions) organized by ATINER throughout the year. The intellectual property rights of the submitted papers remain with the author.

Before you submit, please make sure your paper meets some [basic academic standards](#), which include proper English. Some articles will be selected from the numerous papers that have been presented at the various annual international academic conferences organized by the different [divisions and units](#) of the Athens Institute for Education and Research.

The plethora of papers presented every year will enable the editorial board of each journal to select the best ones, and in so doing, to produce a quality academic journal. In addition to papers presented, ATINER encourages the independent submission of papers to be evaluated for publication.

The current issue of the Athens Journal of History (AJHIS) is the fourth issue of the fifth volume (2019). The reader will notice some changes compared with the previous issues, which I hope is an improvement.

Gregory T. Papanikos, President
Athens Institute for Education and Research



Athens Institute for Education and Research

A World Association of Academics and Researchers

18th Annual International Conference on History & Archaeology: From Ancient to Modern, 1-4 June 2020, Athens, Greece

The [History Unit](#) of ATINER, will hold its **18th Annual International Conference on History & Archaeology: From Ancient to Modern, 1-4 June 2020, Athens, Greece** sponsored by the [Athens Journal of History](#). The aim of the conference is to bring together scholars and students of all areas of history, archaeology and other related disciplines. You may participate as a stream leader, presenter of one paper, chair of a session or observer. Please submit a proposal using the form available (<https://www.atiner.gr/2020/FORM-HIS.doc>).

Important Dates

- Abstract Submission: **28 November 2019**
- Acceptance of Abstract: 4 Weeks after Submission
- Submission of Paper: **4 May 2020**

Academic Members Responsible for the Conference

- Dr. Steven Oberhelman, Professor of Classics, Holder of the George Sumey Jr Endowed Professorship of Liberal Arts, and Associate Dean, Texas A&M University, USA, USA, Vice President of International Programs, ATINER and Editor of the Athens Journal of History.
- Dr. Nicholas Pappas, Vice President of Academic Membership, ATINER & Professor of History, Sam Houston University, USA.
- Dr. David Philip Wick, Director, Arts and Humanities Division & Professor of History, Gordon College, USA.
- Dr. Jayoung Che, Head, History Unit, ATINER & Deputy Director of Research, Korean Academy of Greek Studies, South Korea.
- Dr. Tatiana Tsakiropoulou-Summers, Director, Athens Center for Classical & Byzantine Studies (ACCBS) & Associate Professor, The University of Alabama, USA.

Social and Educational Program

The Social Program Emphasizes the Educational Aspect of the Academic Meetings of Atiner.

- Greek Night Entertainment (This is the official dinner of the conference)
- Athens Sightseeing: Old and New-An Educational Urban Walk
- Social Dinner
- Mycenae Visit
- Exploration of the Aegean Islands
- Delphi Visit
- Ancient Corinth and Cape Sounion

Conference Fees

Conference fees vary from 400€ to 2000€
Details can be found at: <https://www.atiner.gr/2019fees>



Athens Institute for Education and Research

*A World Association of Academics and
Researchers*

13th Annual International Conference on Literature 1-4 June 2020, Athens, Greece

The [Literature Unit](#) of ATINER is organizing its **13th Annual International Conference on Literature, 1-4 June 2020, Athens, Greece** sponsored by the [Athens Journal of Philology](#). The aim of the conference is to bring together academics and researchers from all areas of literature and other related disciplines. You may participate as stream leader, presenter of one paper, chair of a session or observer. Please submit a proposal using the form available (<https://www.atiner.gr/2020/FORM-LIT.doc>).

Important Dates

- Abstract Submission: **28 November 2019**
- Acceptance of Abstract: **4 Weeks after Submission**
- Submission of Paper: **4 May 2020**

Academic Member Responsible for the Conference

- **Dr. Stamos Metzidakis**, Head, [Literature Research Unit](#), ATINER & Emeritus Professor of French and Comparative Literature, Washington University in Saint Louis, USA.

Social and Educational Program

The Social Program Emphasizes the Educational Aspect of the Academic Meetings of Atiner.

- Greek Night Entertainment (This is the official dinner of the conference)
- Athens Sightseeing: Old and New-An Educational Urban Walk
- Social Dinner
- Mycenae Visit
- Exploration of the Aegean Islands
- Delphi Visit
- Ancient Corinth and Cape Sounion

More information can be found here: <https://www.atiner.gr/social-program>

Conference Fees

Conference fees vary from 400€ to 2000€

Details can be found at: <https://www.atiner.gr/2019fees>

The Beast Initiate: The Lycanthropy of Heracles

*By Carl Anton Paul Ruck**

The obscurantist Hellenistic poet Lycophron referenced the initiation of Heracles as a beast suckling the breast of the goddess Hera. This was the event that was the mythological origin of the Galaxy and of the lily flower that incarnated the same deifying essence as the celestial milk of the goddess and it was the etiology for the domestication of felines. As the Lion of Nemea, Heracles was the greatest of the wild cats. The lily was an analogue of a sacred mushroom, as the narkissos of Persephone's abduction by Hades. The event of the lactation of Heracles is depicted on four Etruscan mirrors and a Faliscan-Hellenic red-figure krater. The deifying milk-flower of the goddess was a ritual of adoption into the family of the celestial deities, that Hera performed also with two other bastard sons of Zeus, Hermes and Dionysus. As the beast being initiated, Heracles became a wolf. Like the motif of the domestication of the cat, the lycanthropy of Heracles involves the whole family of canines, from the domesticated dog to its wilder antecedents in the wolf and its analogue as the fox. The lycanthropy initiation is a bacchanalian rite of root-cutters and is a motif of warrior brotherhood widespread among the Indo-European peoples.

Milk-Flower

The etiological myth for the domestication of the cat is the tale of the metamorphosis of the handmaiden Galanthis, named as "Milk -flower," extant in various degrees of completeness in three ancient literary sources and depicted as the breastfeeding of Hercules on four Etruscan mirrors and a Faliscan- Hellenic red-figure krater, with significant variations that testify to an underlying theological complex implicating the lily as the milk-flower of the celestial Galaxy and an analogue of a psychoactive mushroom, bacchanalian root-cutting rituals, and the visionary sacrament of ancient Mystery religions.

Ovid narrated the event in the *Metamorphoses*.¹ Ovid's context for the tale is typically playful and ironic, the womanly chat of Alcmene with Iole, the pregnant wife of her grandson Hyllus. In the narration, Alcmene recalls her own pregnancy with the infant Heracles and hopes that Iole has an easier delivery.

When Alcmene was in labor, Hera (Juno), the wife of Zeus (Jupiter) had sent the goddess of childbirth to sit upon the altar beside the birthing chamber with her legs crossed and fingers interlocked to compress and seal the avenue of delivery. Galanthis, her slave girl of the common people (*media de plebe*), concerned for

*Professor of Classics, Boston University, USA.

1. Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 9. 273 *et seq.*

her mistress now suffering the seventh day of her agony played a trick. She rushed in and falsely proclaimed a successful delivery.²

Congratulate the mistress. Alcmene of Argos is delivered of her burden. She's the mother of a boy, the answer to her prayers.

The startled goddess deceived unclasped her legs, and the infant passed through.

Galanthis laughed at her clever trick and ridiculed the cheated goddess, angering her so that she grasped the poor maidservant by her blond-red hair and dragged her upon the ground, transforming her arms into forelegs. Ovid challenges his reader to know the manner of the metamorphosis, not naming the cat, but only saying that since she had aided the woman in parturition with her lying mouth, that's how she would give birth, through the mouth, and just as before she had come and gone from the house, that's how she would continue,³ indicating that she was henceforth a domesticated animal, a lowly commoner admitted into the house of her mistress. Delivery through the mouth or the word encodes the secret of a Mystery religion, and the clever Galanthis is comparable to the dwarfish Iambe-Baubo of Eleusis.

Several centuries later, the Greek grammarian Antoninus Liberalis offered a prose summary of the tale of the maidservant's metamorphosis. His version derived the tale from a lost verse epic, the *Heteroeumena* ("Metamorphoses, Changes") of the second-century BCE Hellenistic Greek Nicander, a hereditary priest of Apollo in the court of the kingdom of Pergamum, one of the inheritors of the conquest of Alexander the Great. Nicander's extant poems, the *Alexipharmaca* and the *Theriaca* indicate his vast knowledge of toxins derived from plant and animal sources, probably an expertise acquired from his training in priestly lore. The version summarized by Antoninus Liberalis (*Metamorphoses*, 29) is probably closer to Nicander than Ovid. The name of the maiden is Galinthias, a variant of the same Milk-flower, and she is not a commoner or slave girl, but Alcmene's childhood playmate and the daughter of the Theban Proetus, the legendary eponym of one of the city's famed seven gates. The Fates or Moerae who attended the forestalled birthing changed the girl into the cat, an animal that was thought to conceive via the ear (a detail not mentioned by Ovid) and deliver via the mouth. The goddess Hecate took pity of her and made her one of her sacred animals, along with the dog. Heracles when he grew to manhood dedicated a sanctuary to her at Thebes.

The obscurantist Hellenistic poet Lycophron referenced the initiation of Heracles as a beast suckling the breast of the goddess Hera (*thér mystes*):⁴

[Phemios' son, i.e. Theseus] went with the beast initiate who sucked the ample breast of the hostile goddess Tropaia ["who grants victory," Hera], [Theseus] who stole the menstrual belt....

2. Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 9.311-312.

3. Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 9.322-323.

4. Lycophron, *Alexandra*, 1327-1328.

Phemios as the father of Theseus is unattested elsewhere, but the twelfth-century Byzantine grammarian who wrote the *Suda* records that Phemios was the father of Aegeus and hence the grandfather of Theseus. Such is the erudite riddling obscurity of Lycophron's poem.

The first-second-century CE Greek Christian anti-Semitic epistle attributed to Barnabas, in listing animals taboo for eating, condemns the cat as hateful to the Lord for its manner of procreation, making the mouth, however, the organ of unlawful sexual congress, apparently a condemnation of oral sex.⁵ This confusion entered the medieval bestiary tradition, which makes either the ear or the mouth the equivalent of the vulva.⁶ This perverts the obvious symbolism of the tale, that the spoken word heard (ear) opens the way for delivery (mouth), the riddling formula for a mystical revelation or Mystery initiation.

Pausanias mentioned the sanctuary that Heracles dedicated in his description of the city in the second century CE.⁷ In view of the name of Milk-flower, it is significant that the females who were impeding the opening of the birth channel are not named as the goddess of birthing or her analogues, but, according to the local Theban tradition reported by Pausanias, they were a sisterhood of pharmaceutical sorceresses (Pharmacides) sent by Hera, and Galanthis/Galinthias may be one of them, since she is cited as a daughter of the legendary seer Tiresias, perhaps the spiritual daughter as an initiate, since her name is not cited as the Milk-flower Galanthis or Galinthias, but Historis, the "person who knows," cognate with "wisdom" and hence "witch." In the Greek language, wisdom etymologically results from the visionary experience of sight. Historis is the equivalent of a Spanish *sabia* and *curandera*, a shaman. The Theban sanctuary had a statue of her as Galanthis.⁸

Thus, the cat was personified as the sorceress Gale, a dealer in spells, whom Hecate metamorphosed into a cat.⁹ The "cat" (*galée, galé*) was named for its fondness for "milk" (*gála, gálaktos*, cognate with Latin *lac, lactis*). The cat, even in antiquity, was noted for the acuity of its vision, especially sight in the darkness of night, and for its lustful estrus. "Cat" was slang in Greek for a girl.¹⁰ As with the canines (dog, fox, and wolf), the felines (panther, leopard, and lion), are all versions of the various species of cat in mythical tradition, segregated merely into stages in the evolution from wild to potentially domesticated home pets or helpmates.

Both the dog and the cat were less tamed in Classical antiquity and not sentimentalized, but tolerated for their assistance, the dog as guardian and in hunting, herding, and warfare, and the cat as a predator on rodents and snakes. Isidore of Seville (seventh century CE) called it a "mouser" (*musio*) and derived

5. Epistle of Barnabas, 10.8.

6. Thirteenth-century *Aberdeen Bestiary*, folio 23v.

7. Pausanias, 9.11.3.

8. Maurizio Bettini, *Women and Weasels: Mythologies of Birth in Ancient Greece and Rome*, trans. Emlyn Eisenach (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013), 44.

9. Aelian (third century CE), *On the Nature of Animals*, 15.11.

10. Aristophanes, *Wasps*, 1185.

"cat" from *captus* ("caught") or *catus* ("acute" sight).¹¹ The cat was also called *ailouros* in Greek, of uncertain etymology, but plausibly, at least as folk etymology, derived from *aiolos* ("fast-moving, nimble") and *oura* ("tail").

The Greek cat was a *Mustelidae* (ferret, marten, or polecat, which includes also skunk, mink, etc.). The modern domesticated cat (*Felidae*) evolved from a Numidian breed, first appearing in the first century CE as *catta* and in Byzantine Greek in the fourth century as *katta*, replacing Latin *feles* (of uncertain etymology) in Europe by the eighth century, Modern Greek *gata*, derived from Berber *kaddiska*.

Herbalism

After Alcmena's delivery, the Milk-flower cat maiden as one of the sorceress sisters took the infant Heracles to Mount Cithaeron outside of Thebes and tricked Hera into nursing him. The sisterhoods of pharmaceutical herbalist Pharmacides were not unique to Thebes. The prototypic exemplar of the motif was the abduction of Persephone by Hades from a sisterhood of flower-gathering sea nymphs when she plucked the narcotic *nárkissos* bloom,¹² the etiological myth for the Eleusinian Mystery religion.¹³ These sorceress women were performing a Dionysian ritual. They were versions of the maenads or bacchantes. Among the metaphors that describe their ritual, the bacchantes impersonated wet nurses (*tithénai*) of the infant deity.¹⁴ The milk from their breasts, however, was not ordinary milk, but a divinizing potion.¹⁵

These metaphors represent the fantasies or ritual impersonations of root-cutters (*rhizótomoi*) or herb-gatherers. Thus, the emblem of their bacchanalian ritual was the thyrsus, the stalk of the giant fennel (*Ferula communis*), which was the symbolic container for the herbs gathered.¹⁶ It was also called the narthex, which has the obvious etymology (*narco-thex*) of a "narcotic repository." *Nárthex* was used as the title of various compendia of herbal medicines in antiquity.¹⁷

The thyrsus was a staff of altered mystical vision and emblematic of the psychoactive and magical herbs it contained. Prime among these were mushrooms, specifically, the psychoactive *Amanita muscaria* or fly agaric mushroom and related species so frequently involved in the folkloric traditions of later Europe. In common Latin culinary nomenclature, the stipe of the mushroom was called its thyrsus.¹⁸ Thus, the mushroom itself was the prototype of the herb gatherer's narthex, since the psychoactive toxins of the

11. Isidore of Seville, *Etymologies*, 12.2.38.

12. Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* (2).

13. R. Gordon Wasson, Albert Hofmann, and Carl A.P. Ruck, *The Road to Eleusis: Unveiling the Secret of the Mysteries* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1978), 85-136.

14. Homer, *Iliad*, 6.132.

15. Nonnus, *Dionysiaca*, 45.298-303: the milk is described as an "unfamiliar dew" (*anéthēs eérse*), something a three-year-old had never tasted from his mother.

16. Theophrastus, *Historia plantarum*, 9.16.2.

17. Galen, 12.398, 959; Aëtius, 8.45.

18. Apicius, *De re culinaria*, third-fourth-century CE Latin cookbook, 7.15.6.

Amanita species are confined mainly to the rind of its cap, which represents the magical plants gathered into its receptive stalk, botanically termed its stipe or trunk, hence metaphorically a tree. In depictions and literary descriptions of the narthex, these plucked herbs are represented as ivy, bryony (wild squirting cucumber), and smilax (bindweed, wild morning glory), all involved in traditions of mind-altering potential and as berried vines resembling the grapevine, but toxic in their natural state, whereas the leaves and berries of the grapevine are edible, but through the controlled fungal growth of fermentation capable of yielding a cultivated intoxicant, opposed to the natural toxicity of the wild vines.¹⁹ A Roman period Greek mythographer attributed the madness to their "grazing like animals" (*nemonto*, the equivalent of Latin *pascuntur*) on ivy, smilax, and laurel.²⁰

The plants atop the thyrsus can be replaced by a pinecone, an emblem of the god, but also suggestive of altered vision, since the pineal gland was so named for its resemblance to the pinecone and commonly considered the visionary organ of mystical transcendence.²¹

Origin of the Milky Way

As Hera suckled Heracles, he drank so voraciously that some of the milk scattered to the heavens, becoming the Milky Way or Galaxy. What fell to the earth sprouted as the lily (*leírion*). It can designate any of several species of herbaceous flowers which may or may not resemble the genus *Lilium* and which are not closely related to it or each other. In heraldry, it became the fleur-de-lis.

A gold signet ring from Cretan Isopata depicts a sisterhood of bare-breasted priestesses with the heads of bees, with the milk of their breasts flowing to the Galaxy, in a ritual of plant-gathering that accesses a visionary experience, as indicated by the single disembodied eye and the epiphany of a deity floating in the sky. The bee was thought to derive both the inspiring drink of honey and the toxins of its sting from the nectar of the flowers it visited. The toxins of serpents and plants were similarly analogous, the serpent acquiring its poison supposedly by ingesting toxic plants, and plants becoming poisonous by growing in proximity to serpents. In Euripides' *Bacchae* (405 BCE, performed posthumously), the maenads scratch the earth with their fingertips and milk flowed like a swarm of bees, while from the ivy leaves of the thyrsus dripped down streams of honey.

Four flowers in the depiction on the signet ring sprout from the ground, perhaps single lily blossoms, with extended stamens and pistil, the *nárkissos* of Persephone's abduction. A wavy line separating the priestesses from the goddess terminates in a celestial "heart-shaped" ampule or vessel, as container for the elixir

19. Carl A.P. Ruck, (ed.), *Dionysus in Thrace: Ancient Entheogenic Themes in the Mythology and Archaeology of Northern Greece, Bulgaria, and Turkey* (Berkeley: Regent Press, 2017).

20 Antoninus Liberalis, *Metamorphoses*, 10.

21. Galen, *De usu partium*, 8.14.

of the gathered plants or the lactation from their breasts. This may be the earliest proto-Greek depiction, dateable to the mid second millennium, of the conjunction of the lilies with the milk of the Galaxy. A second, shorter wavy line flows from the breast of the central female on the ring, who is dancing directly above the largest of the four lilies depicted, four being also the number of the females in the dancing group, apart from the epiphany of the much smaller female in the heavens, spatially balancing the disembodied eye.

Another account of the origin of the Galaxy claimed that the milk was Rhea's, the mother of Zeus. It flowed when she pressed to her breast the "stone" that she gave Cronus to eat, disguised in swaddling as her infant son. The flowing milk that nursed the stone was Rhea's ruse to prove the authenticity of the stone wrapped in swaddling as indeed the divine infant in disguise.

Ritual of Adoption

A similar tale of Hera's nursing of Heracles was told about Dionysus and Hermes, both like Heracles, deified bastard sons of Zeus. The suckling of these sons of Zeus represents an acknowledged ritual of adoption in Greek and Roman culture. Plutarch described it, as prescribed by the Delphic oracle, as the procedure required to reintegrate among the living a man presumed dead: he must put himself in the women's hands, be washed and wrapped in swaddling, and then suck the breast, in the same manner as when he was newly born. Thus, his identity among the living was reestablished by being born anew. Diodorus Siculus similarly described Hera's nursing as a mimesis of birthing her adopted son as an adult:

Hera lay upon a bed, and drawing Heracles close to her body then let him fall through her garments to the ground, imitating in this way the actual birth; and this ceremony is observed to this day by the barbarians whenever they wish to adopt a son.

It is still practiced today as validation of artificial kinship, with the adult nursed by the tribal matron as a baby.

In suckling someone else's nursling, Hera is enacting her ornithological analogue as the cuckoo bird, which she bore traditionally upon her scepter, or ornamenting her throne. The scepter could also have the lily flower as its finial, sometimes ornamented with a floral motif to indicate its botanical reference. The two emblems recall the episodes of Hera's adoptive divinizing role as wet nurse with the milk of the Galaxy. Cuckoos were recognized in antiquity as brood parasites, laying their eggs in the nest of another species, leaving the foster parents to hatch their young, which is the etymology of "cuckoldry."

The Lily-stone

The so-called Suckling Painter depicted Hera with an ample exposed breast nursing Heracles as an episode of herbalism with the lily equated to a "stone." The artist is named for the fourth-century lekythos vase from southern Italy, now in the collection of the British Museum. The vase probably survived intact because it was sequestered in a tomb, and it can be expected to represent a scene of cultic significance for the deceased.

Heracles is unmistakably not an infant, but an adolescent. This is true of all other surviving depictions of this episode. He is never an infant, but a pubescent youth. On the lekythos, Heracles is nude, except for bracelets, shoulder strap, and anklets. He is making direct eye contact with the goddess. In front of the nursing Hera stands Athena, identified by her aegis goatskin, which she is not wearing as usual as a shawl, but draped over her extended arm, holding in her hand a large flower that she has plucked. Athena holds the flower next to the suckling Heracles, equating the flower with the milk of the goddess, from which it presumably has sprouted and which she now has picked. It resembles the single trumpet-shaped blossom of a lily (*leírion*, *krínon*), as depicted on Minoan vases and frescos and the Isopatra ring.

Behind the seated Hera is the winged Iris, standing, the messenger goddess of the Olympians, probably signifying that this event fulfills the intention of Zeus. As messenger, Iris fulfills the same office as Hermes, but in her materialization as the rainbow, she visually signifies the linkage of the celestial and terrestrial realms. She holds a knobby staff, not a customary item of her iconography, but probably a depiction of the pruned olive club that will serve as the badge of Heracles' heroism, wielded in the labors that will win him admittance as a deity among the Olympian family. It is the traditional motif of the entheogen transmuted into the olive as the paramount triumph of cultivation. She is looking down at Heracles' mother Alcmene, who is seated and holding a victor's wreath. Above her is a window, recalling the deceptive visit to her bedchamber, in which Zeus had impersonated her husband Amphytrion. On the other side, behind Athena, is Aphrodite, seated high upon a rock and identified by jewelry and the mirror she holds. Below her is a myrtle tree, which was emblematic of the vulva. On a higher level appears Eros, wings spread and looking down at his mother, a wreath over his right shoulder, holding another wreath in his right hand and an embroidered *tainía* fillet or headband in his left. Like wreathes, the headband was an award of victory. A *tainía* was meant to be tied, and especially when wielded in the hand of Eros, it had erotic connotation of union, not only sexual, but metaphysical with a spiritual lover in another trans-dimensional realm.

In a scene depicted with such detail, with different types of footwear, jewelry and items of clothing distinguished by style and ornamented with fabric design, it would be remiss not to notice four round objects on the ground, which is where a plant, like the lily that Athena has picked, could be expected to appear. They are not lilies. They are spherical like stones.

Celestial Circlet

A late fourth-century BCE Etruscan mirror from Volterra depicts Uni (Hera/Juno, i.e. [Y]uni) suckling Hercle (Heracles).²² Like the lekythos vases, mirrors were tomb dedications. The Etruscan mirrors were expensive objects indicative of a woman's status in life, and beyond their use while living, they were placed in the tomb to transfer that status to the afterworld and often had depictions relevant to the preparation for immortality.²³

On the mirror, Heracles is seen not as an infant nor an adolescent, but as a muscular and bearded adult man, leaning on his club as he suckles upon the teat that a very beautiful Uni has exposed and holds for him. Uni sits on an elaborate throne, with footstool, suggesting that the locale is Olympus. The scene on the mirror is witnessed by Olympians (a nude Apollo / Apulu, identified by laurel chaplet and staff of branching laurel; two nude females, wearing elaborate necklaces; one, distinguished by the uncovered bridal veil, is probably Hebe ("Eternal Youth"), who will become Heracles' Olympian wife; and a very handsome and regally robed Zeus/Tinia (cognate with Zeus as Dios), identified by his scepter. It is a ritual of formal adoption into the celestial family, and labeled in Etruscan with a placard held by Tinia, that reads, perhaps: "This image shows how Hercle, Hera's son, drank milk," or something similar, since Etruscan is only partially decipherable.²⁴

A bald and bearded satyr with a bizarrely disjointed neck reclines above them. The satyr is using the saucer as a mirror for divination by lecanomancy (divination by inspection of a reflecting liquid in a "basin" *lekanê*), hence the presence of Apulu as prophetic deity, with the top of his psychoactive oracular laurel directly below the phiale libation saucer. A winged nude child on the handle of the mirror, wearing only a ring-circlet on a ribbon as necklace, is Epiur, holding an oval egg-like object in either hand as symbolic of rebirth or perhaps as *sortes* (lots) for divination. Epiur (Greek *epiourous*) was the guardian spirit of infants.

The figure of Tinia/Zeus on this mirror has sometimes been identified as Poseidon/Neptune based on his scepter, which could be interpreted as a trident, but the three tines of the fork are too small and the outer two are curled outward, making it not serviceable as a fishing prong. The central tine is flanked by two additional tines curled inward. The scepter's finial is clearly a stylized lily, with central pistil and surrounding stamens. Thus, perhaps we should interpret the winged child as holding "stones" instead of *sortes* and the circlet, worn as an ornament on his necklace, as emblematic of the circle formed by the Galaxy in the heavens.

22. Etruscan mirror, from Volterra, late fourth century BCE, Uni (Hera) nursing the grown Heracle, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Florence.

23. Nancy de Grummond, "The Etruscan Mirror," *Notes in the History of Art* 4, no. 2/3 (1985): 26-35.

24. Eca sren tva ichnac hercle unial clan thra sce.

Lycanthropy

A mirror from Tarquinia (*ca.* 300 BCE) depicts the scene of the suckling with the seated Uni attended by a woman standing behind and grasping her, who is perhaps supporting her as midwife, although Hercle is fully adult, but breadless, with a bizarrely drawn face, with what appears to be more like a snout than a nose, and supporting himself with his club.²⁵ This is a scene of adoption through mimetic birthing. The lower drapery of Uni's gown has been pulled up into her lap to suggest that Hercle has emerged from between her legs. Behind the midwife is a very tall flower, identifiable perhaps as the lily, complete with leaves, long stems, and two buds, very carefully drawn, although the figures of the personae are rather ineptly portrayed, especially the weird face of Hercle, who appears somewhat canine, making the presence of the carefully delineated lily more remarkable.

The winged female behind Hercle is perhaps Mean, Athena as the Victory goddess Nike, with proffered crown. Behind Hercle, directly beneath the proffered crown, is another circlet, much larger, like an oval shield, but it obviously belongs neither to Mean nor to Hercle, who traditionally doesn't wield a shield in his feats of heroism. The circlet apparently is being carried in the talons of a small bird, perhaps a dove, above it. The dove may identify the winged goddess not as Mean, but Turan, the Etruscan equivalent of Venus. Her name is pre-Hellenic, cognate with *tyrannos*, as "mistress," and may be the Etruscan word for "dove" or "swan." She was both mother and lover, and signified health and vitality, hence the equivalent of Hebe as Hercle's bride on the mirror from Volterra. Turan, like Hebe, is the Etruscan empowering female for the male's sovereignty.

The circlet, however, isn't an empty ring; it is filled with three lateral wavy lines that identify it as the Milky Way. The circlet of the Milky Way carried in the talons of the dove on the left balances the lily on the right and is intended to equate the two items, in accordance with the description of the Galaxy as a somewhat circular figure or "ring" among the constellations,²⁶ a "ring, although not perfect" (*deformatum*, "deformed"),²⁷ or as depicted on the Etruscan mirror, oval shaped.

The weirdly lycanthropic snout of Hercle may have been the intention of the artist. In the same manner, the uncharacteristic unmuscular body and arm of the hero and the canine leg and foot were probably intentional. Etruscan artists excelled in the depiction of humans, and mirrors were objects of considerable cost. Hercle, as the artist intended, is metamorphosing into a wolf, accessed via the deifying milk from Uni's breast and its equivalent, the oval circlet of the Galaxy borne in the talons of the empowering dove. This is the significance of Lycophron's riddling bizarre reference to Hercules in this episode as a theriomorphic "bestial initiate" (*ther mystes*).²⁸

The lycanthropy of Heracles is the major motif in Euripides' *Heracles* tragedy (*ca.* 416 BCE).²⁹ He has just fetched the infernal hound Cerberus from Hades. In

25. Tarquinia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Florence.

26. Pseudo-Hyginus, *Astronomica*, 2.43.

27. Pseudo-Hyginus, *Astronomica*, 2.43.

28. Lycophron, *Alexandra*, 1327-1328.

29. Carl A.P. Ruck, "Duality and the Madness of Herakles," *Arethusa* 9 (1973): 153-176.

his absence, the "Wolf" Lykos intends to kill Heracles' family. Hercules intervenes to rescue them, but at the critical moment, Lyssa, the goddess of madness, commanded by Hera, drives her pack of hounds against him, infecting him with the toxin of his own arrows, and he becomes mad. Thinking that he is performing one more of his heroic labors, in a delusion of altered consciousness, he murders his wife and children. He becomes the "Wolf." Lyssa, the agency for the delusion, is named as the "She-wolf," the personification of rabidity, the madness that regresses the domestication of the canines back to its lupine predecessor. She was costumed with a wolf headgear, the fox pelt headdress of the Thracian maenads. The toxin associated with Cerberus was *Aconitum lycoctonum*, commonly called wolfs-bane, a plant of the Delphinium family, of which all species are toxic. Heracles was costumed for the play with his traditional feline headgear, the Nemean lion-skin, and a verse in the text suggests that Lykos, like Lyssa, was costumed with a canine headdress.

The *Alexandra* was ascribed to the third-century BCE tragedian Lycophron, although perhaps falsely. Lycophron was his adopted name. It means "with the mind of a wolf," and it suggests that he had himself been a theriomorphic initiate into the lycanthropic Mysteries in Southern Italy, the home of his so-called adoptive father.

The lycanthropic metamorphosis would have special significance for the Etruscan/Romans. The mythical founders of Rome were sons of Mars, nursed as infants by a wolf,³⁰ which suggests the cult of warrior lycanthropy,³¹ although some accounts rationalized her as a woman, "wolf" (*lupa*) being slang for a prostitute.³²

Galaxy-stone

The word for "stone" (*lás, láos*) offers a traditional pun with the word for "people" (*laós*), documented as early as the Homeric tradition,³³ and demonstrated in the myth of Deucalion, who created people from the stones that were the bones of mother Earth.³⁴ These are the primordial creatures, the "stones" that sprouted as mushrooms after a fall of rain at Corinth.³⁵

Here, tradition says, that in earliest times, human bodies sprang from fungi swollen with rain.

30. The earliest account is Dionysius of Halicarnassus (first BCE), *Roman Antiquities*, 1.77-79, derived from the third-century BCE Quintus Fabius Pictor.

31. Kris Kershaw, *The One-eyed God: Odin and the (Indo-)Germanic Männerbünde*. (Washington, D.C.: Journal of Indo-European Studies, Monograph No. 36, 2000); Carl A.P. Ruck, "The Wolves of War: Evidence of an Ancient Cult of Warrior Lycanthropy," *Neuroquantology* 14, no. 3 (2016): 544-566.

32. Livy, 1.4.7.

33. Hesiod, *Catalogue of Women*, frag. 82 (Strabo, 7.322): "So out of stones moral men were made, and they were called people." Homer, *Iliad*, 24.611.

34. Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 1.393-394.

35. Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 7.392-393.

Theophrastus records that certain mushrooms sprouting near the sea petrify to stones with the heat of the sun.³⁶ "Stone" is a metaphor for mushroom as a folkloric motif, documented by a Byzantine commentator on the second-century BCE Nicander.³⁷

As something sacred, mushrooms have no name, only metaphors. The paucity of metaphors reflects a taboo against profane use, shrouding them with phobias of lethal toxicity. Thus, in English there are only four words for the mushroom. It can be called a fungus, which is safe because it is a foreign and quasi-scientific assimilation from Latin, but fungus itself is a metaphor, cognate with the Greek *spongios* for "sponge," descriptive of the mushroom's rapid fruiting, expanding as it absorbs the moisture of a rainfall. Transculturally, the genesis of mushrooms is attributed to the thunderbolt, encapsulating its celestial fire in the expanding wetness of matter.³⁸ The sponge itself is interchangeable with an aquatic rock. The blood from the decapitated head of the Gorgon Medusa fell to the ground as coral,³⁹ which was so named in Greek as the "little pubescent girl" (*korállion*), equating the blood with menses. It was pliant, but changed to the hardness of rock when submerged in water. Ovid's extended narration of the event indicates that his audience understood his mythological reference. Pliny called it the Gorgon-stone.⁴⁰ The Gorgon Medusa herself was a zoomorphism of the mushroom, as depicted on a fourth-century BCE Greek vase,⁴¹ and substantiated by the local mythological tradition that Pausanias records about Mycenae, whose name (*Mykenai*) was given the etymology of the "Mushroom-sisterhood" of the Gorgons.⁴² This is probably a verbal punning calque of its pre-Indo-European name as the Minoan sisterhood of the *Mekonai*, the sisterhood of the poppy flower.⁴³ The earliest record of the city's name as *m-w-k-i-n-u* (*Mukina*) occurs in an inscription from the mortuary tomb of Pharaoh Amenhotep III, the father of Akhenaten, at Kom el-Hettân (1349 BCE). The opium capsule is often depicted in Minoan iconography as a knob on a stem, resembling a mushroom. The capsule also resembles the pomegranate, which often has a prominent elongated calyx, and when inverted presents the likeness of a mushroom. The bloody matrix of the

36. Theophrastus, *Historia plantarum*, 4.7.2. John Marco Allegro, *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross: A Study of the Nature and Origins of Christianity within the Fertility Cults of the Ancient Near East* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd, 1970), chap. 6, footnote 13.

37. Scholia to Nicander, *Alexipharmaca*, 526. The note comments on Nicander: "For to different kinds of mushrooms different names have been assigned."

38. R. Gordon Wasson, Stella Kramrish, Jonathan Ott, and Carl A.P. Ruck *Persephone's Quest: Entheogens and the Origins of Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 83-94; Carl A.P. Ruck, "Mushroom Sacraments in the Cults of Early Europe," *NeuroQuantology* 14, no. 1 (2016): 68-93.

39. Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 4.735-752.

40. Pliny, *Natural History*, 37.56.

41. Fourth-century BCE amphora, Berlin, inv. no. F. 3022.

42. Pausanias, 2.16.3.

43. Ruck, *The Son Conceived in Drunkenness*, 140-141. Michael Ripinsky-Naxon, *The Nature of Shamanism: Substance and Function of a Religious Metaphor* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993), 159.

pomegranate (which was called *rhoie* or "flux") would suggest the menses of the coral, as well as any knob-shaped item,⁴⁴ like the *mykos*.

The mushroom in English can also be called champignon, which is similarly distanced as foreign, assimilated from the French and naming it simply as something native to the "fields" (*champs*), technically specific for the button mushroom (*Agaricus bisporus*) native to the grasslands, the commonly cultivated mushroom.

The term "toadstool" is a folkloric metaphor identifying it as a stool for a toad,⁴⁵ which is frequently associated with the mushroom because of its secretion of psychoactive bufotoxins like the psilocin of *Psilocybe* mushrooms. The toxin in the psychoactive *Amanita* is primarily muscimol (a GABA_A receptor), not the same as psilocybin (which is like LSD, mescaline, and DMT). The toadstool is specifically a toxic mushroom, but commonly applied to all fungi as loathsome and dangerous. In Elizabethan folklore, the toad absorbed its venom by lurking under so-called stones.⁴⁶ This is analogous to the ancient tradition that the toxin of serpents and plants as reciprocal, each deriving the toxin from the other. In French, the *Amanita muscaria* is specifically called *crapaudin*, from the "toad" (*crapaud*). The mushroom as a stool is transcultural, occurring in the effigy of the Aztec analogue of Dionysus as Xochipilli, seated upon a stool ornamented with glyphs for the psychoactive mushroom.⁴⁷

The scientific *myco*-prefix as in "mycology" is a Greek metaphor designating the mushroom as something mucous, repulsively slimy with bodily effluents like semen and menses.⁴⁸ The Greek *amanites*⁴⁹ (Modern Greek *manitari*, botanical Latin *amanita*) probably derives from the Egyptian *amentet* for the underworld, assimilated into Greek in the Ptolemaic period, and personified as the goddess Amentet, equated with the Greek Persephone.

The only common term as a mushroom is similarly a folkloric metaphor designating it as an onomatopoeic bovine zoomorphism, assimilated from the French *mousseron*, derived from Late Latin *mussare*, "to bellow or moo," cognate with Greek *muá-ein*. The same root is responsible for the Greek *muía* (diminutive *muíska*) and Latin *musca* for the fly as onomatopoeically "buzzing." Mushrooms bellowed as they fruited from the earth.⁵⁰ In the myth of Zeus and his courtship of the cow-maiden Io, the bellowing was the mooing of the cow in estrus, stung with the toxin of the cow-fly (*Tabanus bovinus*), which was called *oistros*, assimilated into English as estrus, the entomological ghostly metamorphosis of her former

44. Herodotus, 7.41.

45. Valentina Pavlovna Wasson and R. Gordon Wasson, *Mushrooms, Russia, and History* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1957), 65-91.

46. Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, act 4, scene 1, verse 6-8: Toad that under cold stone days and nights has thirty-one sweltered venom sleeping got.

47. R. Gordon Wasson, *The Wondrous Mushroom: Mycolatry in Mesoamerica* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980), 57-78.

48. Carl A.P. Ruck, "The Great God Sabazios and the Crab Dance in Athens," in *The Stone Mushrooms of Thrace* (Alexandroupoli: EKATAIOS, 2012), 193-220.

49. Nicander, frag. 79.

50. Aristias, (fifth-century BCE tragedian) frag. 6 (Nauck), probably from his *Perseus* tragedy; Ruck. *Dionysus in Thrace*, 49-51.

tender Argos, who wielded the cow-prod and whip of sexual arousal.⁵¹ The Latin version of the cow-prod is the *stimulus*, which Virgil employs in his description of Amata, the "beloved," whipped into estrus by the Fury Alecto with the toxins of Mycenae.⁵² The multiple eyes of the Argos Panoptes were placed in the tail of the peacock, whose feathered sexual display is triggered by the pheromone of its peahen, the iconic bird of Hera as wife of Zeus.⁵³ The multiple "eyes" of the herdsman and the stinging fly suggest the scabby white remnants of the shattered universal veil that adhere to the cap of the *Amanita muscaria* and related psychoactive species, an "eye" being an appropriate metaphor for a mushroom that affords access to visionary experience. The cow-maiden in estrus pursued by her herdsman fly is an expression of this mushroom's common association with the fly; hence its specific nomenclature as *muscaria*. Flies are attracted to this mushroom to lay their eggs in its cap, and within a few days, the mushroom is loathsome, crawling with larvae, but also emblematic of rebirth, since souls were commonly depicted as entomological manifestations, like bees and butterflies. Folkloric tradition equates all flying insects with the same symbolism.⁵⁴ The fly-agaric mushroom is naturally programmed with a scenario for initiatory rituals. It was commonly mixed with milk and employed as an insecticide attracting flies, who drowned in the galactic potion.⁵⁵ Hence its name in French as *tue-mouche*.

Perhaps no plant masquerades more easily as a stone than the fungi (which have no leaves, branches, roots, or flower), for which the name is "stone" in Hebrew (PTR). The evangelist Matthew's account of the ordination of Simon with the new name of Peter (Greek *pétros*, "stone," *pétra*, "topographical rock") as the rock entrusted with the keys of heaven⁵⁶ puns upon the mushroom. The ancient key was a knobbed bolt, presenting a likeness of a mushroom, opening the door to mystical experience.⁵⁷ The Jewish name Simon designates "someone who listens," a suspiciously too apt name for the first apostle. His role as "head," Cephas (Greek *képhas*, *kephalé*), further puns upon Aramaic *kepha* for "stone," and the anthropomorphism of the mushroom as a harvested head, like the Gorgon Medusa.⁵⁸ It should be remembered that the Gorgon head had the efficacy of petrification. The German *Pilz* for mushroom is derived from *Btilz*, an assimilation of the Latin *boletus* (Latin for "mushroom," cognate with Greek *bolítos*, a metaphor as "clod of earth, stone"), one of which *Pilze* is called *Steinpilz*, "stone-mushroom." The tradition of the "stone" as the substance from which the deifying elixir is prepared is the fundamental motif of alchemy, termed the philosophers' stone (*lapis philosophorum*), first mentioned by Zozimos of Egyptian Panopolis (ca. 300 CE). The "stone" was edible. Drinking the elixir accessed enlightenment,

51. Ruck, *Dionysus in Thrace*, 51-52.

52. Vergil, *Aeneid*, 7.346 et seq.

53. Carl A.P. Ruck, *The Great Gods of Samothrace and the Cult of the Little People* (Berkeley: Regent Press, 2017), 136 et seq.

54. Wasson and Wasson, *Mushrooms, Russia, and History*, 206.

55. Albertus Magnus (thirteenth century), *De veg etalibus*, 2.6.87. This is the first mention of the fly-agaric in Europe.

56. *Matthew*, 16.18.

57. Allegro, *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross*, 47 et seq.

58. Allegro, *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross*, 46-47.

gnosis, and the transcendent metamorphosis of the leaden soul to golden perfection.

Stones were thought to have magical powers. Gemology in antiquity was a compendium of traditional accounts, passed on without verification by each new author, and it often includes garbled information which derived from mythologized stones, which were not actual stones. The anonymous *Orphic Lithica* is a work of the fourth century CE. The narrative scenario that serves as introduction indicates that the compendium is Orphic. It records a tradition about a galaxy-stone, whose antiquity goes back to before the time of Pliny. It dissolves in the mouth, tastes like milk, and affects the mind, depriving it of memory, and comes from Egypt.⁵⁹ The *Orphic Lithica* lists the galaxy-stone as second in the hierarchy of magical gems, after only the crystal, which had pride of place for its ability to focus the rays of the sun and ignite fire. The galaxy-stone was filled with "divine milk" (*thespésios gála*) and had the property to alter even the mind of deity and bend it to one's will.⁶⁰ Some people called it *lethaíon*, because it induced amnesia in both men and gods. *Lethaíon* suggests the Fountain of Lethe or "Forgetfulness," a river in the netherworld, of which Orphic initiates were instructed not to drink, however burning the thirst of their soul for the wetness of incarnation. "Truth" was *a-letheía* or the negation of forgetfulness, remembrance, recognition, recollection of previous incarnations, gnosis, knowledge. In Virgil's description of the river Lethe, which the author of the *Lithica* would well have known, innumerable souls fly about like bees, filling the grove with buzzing, as they settle into white lilies, harvesting their nectar, waiting for reincarnation, drinking of the stream's milky juice of oblivion.⁶¹ The juice-nectar of the lily is confounded with the waters of the river and the simile of the bees presents the souls as the prototypic root-cutters.

The galaxy-stone was filled with ichor, the fluid that flowed instead of blood in the veins of the immortal deities, which you could milk from it, as if it had udders, yielding a fluid just like milk in every respect. The white scabs of the *Amanita muscaria* are fantasied as udders of a cow.⁶² The galaxy-stone is a version of the Zoroastrian Persian *haoma* sacrament, which the Greeks knew as [*h*]ómomi, and it was associated with lycanthropy.⁶³ Zoroaster was cited as the author of a compendium of gemology; several of the stones may masquerade as *haoma*. Pliny records one of these as much prized by the Magi, the *astriótes*, so named as a "star" apparently fallen from the Galaxy.⁶⁴ The Avestan *haoma* is cognate with the Vedic Soma potion which was considered milk from the udders of the Celestial Cow of the Galaxy, and it is always concocted with cow milk, to implant this metaphor of lactation. It was churned into existence from a cosmic

59. Pliny, *Natural History*, 37.56.

60. *Orphic Lithica*, 191-203.

61. Vergil, *Aeneid*, 6.705-715.

62. Peter Lamborn Wilson, *Ploughing the Clouds: The Search for Irish Soma* (San Francisco: City Lights, 1999), 31: "*Púca*" as a mushroom name also means "heifer's pouch" (udder).

63. Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, 46 (369d-f).

64. Pliny, *Natural History*, 37.45.

ocean of milk, the Galaxy. In the hagiographic biography of Zoroaster, his father mixed the *haoma* with milk and shared the drink with his wife to conceive the legendary eponymous founder of the lineage of astrological priestly prophets who perpetuated the title of Zoroaster or "star-gazer" and Magi. The probable date of Zoroaster is the mid second millennium BCE, but since it was a priestly title, he often is placed in the eighth century. Among the ethnically marginalized Yezidi, the *Amanita muscaria* is still employed today as *haoma* in the cult of Mithras.⁶⁵ The Hindu dietary prohibition against mushrooms was probably extended to include all bovines as taboo. The Buddha broke the taboo by consuming mushrooms in his last meal, prepared for him by a blacksmith, as he journeyed to the pre-appointed site of his Great Demise with his entourage of monks, who were forbidden to partake of the tabooed meal.⁶⁶ Surely, a blacksmith as implausible chef implies an alchemical diet.

The human breast itself could be likened to a spoked wheel, with the nipple as the axle or central hub.⁶⁷ The episode is a hallucinatory account of Zeus's insemination of Semele as a serpent, bellowing like a bull. The spoked wheel (Greek [*w*]/*ítus*) is a glyph for the mushroom, depicting the radiating underside of its gilled cap. It is the etymology for the "vine" (Latin *vitis*, as in "viticulture") and of "wine" (Greek [*w*]/*oínos*).⁶⁸ As an Indo-European word imported into vine-growing regions from their original northern homeland, where the climate is not suitable for the growing of grapes for fermentation, it must have been a word for their original "intoxicant," which was later applied for the intoxicant of wine as found in their new Mediterranean environment. This is an apt assimilation since the mushroom was termed a "fermentation of earth,"⁶⁹ and the fungal yeasts manipulated in the process of fermentation were a civilizing taming of the wild, uncultivable mushroom. A circle with a central dot is a glyph for the mushroom in indigenous Mesoamerican cultures, as is the "wheel," as a means of shamanic, whirling, dizzying transcendence or transport. The seer Ezekiel received his call to prophecy amid a thunderstorm with the mushrooms fruiting as the wheels of the mekabah chariot throne of Yahweh.⁷⁰

Soma/*haoma* is related etymologically to the Greek *hú-ein*, "rain," with the connotations of "squeezing" out the water or juice, cognate in English with "suck", as in suckling or the manipulation of the elongated teats of the udder of the celestial cow, analogous to the masturbation of the bull, with the male's seminal

65. Carl A.P. Ruck, Mark Alwin Hoffman, and José Alfredo González Celadrán, *Mushrooms, Myth, and Mithras: The Drug Cult that Civilized Europe* (San Francisco: City Lights, 2011), 235-238.

66. R. Gordon Wasson, "The Last Meal of the Buddha," in *Persephone's Quest*, 117-139.

67. Nonnus, *Dionysiaca*, 7.331.

68. Carl A.P. Ruck, "The Wild and the Cultivated: Wine in Euripides' *Bacchae*," in *Persephone's Quest*, 178-223. Pierre Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1968-2009), s.v. *oinos* and *botrys*. Hjalmar Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg Carl Winters, 1954-1970), s.v. *oinos* and *botrys*.

69. Nicander, *Alexipharmaca*, 521; cf. 525 with scholia.

70. *Ezekiel*, 1.1-28.

ejaculate analogous to milk.⁷¹ The nymphs of Nysa nursed the infant Dionysus with "the milky juice" (*glagóessan...ikmáda*) of their breasts,⁷² and they were transformed into the constellation of the Hyades,⁷³ not pressing their nipples to his mouth, but as droplets of rain falling from the Galaxy as the baby lay supine upon his back gazing up upon the stars. The Hyades were supposedly named for the "rain" (*hú-ein*), by the traditional etymology. By some accounts, the nursing occurred underground, with the infant hidden in a cave, a murky chamber, or a cellar.⁷⁴ This suggests the metaphor of a spongy fungus awaiting the rainfall for the incarnation of the celestial fiery spirit from the lightning's bolt that traditionally is the generative cause for the fruiting of the mushroom. It was this incarnation that allowed the bacchants to draw milk from clods of earth or from rock as from living breasts.⁷⁵

There was, however, another meaning to the name of the Hyades. The Hyades were also called *Suculae* or "suckling piglets" in Latin, which is the more plausible etymology for their Greek name, from *hys* for "pig."⁷⁶ The significance of the pig is its association with the Goddess, being an obscene metaphor for the female genitals,⁷⁷ suggested by the boar's arousal by the pheromone of a woman in estrus. Thus, the Gorgon Medusa had porcine attributes—the nose, ears, and tusks of a sow, and the sorceress Circe turned men into boars, for which the antidote was moly, or [*h*]ómomi.⁷⁸ As the *délphax*, the pig is named like the dolphin for the "womb," cognate with French *Dauphin*.

The Lily-mushroom of Ixion's Torment

An Etruscan mirror explicitly depicts the lily as an analogue of the mushroom. It portrays Ixion bound to the spoked solar wheel, flying in shamanic torment, with a bizarrely-drawn "flower" at his feet.⁷⁹ Again, in view of the beautifully exact engraving of the mirror's subject, the ineptness of the flower's depiction would have displeased the artist's patron, were it not intentional, like the lupine snout on the suckling Heracle. Cook, in his discussion of the mirror, dismissed the "flower"

71. Aristophanes, *Birds*, 1646: "I will make you king and feed you on phallic bird's milk."

72. Nonnus, *Dionysiaca*, 9.31.

73. Pseudo-Apollodorus, *Bibliothèque*, 3.4.3; Pherecydes, scholia to Homer, *Iliad*, 18.486; Pseudo-Hyginus, *Astronomica*, 2.21; Scholia to Germanicus, *Aratea*.

74. Homeric *Hymn to Dionysus* (26), 6: in a fragrant cave. Nonnus, *Dionysiaca*, 9.65: in a gloomy house. Nonnus, *Dionysiaca*, 14.151: in a dark cellar as the baby called daddy to the skies. Greek houses did not ordinarily have cellars.

75. Euripides, *Bacchae*, 708-710; Philostratus, *Elder*, *Imagines*, 1.14; Nonnus, *Dionysuaca*, 45.309-310.

76. This etymology accounts for the quantity of the upsilon as long, as in "pig." Ruck, *The Great Gods of Samothrace*, 394-395.

77. Aristophanes, *Acharnians*, 729-817; Henderson, *The Maculate Muse*, 132.

78. Ruck, *Dionysus in Thrace*, 140-141.

79. Ixion, bound to the spoked wheel, ca. 460-450 BCE, British Museum, inv. no. GR 1900 6-11.3.

as a meaningless design.⁸⁰ The left bottom of the mirror is lost, but presumably it would have had another version of the "flower," either identical or perhaps as a clue or comment on the extant "meaningless design." There are no meaningless designs on Etruscan mirrors.

Ixion at a banquet with the Olympians upon their magical foods of ambrosia and nectar⁸¹ tried to rape Hera, but was misled by a hallucinatory look-alike in the persona of the lady Cloud (*Nephéle*).⁸² Hallucinatory erotic-ecstatic experience at a divine dinner upon ambrosia and nectar surely implicates the role of an entheogen. The union of Ixion with Cloud resulted in the tribe of centaurs, who sprouted from a rainfall upon the slopes of Mount Pelion,⁸³ the mountain ridge that borders the northern edge of the plain of Thessaly, claimed in antiquity along with the Peloponnesus, as one of the original homelands of the Etruscan people.⁸⁴ Aristophanes staged a chorus of *Clouds* in his parody of Socratic teaching (423 BCE), identifying the phallus that was their obligatory costuming for the comic stage as their noses, as they inhaled the nebulous smoke of cannabis that allowed them to get high.⁸⁵

As punishment for his misled delusional rape of Hera, Ixion was bound spread-eagled (or in running-man position⁸⁶) to a whirling wheel of fire. Ixion was named as the "mistletoe" (*Viscum album*⁸⁷), which in English is derived as the "urine-twist,"⁸⁸ cognate with "micturition." He is depicted on an Apulian amphora, bound to his fiery wheel, while Hephaestus with hammer on one side leans upon a tree sprouting the twigs of mistletoe and an Erinys on the other sets the wheel whirling.⁸⁹ Erinyes traditionally afflicted their victims with maddening toxins.⁹⁰ The scene is witnessed by an enthroned Zeus and the rainbow Iris, who is a thematic doublet for the rainy lady Cloud. The botanical persona of Ixion as the urine-twist mistletoe refers to the sanctity of the *Amanita muscaria* and its potentiated metabolite in urine among the Druids. The motif extends even to the

80. Arthur Bernard Cook, *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1914-1940), 201, fig. 146.

81. Lucian (second century CE), *Dialogues of the Gods*, 9.

82. Pindar, *Pythian Odes*, 2.32 *et seq.*; Pseudo-Apollodorus, *Bibliothèque*, Epitome, 1.20.

83. Diodorus Siculus, 4.12.5.

84. Hellanicus of Lesbos (fifth century BCE), *Phoronis* (genealogical notices of events from the times of Phoroneus, primordial king of the Peloponnesus), frag. 76.

85. Carl A.P. Ruck, "Aristophanes' Parody of Socrates as a Pothead and the Spartan Warrior Cult of the Wolf," in *Seeking the Sacred with Psychoactive Sacraments: Chemical Paths to Spirituality and God*, vol. 1, History and Practices, ed. J.H. Ellens (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2014): 75-91; Carl A.P. Ruck, "Cannabis, Caves, and Plays," in *One Toke to God: The Entheogenic Spirituality of Cannabis*, ed. M.J. Estren (Malibu: Cannabis Spiritual Center, 2017), 27-32.

86. Kylix, ca. 500 BCE: Ixion, bound to his wheel in running position, Museum of the History of Art, Geneva, inv. no. 5728.

87. Greek [w]ixía, [w]ixós.

88. Sanskrit *mehati*, cognate with Greek *omeích-ein*. Carl A.P. Ruck, Blaise Staples, and Clark Heinrich, *The Apples of Apollo: Pagan and Christian Mysteries of the Eucharist* (Durham: Carolina Academic Press, 2001), 15-40.

89. Saint Petersburg, Hermitage Museum, printed as fig. 146 in Cook, *Zeus*.

90. Vergil, *Aeneid*, 7.346 *et seq.*

supposedly poisonous urine of toads.⁹¹ The toad's lascivious eroticism made it a common metaphor for the vulva.⁹² It was often represented with its hind legs spread wide apart to expose its genitals.

The spoked wheel of Ixion's torment is a demonstrable image of the gilled underside of the mushroom's cap as a spoked wheel. From Ixion was descended the race of centaurs, whose leader Chiron possessed vast herbal knowledge, which he taught traditionally to the heroes entrusted to his tutelage as the poison-arrow motif of toxic archery.⁹³ The Gorgon Medusa, among her other zoomorphic materializations, was a centaur.⁹⁴

The centaurs, as a race of creatures that sprouted from a mountain rainfall and as a tribe of primordial men known as the Lapiths are an equine zoomorphism of the same mushroom motif that yielded the Gorgon Medusa and the bovine anthropomorphism of the cow maiden Io. Io was cited as the sister of the mushroom maiden Mykene, after which the citadel was renamed Mycenae. The Lapiths are named as a primordial race of stones, "sons of the rock."⁹⁵ It is perhaps significant that if Hephaestus is not the deity who provides the wheel for Ixion's torment, the spoked wheel is presented by Athena in her role of Metis-Medusa analogue.⁹⁶

The curiously ineptly depicted "flower" on the Etruscan Ixion mirror was identified by Robert Graves as a mushroom. He suggested that it was the food of centaurs, that they embodied the animism of the psychoactive mushroom.⁹⁷ Wasson had earlier accepted ("he is surely right") and presented Graves' identification in *Mushrooms, Russia, and History*.⁹⁸ The bizarreness of the depiction, as Wasson reasoned, was its likeness to the fire-drill, the stipe representing the penis, called "mushroom" in Greek, as a stick, drilling into the cap as vulva, with the crosshatching lines on the underside of the cap designating the radiating gills as the teeth of the "comb" of the loom, the vulva as a sacred image, comparable to the male member as phallus. Mushrooms were employed as tinder for the generation of fire as a sexual union. The fire-drill makes Ixion an analogous tradition to Prometheus' theft of fire. Prometheus stole it as a "flower" (*ánthos*) gathered into the narthex-thyrsus from Hephaestus, and that deity is also the one who chained the Titan to the rock of his torment.⁹⁹

91. Adrian Morgan, *Toads and Toadstool* (Berkeley Celestial Arts, 1996), 10.

92. Hieronymus Bosch, *Seven Deadly Sins*, Prado, Madrid: superbia with toad over vulva. Wasson. *The Wondrous Mushroom*, 184 *et seq.*

93. Ruck *et al.*, *The Apples of Apollo*, 89-92.

94. The earliest depiction of the Medusa: large relief pithos from Thebes, *ca.* 670 BCE, Louvre, Paris, inv. no. CA 795.

95. Latin *lapis*, "stone," cognate with Greek *lepas*, "topographical rock," like *petra*. The patronymic *-id* suffix in Greek designates "child of."

96. Ares and Hermes apprehend Ixion, before an enthroned Hera, with Athena providing the wheel, Attic red-figure kantharos (Dionysian drinking cup), attributed to the Amphitrite painter, British Museum, London, inv. no. London E155, Beazley archive no. 212127.

97. Robert Graves, *Food for Centaurs* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1960).

98. Wasson and Wasson, *Mushrooms, Russia, and History*, 116 *et seq.*

99. Aeschylus, *Prometheus*, 7.

The depiction of the "flower" on the Etruscan mirror has not only deformed the mushroom to illustrate its sexual imagery as a fire-drill, but it has endowed it with an anomalous stem supporting a calyx widening into a trumpet-shaped blossom. The mushroom is morphing into a lily. One such lily is notoriously psychoactive, the *Datura*, and like the mushroom that was food for centaurs, it bore the folkloric name in Greek as "horse-mad" (*hippománes*). Ajax "harvested" it as the cause of the delusionary madness that led him to slaughter herds, thinking that they were men.¹⁰⁰ This lily with the name as *dirkaion* / *kirkaion* was also involved in the motif of lycanthropy¹⁰¹ and with the sorceress Circe as perhaps an analogue of moly, the *[h]ómomi* or *haoma* of the Zoroastrian magi priests.

The Ixion mirror surrounds the central episode with a border of trailing wild ivy vine, suggesting that the morphing lily is an analogue to the Dionysian ivy, the prototypic toxic antecedent to the grapevine as the product of human intervention in hybridizing the intoxicating cultivated transmutations of primitive and toxic natural growths. Frequently the vase depictions of the lily from Southern Italy show the blossom as the apparently toxic¹⁰² bindweed wild morning glory (*smilax*), with an anomalous head raising from within its funnel and wearing the red Phrygian cap.¹⁰³ The cap derives from the pointed fox snout and the pelt worn by the Bassarides Thracian bacchants, and implies the motif of lycanthropy.¹⁰⁴ This identifies the lily's flower as the little red-cap, the anthropomorphism of the European folkloric tale of *Rotkäppchen* and her adventure of initiatory lycanthropy.¹⁰⁵

A very broad red-figure fourth-century BCE terracotta patera platter from a grave in Apulia depicts the abduction of Persephone with four mushroom-shaped knobs around its rim.¹⁰⁶ These are clearly not intended as handles since the platter has explicit handles on either side. The central scene is surrounded by a bindweed morning glory vine blossoming with lilies. Two on opposite sides, rising amid the tendrils, are the capped heads of a female. Pliny noted the extraordinary similarity of the morning glory's flower to the lily.¹⁰⁷

A second-century CE mosaic from a villa north of Rome depicts the winged Gorgon head at its center.¹⁰⁸ Such Gorgon heads (*gorgóneia*) were often used as

100. Sophocles, *Ajax*, 143; Ruck *et al.*, *The Apples of Apollo*, 24 *et seq.*; Ruck, *The Son Conceived in Drunkenness*, 111, 197.

101. *Dirke* was the wife of the "wolf" Lykos of Thebes. She was a bacchant: Ruck. *The Son Conceived in Drunkenness*, 129 *et seq.*

102. Ruck, *Dionysus in Thrace*, 83: the Grimm fairytale of our lady's little drinking glass identifies the bindweed morning glory as the flower of the Virgin and suggests folkloric knowledge of its intoxicating potential.

103. Red-figure krater, fourth century BCE, Etruscan.

104. Ruck, *Dionysus in Thrace*, 111 *et seq.*

105. Carl A.P. Ruck, Blaise Daniel Staples, José Alfredo González, and Marl Alwin Hoffman, *The Hidden World: Survival of Pagan Shamanic Themes in European Fairytales* (Durham: Carolina Academic Press, 2007), 55-62.

106. Attributed to the Baltimore painter, Art Institute of Chicago. Ruck (ed.), *Dionysus in Thrace*, 97-99, fig. 6.2 and 6.2a.

107. Pliny, *Natural History*, 21.11

108. Now installed in the central garden courtyard of the Gardner Museum, Boston. The mosaic was discovered in 1892 in the remains of an ancient villa north of Rome, near the villa

an apotropaic emblem to decorate the entrance hall of houses. The delicate tracery of stems with occasional stylized leaves and flowers filling the area surrounding the Gorgon head sprout from bases midpoint in each quadrant of the central square. Here at the base as if sprouting directly from the ground as well as from the branching and encircling stems are more elaborate and much larger flowers, four of them, arrayed cruciform with the Medusa at its center. They are lilies, complete with three leaves of their calyx. However, the top of each blossom is a red rim, spotted with white, and each has a bird anomalously alighting or apparently dancing upon it, as if it were a solid cap, rather than the opened space of the funnel of the lily's trumpet. The birds perhaps identify the flower as their fare, each bird a different species. The lilies appear to be morphing into red mushrooms.

Bibliography

- Allegro, John Marco. *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross: A Study of the Nature and Origins of Christianity within the Fertility Cults of the Ancient Near East*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd, 1970.
- Bettini, Maurizio. *Women and Weasels: Mythologies of Birth in Ancient Greece and Rome*, translated by Emlyn Eisenach. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013.
- Chantraine, Pierre. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1968-2009.
- Cook, Arthur Bernard. *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1914-1940.
- Frisk, Hjalmar. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg Carl Winters, 1954-1970.
- Graves, Robert. *Food for Centaurs*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1960.
- Grummond, Nancy de. "The Etruscan Mirror." *Notes in the History of Art* 4, no. 2/3 (1985): 26-35.
- Henderson, Jeffrey. *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.
- Kershaw, Kris. *The One-eyed God: Odin and the (Indo-) Germanic Männerbünde*. Washington, D.C.: Journal of Indo-European Studies, Monograph No. 36, 2000.
- Morgan, Adrian. *Toads and Toadstool*. Berkeley Celestial Arts, 1996.
- Ripinsky-Naxon, Michael. *The Nature of Shamanism: Substance and Function of a Religious Metaphor*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.
- Ruck, Carl A.P. "Cannabis, Caves, and Plays." In *One Toke to God: The Entheogenic Spirituality of Cannabis*, edited by M.J. Estren. 27-32. Malibu: Cannabis Spiritual Center, 2017.
- Ruck, Carl A.P. "Duality and the Madness of Herakles." *Arethusa* 9 (1973): 153-176.
- Ruck, Carl A.P. "Mushroom Sacraments in the Cults of Early Europe." *NeuroQuantology* 14, no. 1 (2016): 68-93.

of Augustus' wife Livia. It probably was the floor of a bath. The delicate tracery of the interlocking design of stems, flowers, and leaves resembles those of Pompeii around 25 CE, but brick stamps indicate that it was laid a century later during the reign of the Emperor Hadrian.

- Ruck, Carl A.P. "The Great God Sabazios and the Crab Dance in Athens." In *The Stone Mushrooms of Thrace*. Alexandroupoli: EKATAIOS, 2012.
- Ruck, Carl A.P. "The Wolves of War: Evidence of an Ancient Cult of Warrior Lycanthropy." *Neuroquantology* 14, no. 3 (2016): 544-566.
- Ruck, Carl A.P. (ed.) *Dionysus in Thrace: Ancient Entheogenic Themes in the Mythology and Archaeology of Northern Greece, Bulgaria, and Turkey*. Berkeley: Regent Press, 2017.
- Ruck, Carl A.P. *The Great Gods of Samothrace and the Cult of the Little People*. Berkeley: Regent Press, 2017.
- Ruck, Carl A.P. *The Son Conceived in Drunkenness: Magical Plants in the World of the Greek Hero*. Berkeley: Regent Press, 2017.
- Ruck, Carl A.P., Blaise Daniel Staples, José Alfredo González, and Marl Alwin Hoffman. *The Hidden World: Survival of Pagan Shamanic Themes in European Fairytales*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press, 2007.
- Ruck, Carl A.P., Blaise Staples, and Clark Heinrich. *The Apples of Apollo: Pagan and Christian Mysteries of the Eucharist*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press, 2001.
- Ruck, Carl A.P., Mark Alwin Hoffman, and José Alfredo González Celdrán. *Mushrooms, Myth, and Mithras: The Drug Cult that Civilized Europe*. San Francisco: City Lights, 2011.
- Ruck, Carl A.P. "Aristophanes' Parody of Socrates as a Pothead and the Spartan Warrior Cult of the Wolf." In *Seeking the Sacred with Psychoactive Sacraments: Chemical Paths to Spirituality and God*, vol. 1, History and Practices, ed. J.H. Ellens, 75-91. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2014.
- Wasson, R. Gordon, Albert Hofmann, and Carl A.P. Ruck. *The Road to Eleusis: Unveiling the Secret of the Mysteries*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1978.
- Wasson, R. Gordon, Stella Kramrish, Jonathan Ott, and Carl A.P. Ruck. *Persephone's Quest: Entheogens and the Origins of Religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Wasson, R. Gordon. *The Wondrous Mushroom: Mycolatry in Mesoamerica*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980.
- Wasson, Valentina Pavlovna, and R. Gordon Wasson. *Mushrooms, Russia, and History*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1957.
- Wilson, Peter Lamborn. *Ploughing the Clouds: The Search for Irish Soma*. San Francisco: City Lights, 1999.

The Great Tew Circle, 1630-1639

By Michael J. Langford*

The Great Tew Circle comprised a group of theologians, philosophers and poets who met regularly in Lord Falkland's house at Great Tew, near Oxford, from the early 1630s until around 1639. Although strongly royalist and Anglican, on many matters, especially that of toleration, they defended views that would later be classed as liberal.¹ This article introduces the reader to the Great Tew Circle, and explores its relationship with the better-known Cambridge Platonists, most of whom flourished a few decades later. Common ground included the influence of Plato and an appeal to 'reason', although exactly how reason should to be understood raises interesting issues.

Introduction

The Great Tew Circle comprised a collection of theologians, philosophers and poets who met together in Lord Falkland's house at Great Tew, about sixteen miles from Oxford, from the early 1630s until around 1639 when rumbles of the civil war – which broke out in 1642 -- summoned Falkland to matters of state, and the group discussions were discontinued. Thereafter, despite the deaths of Falkland and Chillingworth, the Circle maintained some influence and a degree of association between many of its members remained, in part through the continued patronage of Falkland's widow. At first sight, the Restoration of Charles II in 1660 might seem to mark a kind of success for the aspirations of the Circle, and particularly for the efforts of Henry Hammond during the Commonwealth period, but although the return to monarchy and state Anglicanism did represent some aspects of the Circle's agenda, the generally narrow and intolerant agenda of the new order certainly did not.

Both Lord Clarendon (Edward Hyde) in his *Life*,² and John Aubrey (1626-97) in his *Brief Lives*, provide lists of the collection of stars who were members of the Circle, all of whom were friends of Falkland, although -- as the historian Trevor-Roper warns us, in his chapter on the Great Tew Circle -- not all of his friends

*Emeritus Professor of Philosophy, The Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada, and Faculty of Divinity, University of Cambridge, UK.

1. In the seventeenth century the word 'liberal' tended to mean 'given to generosity', or to refer to the traditional 'liberal arts', but since the late eighteenth century (according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*) it has also been used to mean 'free from narrow prejudice, open-minded, candid'. In accordance with this later usage, the term 'liberal theology' has been used to refer to styles of theology that seek bridges with different faith systems and stress the metaphorical rather than the literal use of sacred writings. Formerly, the term 'latitudinarian' tended to be used for this.

2. Edward Hyde (Lord Clarendon), *Life* (Oxford: 1760), ps. 29 ff.

were 'members' of the Circle.³ In addition to Lord Falkland (Lucius Cary), key figures included William Chillingworth, who along with Ben Jonson were perhaps the most renowned members of the Circle -- other than Thomas Hobbes, who was often there, but was not really a 'member' in terms of his overall philosophy.⁴ William Chillingworth wrote most of his hugely influential *The Religion of Protestants* (1638) at the house. Others members included John Hales of Eton, John Earle (or Earles, who, as Bishop of Salisbury, after the Restoration, worked for reconciliation with non-conformists), Gilbert Sheldon (later Archbishop of Canterbury), Robert Boyle, Sidney Godolphin, Henry Hammond, Edmund Waller and Hugh Cressy (who later, in the language of the time, 'perverted' to Rome and became a polemicist). Clarendon, a close friend of Falkland's, describes the atmosphere as "one continued *convivium philosophicum* or *convivium theologicum*" and adds "nor did the lord of the house know of the comings and goings, nor who were in his house, till he came down to dinner or supper, where all still met."⁵ The intellectual activity was supported by the excellent library held at the house.

Given the nature of this group, notably its rationalizing nature and -- as Trevor-Roper points out⁶ -- its intrinsic quality, one of the questions that arises is: "What was the Great Tew Circle's relationship to the Cambridge Platonists, many of whom were active shortly after the demise of the Circle?"

The Beginnings of a Plausible Answer is Provided by the Scottish Theologian John Tulloch (1823-86)

In the introduction to his volume on the Cambridge Platonists he writes: "There is even good reason to conclude that the ultra-dogmatic character of the Westminster Confession of Faith was itself among the chief reasons of the reaction to a more liberal theology" (p. 11).⁷ Although this Confession (1646) was

3. H. Trevor-Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth Century Essays* (London: Fontana, 1989), p. 171 note.

4. M.L. Donnelly has argued for a closer association of Hobbes with the Great Tew Circle in the context of his argument that the Circle was influential in advancing a neoclassical aesthetic. See his "The Great Difference of Time: The Great Tew Circle and the Emergence of the Neoclassical Mode," in Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (eds.) *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England* (London: University of Missouri Press, 2000).

5. Edward Hyde, *Life*, p. 33.

6. Trevor-Roper, *Ibid*, p. 175.

7. John Tulloch, *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century* (Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1872), vol. 2. Note, in particular, these two articles from the Westminster Confession: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His Glory, some men and angels are predestined unto everlasting life; and others foreordained to everlasting death" [III, 3], and "They [Adam and Eve] being the root of all mankind, the guilt of their sin was imputed ... and ... conveyed to all their posterity" [VI, 3]. Elsewhere, I have criticized the Western doctrine of original *guilt*, defending instead the Greek Orthodox account of an 'original sin' that sees a stain of 'weakness' but not 'guilt' in the newborn, and quoted Abelard and Jeremy Taylor as rare, pre-nineteenth century Western representatives of a similar

produced after the Great Tew Circle had been wound up, there can be little doubt that its members were similarly inspired, in part, by an equivalent reaction to what was seen as unnecessarily dogmatic and divisive forms of Christianity -- reflecting Richard Hooker's earlier rejection of both hard-line Calvinism and orthodox Catholicism. In the case of the Great Tew Circle, instead of the Westminster Confession we may point to the decrees of the Synod of Dort, 1618-9, as a major cause of irritation. John Hales, although not an official deputy, attended this synod and wrote extensive reports on its meetings to the English ambassador at The Hague, Sir Dudley Carlton.⁸

However, despite the common source of the two movements in the rejection of Calvinism and in an eirenic response to church divisions, Tulloch argues that a much more speculative atmosphere permeates the later, Cambridge Platonist movement: "In their writings we pass into a higher, if not more bracing, atmosphere than that in which we have been dwelling in the pages of Hales and Chillingworth. They discussed larger questions and principles of a more fundamental and far-reaching character" (ps. 13-14). In Cambridge Platonism he sees "the first elaborate attempt to wed Christianity and philosophy made by any Protestant school", and he adds "it may be even said to have been the first true attempt of the kind since the days of the great Alexandrine teachers" (p. 14). Tulloch adds a footnote here: "The Florentine movement in the latter part of the fifteenth century is hardly an exception. Marsilius Ficinus and the two Pici of Mirandola -- uncle and nephew -- were not theologians, although animated by a profound theological instinct. The Academy of the Medici, of which they were the ornaments, was, in part at least, literary and humanistic in its tendencies."

This wider philosophical concern, which Tulloch attributes to the Cambridge Platonists but not to the Great Tew Circle, is also based, he maintains, on the growing influence, in Cambridge, of both Bacon and Descartes. Bacon's *Novum Organon*, first appeared in 1620, but Tulloch argues that for some twenty years, it was largely ignored in favour of an old-fashioned scholasticism (p. 15). Bacon's philosophy -- it should be noted -- was not an influence in terms of agreement, but in large part, of reaction, especially in the light of his divorce between philosophy and theology. Rather later did Descartes begin to be studied seriously in Cambridge, as witnessed by Henry More's interest in him (p. 17).

The theologian (Dean) W.R. Inge (1860-1954) suggests a similar relationship between Great Tew and the Cambridge Platonists. He writes: "After the Reformation there was an important ecclesiastical movement in the direction of liberalism, comprehension, and toleration, which has no intimate connexion [sic] with the Platonic tradition, though the two naturally appealed to the same type of mind. The chief names are Lord Falkland, Hales of Eton, Chillingworth, and Stillingfleet, with whom, I think, Jeremy Taylor may be associated. The

view. See Michael J. Langford, *The Tradition of Liberal Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014).

8. John Hales, *Works*, 1765, III p. 59. [The pagination in volume 3 restarts with the Letters from the Synod of Dort.] Because of the tediousness of some debates Hales admits to sometimes falling asleep and on these occasions only being able to provide a 'thread'.

philosophical movement [i.e. the Cambridge Platonists] followed."⁹ It should be noted that neither Edward Stillingfleet nor Jeremy Taylor were part of the Great Tew Circle, although they certainly supported its liberalism and Stillingfleet quotes both Chillingworth and Hales.¹⁰

Yet further evidence for the more philosophical approach of the Cambridge Platonists is provided by a comment made after the Reformation by Gilbert Sheldon when Archbishop of Canterbury. He intimated to the Platonist, Henry More, that he was disposed to look up to "the new 'free method of philosophizing' with far from unfriendly sentiments -- provided the faith, the peace, and the institution of the Church were not thereby menaced."¹¹

The suggestion, in both Tulloch and Inge, is that while both movements had in common a moderation and an appeal to rationality (in contrast with the pronouncements of either the Synod of Dort or the Westminster Confession) the Great Tew Circle was more theological and more concerned with church divisions than it was philosophical in general, or Platonic in particular -- in contrast with the Cambridge Platonists. In an attempt to see if this view could be tested I undertook a scan of the published works of John Hales of Eton -- or more strictly of the three volumes of his *Works* in the Glasgow edition of 1765, reprinted in New York in 1971. I chose John Hales of Eton, in part because he was acknowledged to be one of the most learned of the Circle, and in part because he was, for a time, Regius professor of Greek at Oxford, who could therefore be expected to be thoroughly familiar with the Platonic corpus. I came up with the following results. There were numerous quotations in Greek, usually appended to notes at the bottom of the page, with many references to Aristotle and Homer, and occasional references to (among others) Hippocrates (II, 12, 34), Epictetus (II, 88, 169), Euripides (II, 144), Aristophanes (II, 231), Aeschylus (II, 305), Sophocles (III, 149), Thucydides (III, 144), Protagoras (II, 89), as well as many to Chrysostom who was a special object of his study, and Basil; but only one to Plato, and that was in Hales's letters describing the Synod of Dort in a passage in which he is summarizing a speech by Episcopius.¹² The only other things I found that related *directly* to the Platonic tradition were a reference to Porphyry (I; p. 93) -- which is, by implication -- somewhat uncomplimentary, and perhaps more significantly, a reference to two 'emanations' during a discussion of the Trinity.¹³

9. W.R. Inge, *The Platonic Tradition in English Religious Thought* (London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1926), p. 39.

10. Tulloch, vol. I, p. 460.

11. N. Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. IV (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), p. 423.

12. John Hales, *Ibid*, p. 74. Episcopius's speech includes the words *Amicus Socrates, amicus Plato, amica synodus, sed magis amica veritas*. Simon Episcopius was one of the 'Remonstrant' (Arminian) representatives at the Synod who -- after the deliberations -- were deprived of their offices.

13. In this Trinity there is one essence: two emanations: three persons, or relations; four properties, five notions," and a little later: "The two emanations are, to be begotten: and to proceed, or to be breathed out ... " (vol. I, ps. 76-7). The notion of 'emanations' is strongly

However, it is too soon to conclude that Plato was more or less absent in terms of first-hand influence, particularly in the light of a suggestion by the author of the *Dictionary of National Biography* on Clarendon (Paul Seaward) that Edward Hyde was "spurred by Falkland's reading in Plato" to consider issues of authority and reason.¹⁴

Trevor-Roper provides a list of the sources used by the Great Tew Circle, noting especially Erasmus, Sebastian Castellio, du Plessis-Mornay (the influential Huguenot writer), Socinus, Acontius,¹⁵ Hooker and Hugo Grotius. The last two were of special importance and of most frequent quotation. Grotius was the principal source for the Great Tew Circle's knowledge of Arminianism. In the case of Chillingworth Trevor-Roper should also have mentioned the multiple references to Augustine.

Prior to an examination of the published works of all the other members of the Circle, my suspicion is that the influence of Plato was twofold; first, in terms of a general rationality (as in the 'natural theology' of Plato's *Laws*, book 10), a rationality that characterized all members of the Circle; second, in terms of a belief in the intimate connection of rationality with moral character (reflecting Plato's intimate connection between knowledge and virtue). John Hales, for example, writes of "that faculty of reason which is in every one of you, even in the meanest that hears me this day, next to the help of God, is your eyes to direct you, and your legs to support you in your course of integrity and sanctity ..." ¹⁶ In the case of the Cambridge Platonists, in addition to these two influences, we find a third, especially with Cudworth, in the detailed analysis of Plato's metaphysics and the different ways in which Plato uses *theos*, for example, in the distinction between the eternal God and the gods that are 'generated'.¹⁷

Closely related to the theme of rationality is the charge of Socinianism that was frequently laid against the Great Tew Circle. Here Clarendon is specially helpful, pointing out that the charge tended to mean two very different things; first a general support for reason, in contrast with a Calvinist doctrine of total depravity that rendered any such reliance on human reason suspect, and second, a specific

evocative, not of Plato himself, but of Neo-Platonism – a tradition that was of interest to scholars of both the Great Tew Circle and the Cambridge Platonists.

14. So far, I have been unable to find documentary evidence for this claim.

15. Jacobus Acontius (Aconsio), who was probably born around 1500 (though some authorities think as late as 1520) and died in 1566 or 7, was an Italian jurist and polymath who converted to a liberal form of Protestantism. He came to England shortly after the accession of Elizabeth (1558) where he was employed because of his engineering skills (in drainage and in the fortifications at Berwick). His *Stratagematum Satanae*, 1565, is one of the classics of Christian appeals for toleration, along with Sebastian Castellio's *De Haereticis, an sint persequendi* of 1554. Persecution is part of Satan's strategy. English versions, *Darkness Discovered*, date from 1647. Early versions of this translation omit the later chapters, 5-8, which were more obviously critical of Calvinism.

16. John Hales, *Works*, 1765, III, p. 156.

17. Ralph Cudworth, *The True Intellectual System of the Universe* (London, 1678), chapter 4, section XIV. In the Preface to this work Cudworth argues that there is a true Trinity to be discerned in Plato's writings (as well as some 'trinities' that do not correspond to it).

unorthodoxy with respect to the doctrine of the Trinity.¹⁸ References to Socinus in one's writings in no way entails agreement with all his views. With respect to the first sense of the term, to a man, the Great Tew Circle did espouse this view; with respect to the second (and much more accurate use of the adjective 'Socinian'), they were strongly opposed -- manifesting a traditional Trinitarian orthodoxy -- although in the case of Chillingworth -- with some hesitation, as we shall see. John McLachlan suggests that the charge of Socinianism was given credence, in part, because some clearly Socinian tracts were wrongly attributed to Hales and Chillingworth.¹⁹ In the case of Falkland, John Aubrey, in his brief account of his life, describes him as "the first Socinian in England" and refers to Cressy's claim (made in 1669) that Falkland was the first to bring Socinius's books into England. However, there is no reason to think that Falkland was a Socinian in the second, and proper sense of the term.

The issue of the manner in which Socinianism either influenced or characterized the Great Tew Circle has been subjected to a useful analysis in Sarah Mortimer's *Reason and Revolution in the English Revolution*.²⁰ What becomes evident from this study is that the influence of Socinus on the Great Tew circle was more than a general emphasis on 'reason' -- and it may well be the case that in the case of Chillingworth his devotion to reason led him to hesitate before officially approving Anglican statements regarding the Trinity. Here his position was different from the more traditional stance of Falkland. Not only does Trinitarian doctrine find little emphasis in *The Religion of Protestants*, Chillingworth's reluctance to accept patronage, including the chancellorship of Sarum, until 1638,²¹ was related to his doubts about affirming the 39 Articles, in which an orthodox Trinitarianism is affirmed. Following correspondence with Sheldon, Chillingworth was eventually persuaded to accept the 39 Articles -- as was legally required for preferment -- in part because this was interpreted as a kind of general acceptance of the underlying principles rather than a reference to the precise wording of each Article.

Of more impact than qualms about Trinitarianism, however, was the Socinian distinction between natural law and the law of Christ, revealed in the New Testament, and the corresponding topic of obedience to political authority. Most expositions of natural law (rooted in the *ius naturale* of Roman Law and the *lex naturalis* of Aquinas) gave criteria for when a war could be just, and for many writers, including John Milton, an extension of the same arguments applied to revolutions, in which -- in 'just' cases -- magistrates (or more rarely, the people) could rise up against their tyrannical overlords. Faustus Sozzini (the younger Socinus) argued that although such rebellion might be allowed under natural law,

18. "In this Trinity there is one essence: two emanations: three persons, or relations; four properties, five notions," and a little later: "The two emanations are, to be begotten: and to proceed, or to be breathed out ... " (vol. I, ps. 76-7). The notion of 'emanations' is, of course, strongly evocative, not of Plato himself, but of Neo-Platonism.

19. H. John McLachlan, *Socinianism in Seventeenth Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951), ps. 74-8.

20. Sarah Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

21. See Tulloch, *op. cit.* vol. 1, ps. 282-87, 292-3.

and although God actually permitted or even commanded some such rebellions in the Old Testament, the revealed law of Christ had changed the situation.²² Christ accepted the rule of Caesar, and Christians should accept even tyrannical kings. The Great Tew Circle's support for the royalist cause – reluctant as it was in many cases – was rooted in this rejection of the natural law argument for a just rebellion used by Cromwell and his followers.

This issue highlights a tension within the philosophy of the Great Tew Circle. The more one stresses a general rationality as a source of knowledge, over against revelation or alleged revelation, the more one might seem likely to approve an overarching natural moral law that was open to all people of good will. The general tendency of the sermons preached by members of the Great Tew Circle to emphasize the ethical aspects of Christianity also supports this emphasis. However, this emphasis does not sit easily with the special claims of an allegedly *different* and more demanding 'law of Christ'. The tension becomes even more evident when this law of Christ does not lead one to outright pacifism, as it did for Faustus Sozzini as well as for most Quakers (some, like Isaac Penington excepted), but to military support for the royalist cause.

The theme of rationality is also linked to that of toleration, and here – I suggest – the Great Tew Circle deserves considerable credit. In 1643, on his deathbed, Chillingworth was pressed by the Puritan, Francis Cheynell, to withdraw his claim that Muslims (he used the term 'Turks'), Roman Catholics and heretics, if they genuinely *endeavored* to do what is good, could be saved. This is to respond to the 'word' of God. Chillingworth refused to do so.²³ Today, his claim might seem natural, even obvious, but we need to realize how extraordinary it seemed to most people of the time, given the narrowness of so many religious people.

In the context of his writings we can understand the reason for Chillingworth's refusal to withdraw his claim. He held the view -- ultimately derived, in all probability -- from an Alexandrine Christian tradition (notably in the writings of Origen) that goes back to the second and third centuries, that people who truly respond to God's *logos*, or 'word', as it comes to them in the form of the Good, the True and the Beautiful, are indeed responding to the *logos*. Christianity is unique in articulating that the *logos* was made flesh in the person of Jesus, but this does not mean that only Christians are responsive to God's Word. In addition to God's grace, the one, absolutely essential thing required for salvation, Chillingworth claimed, is to *endeavor* to do the good, as one sees it.²⁴ This is to respond to the 'word' of God. It was a similar insight that allowed Justin Martyr, writing about

22. See Mortimer, *op. cit.* p. 88.

23. F. Cheynell, *Chillingworthi Novissima* (London: 1644), 44. See also R.R. Orr, *Reason and Authority* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), 163.

24. Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants*, 3, 14, p. 135. "... if we do indeed desire and endeavour to find the truth, we may be sure we do so, and be sure that it cannot consist with the revealed goodness of God, to damn him for error, that desires and endeavours to find the truth." cf. 2, 104, p. 92 and 3, 52, ps. 158-160.

151-5 CE, to claim: "those who live with the *logos* are Christians, even though they have been called atheists".²⁵

Further, we find Chillingworth quoting Hooker's exact expression on the difference between 'Certainty of Evidence' (which we do not have) and 'Certainty of Adherence' (which we can acquire – and which we could liken to 'conviction').²⁶ Again, when he speaks of a 'tyrannical God' who condemns those who make honest mistakes -- a view of God he finds on both sides of the polemical debate -- he adds the comment: "I for my part fear I should not love God, if I should think so strangely of him".²⁷ Congruently, in his defense of toleration, he condemns the use of violence and of "Machiavillian police" [*sic*] in order to make people conform in matters of religion, which can so easily "make men counterfeit".²⁸ Here we see clearly the influence of Acontius, and very likely of Sebastian Castellio as well.

If we seek to explore further what 'Platonism' implies, whether in the case of the Great Tew Circle or the Cambridge Platonists, one interesting line of investigation is to examine the relation of metaphysics to mathematics (potentially an additional aspect of Platonism). For Plato, *ta mathematica*, in the simile of the line, occupies an intriguing half way position between opinion and true knowledge. In the Platonism of Nicholas of Cusa (1401-64) there is a corresponding use of mathematics as a kind of bridge between ordinary human thinking (characterized by his use of *ratio*) and true intellectual vision (characterized by his use of *intellectus*).²⁹ In contrast, although Chillingworth was a gifted mathematician, he does not use mathematics to make any metaphysical argument, and tellingly, he contrasts the kind of 'discerning judgment' of many fine mathematicians who are – nevertheless – 'utterly imprudent', with the wisdom of the truly prudent, "because Prudence requires not only a good discerning judgment and apprehension [which mathematicians have], but a serenity and calmness of the passions."³⁰ I found an interesting parallel in Cudworth – again a man said to be gifted in mathematics, but who refers in one passage to "mere speculation and dry mathematical reason, in minds unpurified, and having contrary interests of

25. Justin Martyr, *First Apology*, ch. 46.

26. Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants* (Oxford, 1638), 1, 9, p. 37; 2, 154, p. 112. cf. A Hooker sermon of c. 1585 in *Works* (3rd ed. ed. Keble, 1845), vol. III, ps. 470-1.

27. Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants*, 2, 104, p. 92.

28 Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants*, 5, 96, p. 297.

29. It is the latter that denies the oppositions proposed by reason, and hence Cusa's famous claim about the *coincidentia oppositorum* – an insight only achievable by *intellectus*. Cusa's frequent excursions into mathematics are an important element in his Platonism, not primarily on account of his strictly mathematical writings, but because of the way he uses mathematical argument within his theology, for example, in his use of 'triangularity'. On the relation of *ratio* to *intellectus* in Cusa see Michael. J. Langford, "Premodern dialogue with special reference to Nicholas of Cusa," in *The Medieval History Journal*, 20, no. 1 (2017), ps. 118-147.

30. Chillingworth, *Sermon* 2, paragraph 29. One of John Hales's letters discusses triangularity, but with no reference to any metaphysical implications or parallels. See his *Works*, vol. 1, ps. 194-6.

carnality [which] cannot alone beget an unshaken confidence and assurance of so high a truth as this, the existence of a perfect understanding Being, the original of all things."³¹ This theme of the interconnection between rationality and ethics is one where there is certainly common ground, if not influence, between the Great Tew Circle and the Cambridge Platonists. In the latter, it is specially evident in the writings of John Smith (1618-52), who writes: "it is the heart that sends up good blood and warm spirits in to the head, whereby it is best enabled to its several functions; so that which enables us to know and understand aright in the things of God, must be a living principle of holiness within us."³²

One clear difference between the Great Tew Circle and the Cambridge Platonists relates to their different responses to the revolution of 1642, and the different treatments by the Commonwealth authorities. The Great Tew Circle supported the royalist cause while those Cambridge Platonists who were fellows or masters of colleges maintained their positions, although some of them, including Benjamin Whichcote, managed to avoid actually taking the Covenant of 1643. However, this difference, though real, was not as sharp as might be supposed, because (i) both Falkland and Chillingworth were highly critical of much of the royalist rhetoric (as evidenced by Falkland's despair on the battlefield, and Chillingworth's unpopular sermons to the royal army), and (ii) many of the Cambridge Platonists argued strongly for more toleration than most Presbyterians wanted to allow.

There is more work to be done in exploring the relationship between the Great Tew Circle and the Cambridge Platonists, including: (i), an exploration of letters in various archives and publications; (ii), an examination of library holdings in the 1630s; (iii), a search for citations in all the members of the Circle along the lines of my examination of John Hales; (iv) a further search for Platonic themes that are not necessarily discernible from quotations; and (v), the way in which all the Circle members used Richard Hooker.

Postscript

Chillingworth's claim that the one thing needful for salvation is to 'endeavour' to do the good, as one sees it, while attractive, raises a difficulty that needs some comment. This claim, like that of Kant when he claims that the only thing good without qualification is 'the good will', can appear to approve the actions of 'fanatics', provided only that -- however mistaken -- (i) they genuinely believe that they are doing the right thing, *and* (ii) that their motive is simply and entirely to do the right thing (and not, for example, the intention of being rewarded in heaven).

³¹. Cudworth, Preface to *The True Intellectual System of the Universe*.

³². John Smith, *Select Discourses* (London: 1660), p. 3.

Quite apart from any evaluation of liberal theology, this is a serious issue in moral philosophy. Arguably, Chillingworth's claim can only be supported within a wider discussion concerning the nature of the good. In addition to the demand to endeavour to follow the good, we also have a responsibility to develop some coherent notion of what the good is. This can be found, in part, through Aristotle's emphasis on the need to acquire genuine virtue through how we manage our whole lives, which will hugely affect how we see 'the good', and in part by stressing Aristotle's claim that we have the potentiality to respond to the 'eye for the good', with which the virtuous person is endowed by nature (*Nicomachean Ethics*, 1114a-b.). If we support Chillingworth's claim that it makes no moral sense to think that a good God will condemn sincere followers of other 'ways' or *dao*, it does not follow that right intention, or endeavour is the only thing needful. Further, the kinds of people Chillingworth has in mind are typical examples of 'good' Muslims and Jews (and we should add, secular humanists) who follow the Golden Rule, and who are as likely to be horrified by the actions of fanatics as are liberal Christians. The situation is paralleled by the distinction between 'conscience' -- when used to refer simply to a momentary feeling -- and the kind of developed 'conscience' described in Bishop Joseph Butler's account of reflecting in 'a cool hour'; and also in the medieval distinction between *conscientia* and *synderesis*.

Bibliography

- Jacobus Acontius (Aconsio), *Stratagematum Satanae*, 1565. English tr. *Darkness discovered*, London, 1651.
- Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*.
- Aubrey, John. *Brief Lives* (written 1669-1697). edited by A. Powell. London: Cresset Press, 1949.
- Castellio (Chataillon), Sebastian. *De hereticis an sint persequendi*, (1554) edited and translated by R.H. Bainton. New York: Columbia University Press, 1935.
- Cheynell, F. *Chillingworthi Novissima*. London, 1644.
- Chillingworth, William. *The Religion of Protestants*. Oxford, 1638.
- Cudworth, Ralph. *The True Intellectual System of the Universe*. London, 1678.
- Donnelly, M.L. "The Great Difference of Time: The Great Tew Circle and the Emergence of the Neoclassical Mode." In Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (eds.) *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England*. London: University of Missouri Press, 2000.
- George, E.A. *Seventeenth Century Men of Latitude*. London: Fisher and Unwin, 1909.
- Hales, John. *Works*, 3 vols. Glasgow, 1765.
- Hooker, Richard. *Works*, 3rd ed. edited by Keble. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1845.
- Hyde, Edward (Lord Clarendon). *Life*. Oxford: 1760.
- Inge, W.R. *The Platonic Tradition in English Religious Thought*. London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1926.
- Justin Martyr. *Writings*, translated by T.B. Falls. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1948.

- Mullinger, J.B. *The University of Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911. Vol. 3, ps. 588-662 (for vignettes of Cambridge Platonists).
- Langford, Michael J. *The Tradition of Liberal Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Langford, Michael J. "Premodern dialogue with special reference to Nicholas of Cusa." In *The Medieval History Journal*, 20, no. 1 (2017).
- McLachlan, H. John. *Socinianism in Seventeenth Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Mortimer, Sarah. *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Orr, R.R. *Reason and Authority*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.
- Smith, John. *Select Discourses*. London: 1660.
- Seward, Paul. entry on Edward Hyde (Lord Clarendon) in *Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, vol. 29.
- Stillingfleet, Edward. *Irenicum* (London: 1661).
- Trevor-Roper, H. *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth Century Essays* London: Fontana, 1989.
- Tulloch, John *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century*. Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1872, 2 vols.
- Tyacke, N. (ed.). *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 4. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

The End of the Satrapies: The Date of Alexander IV's Death

By Harry Tolley*

The dearth of accurately datable documents from the time (323–c. 275 BCE) of Alexander the Great's Successors (also known as the Diadochi or Diadochoi) has contributed to uncertainty regarding the dating of key events from this time. In attempting to explain these inconsistencies, recent scholarship has focused on various different chronologies, some of which are described as "high" and "low." It would seem that particular importance would be assigned to the date of the end of the reign of Alexander IV, Alexander the Great's lone legitimate heir. However, little scholarly attention has been paid to the possible date of this very important transition that marked the end of the Macedonian Argead Dynasty. The current article attempts a thorough investigation of this event by examining remaining historical accounts and surviving contemporary government documents along with epigraphical evidence and archaeological discoveries. This information is then utilized in an attempt to arrive at a more precise date for the end of Alexander IV's reign and the end of the satrapies ruling in his name.

Introduction

The timeline of events regarding the Diadochi, the successors of Alexander the Great, has long been the subject of much scholarly speculation. Attempts to more clearly establish the dates of certain events seem to be dominated by two fields of thought: adherents of the "high chronology"¹ and those of the "low chronology."² Both of these chronologies have their problems, but both share the same logical focus in that they attempt to base the chronology on important events: the death of regents, great battles, etc. However, none of these chronologies focus on an event that should be considered one of the most important during the time of the Diadochi: the end of the reign of Alexander IV, son of Alexander the Great, an event which marked the end of the Macedonian Argead Dynasty.³ The purpose of this article is to address this

*Independent Researcher, USA.

1. A.B. Bosworth, *The Legacy of Alexander: Politics, Warfare, and Propaganda under the Successors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

2. R. Malcom Errington, "Diodorus Siculus and the Chronology of the Early Diadochoi, 320-311 B.C.," *Hermes* 105 (1977): 478-504; Edward M. Anson, "Dating the Deaths of Eumenes and Olympias," *Ancient History Bulletin* 20 (2006): 1-8; Edward M. Anson, "The Chronology of the Third Diadoch War," *Phoenix*, 60 (2006): 226-235.

3. For example, while it is a good introduction to the dating problem inherent in Diadochi studies, Tom Boiy's *Between High and Low...* does not mention the date of the death of Alexander IV. Thomas Boiy, *Between High and Low. A Chronology of the Early Hellenistic Period. Oikumene Studien zur antiken Weltgeschichte*, Bd. 5. (Frankfurt: Verlag Antike, 2007). Alexander Meeus' important reevaluation of the dating of events during the time of the Diadochi mentions Alexander IV's death only in passing (p. 89). Alexander Meeus, "Diodorus and the Chronology of the Third Diadoch War," *Phoenix* 66 (2012): 74-

vacancy with a thorough investigation of the end of Alexander IV's reign. This will be done by making use of remaining historical accounts, surviving contemporary government documents, epigraphical evidence and archaeological discoveries. It is hoped that this investigation may provide a firmer date for the end of Alexander IV's reign and the end of the satrapies.

The Demotic Papyri

The dearth of documents from the time of the Diadochi has contributed to the modern scholarly reliance on histories written long after the events in question.⁴ An example of this can be found in the study of the extant papyri fragments from this time period. Of the five Greek papyri that are known to exist from this period, all are from the island of Elephantine and only one self-dates itself to the year it was written and names the rulers at that time.⁵ There are, however, a number of Demotic papyri from the time of the Diadochi that self-date and include the names of the rulers at that time. These papyri are from Egypt and were found in a necropolis outside the city of Thebes. The Demotic papyri are all government documents, written by government scribes and notaries. This should lend the papyri an air of authenticity regarding the information the papyri contain regarding Alexander IV, but this has not been the case. Part of this somewhat dismissive attitude may be due to that fact that, to date, no single study has examined a selection of the Demotic papyri that have a bearing on the reign of Alexander IV. When one is examining a single source with a "strange" date, it is easy to dismiss the source as an aberrance. However, when that source is viewed in its proper context as part of a collection of several sources that share the same tradition, the collection of sources becomes more difficult to dismiss.

96. Part of this problem seems to be that most of the dating controversy does not cover events after 311 BCE.

4. Alexander IV is mentioned in one main historical account, the *Bibliotheca Historica* of Diodorus Siculus, which dates from the first century BCE. Apart from Diodorus, there are few surviving accounts of the time after Alexander the Great's death. The Roman historian Arrian, writing in the mid- 2nd century CE, composed a 10-volume history of the time after Alexander's death entitled *Events after Alexander*. This work has not survived and is known only from a 9th century Byzantine epitome. Justin's 3rd century epitome of the writings of the 1st century Roman historian Gnaeus Pompeius Trogus includes several interesting pieces of information, but without being able to compare it to its original source, it is difficult to rely on. Several classical authors, including Quintus Curtius Rufus (1st century CE), Plutarch (c. 50 CE-c.120 CE) and Pausanias (2nd century CE) mention events involving Alexander IV, but have little information that is not in Diodorus.

5. This papyri is Papyrus Elephantine 1 (P. Berlin 13500). For more general information on the Elephantine papyri, consult: *The Elephantine Papyri in English* (Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui), ed. and trans. by Bezalel Porten, J. J. Farber, C. J. Martin, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2011) 1-28. For more specific information on Papyrus Elephantine 1 see Porten and Farber 408-410.

Dra Abu el-Naga Papyrus 29-86-523B⁶

This papyrus self-dates⁷ to the seventh year of Philip Arrhidaeus' reign as king, which would be the year 317 BCE.⁸ After Alexander the Great's death in 323 BCE, his generals agreed that the empire would be ruled jointly by Alexander's remaining male relatives: his half-brother Philip Arrhidaeus and Alexander's (then) infant son Alexander IV.⁹ Because Philip Arrhidaeus was of limited mental faculty and Alexander IV was a child, both potential kings were unable to govern their empire and thus their territories were split up among various satraps who governed on behalf of the two. Ostensibly, this arrangement would only last until the time that Alexander IV was old enough to rule.¹⁰

The full date of the papyrus is "year seven, month Tybi, of King Philip," which would be March, 317 BCE.¹¹ In an article on Papyrus 29-86-523B, entitled "A Deed of Gift in 317 B.C.,"¹² Julius Reich explains that the first "year" of Philip Arrhidaeus' reign probably lasted only four to five months until the second year began.¹³ Reich explained that the reason for this was that the Demotic papyri followed the Egyptian tradition of attributing a full year to a new king's first year as king. This first year would begin the moment he became king and last until the beginning of the Egyptian new year, regardless of whether an actual year had passed. According to Reich, the Egyptians dated

6. Unless otherwise noted, these papyri were originally translated and published by Nathaniel Julius Reich, in his journal *Mizraim*. For a detailed overview, see N. J. Reich, "The Papyrus Archive in the Philadelphia University Museum, I" *Mizraim* 7 (1937): 11-19. For Dra Abu el-Naga Papyrus 29-86-523B, see Reich, "Papyrus," 13. Mustafa El-Amir lists this papyrus as "Ph. I, MIZ. II, pl. 3-4." The abbreviation "MIZ" refers to the volume of *Mizraim* where the papyrus was originally published. See Mustafa El-Amir, *A Family Archive from Thebes* (Cairo: Government Printing Offices, 1959), 1-6. El-Amir also included a chart which contained his listings compared to the numbers assigned some of the papyri when they were returned to Cairo in 1951. This papyrus is assigned the Cairo number 89,631. See El-Amir, x. Karl-Theodor (K. T.) Zauzich does not list this papyrus in his work *Die Ägyptische Schreibertradition in Aufbau, Sprache und Schrift der demotischen Kaufverträge aus ptolemäischer Zeit*, Band 1 (Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1968). However, it is listed in a much later article entitled, "Papyri Demotische," in *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* 4.1 (Wiesbaden, 1980). Reich's work on these papyri is the most detailed and as a result most of the examination of dating, etc., will entail interacting with Reich rather than El-Amir or Zauzich.

7. This is a very important distinction to make. These papyri are self-dated by the person who wrote them in the fourth century BCE; the date is not an estimate by modern scholars.

8. Unless otherwise noted, translating and dating was originally done by N. J. Reich. Unless otherwise noted, El-Amir and Zauzich agree with Reich's dating.

9. Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl. Hist.* 17. 117.

10. It is important to note that the joint rule is never mentioned in the Demotic papyri. Philip Arrhidaeus is listed as king until his death, at which time Alexander IV is listed as king.

11. Reich dated the papyrus to a specific day: March 10, 317 BCE. See Reich, "Papyrus." 13.

12. Nathaniel Julius Reich, "A Deed of Gift in 317 B.C.," *Mizraim*, 2 (1936): 57-69.

13. Reich, "A Deed...", 58.

Arrhidaeus' "year one" as beginning in 323 BCE, immediately after the death of Alexander the Great,¹⁴ with "year two" following soon after.

Dra Abu el-Naga Papyrus 29-86-508¹⁵

The papyrus was written in the third year of Alexander IV's reign which would be the year 314 BCE.¹⁶ This was, therefore, three years after the death of both Alexander IV's uncle Philip Arrhidaeus and Philip's wife, the Illyrian princess Eurydice.¹⁷

This papyrus is invaluable to our study. Its existence (along with the material we have already covered regarding Dra Abu el-Naga 29-86-523B) demonstrates that once word reached Egypt about Philip Arrhidaeus' death (and this notification was apparently not long in coming), the Egyptian scribes started dating their documents with the first year of Alexander IV's reign. This papyri also further establishes that there is no indication of a "joint reign" tradition in the Demotic papyri. Philip Arrhidaeus was listed as king until his

14. In the course of his article, Reich mentions another Demotic papyrus written during the reign of Philip Arrhidaeus that may be dated even later than Dra Abu el-Naga 29-86-523B. The papyrus in question is Bibliothèque nationale No. 249. Unfortunately, the papyrus is partially damaged and the exact month it was written in cannot be determined. However, according to Reich, the year in which it was written is visible, as is the name of Philip Arrhidaeus. Reich assumes that the papyrus, since Philip ruled until 317 BCE (six years following the Greek system, seven years following the Egyptian), was dated post mortem, but this is not necessarily the case. The papyrus could date from the early months of the eighth year of Philip's reign according to the Egyptian system, which would be the last few months of the seventh year according to the Greek system. This would match up well with the date given in Diodorus Siculus (Bibl. Hist. 19. 11) for the date of Philip Arrhidaeus' death: October or November 317 BCE. Reich realized this, but attempted to argue that he could somehow make out the month from the few marks that remained, but this seems uncertain. Even if accurate, Reich's dating of the papyrus to the third month of Philip Arrhidaeus' eighth year has little significance when compared to the length of Alexander IV's reign, as given in the Demotic papyri. See Reich, "A Deed...", 58, 59. For more information on Bibliothèque nationale No. 249, see K.T. Zauzich, "Papyri, Demotische, Paris," *Lexicon der Ägyptologie*, Lieferung 25 (Otto Harrasowitz: Wiesbaden, 1980), 862.

15. Reich, "Papyrus," 13-14. El-Amir lists this papyrus as "Ph. II, MIZ. III, pl. 1-2." In general, if a papyrus has been given a Cairo number by El-Amir, Zauzich will list it in parentheses after his listing. Thus, Zauzich lists this papyrus as "Urkunde 2: P. Philadelphia 2 (= P. Kairo 89362)." See El-Amir, 7-12 and Zauzich, *Schreibertradition*, 12.

16. Reich dates the papyrus to the Egyptian month Pachons which is roughly parallel to July. Here as above, Reich dates the papyrus to an actual day: July 8, 314 BCE. In this particular instance, Reich is using the Egyptian system for regnal years. See Reich, "Papyrus," 13-14.

17. Eurydice is sometimes called Adea. Her mother was Philip II's daughter Cynane; thus Eurydice was the niece of both Alexander the Great and her husband Philip Arrhidaeus. Eurydice and Arrhidaeus were killed in 317 BCE by order of Olympias, Alexander IV's paternal grandmother (and Alexander the Great's mother). As Macedonia was already wracked by civil war, Philip's and Eurydice's deaths made the political situation in Macedonia even more chaotic. Olympias emerged as ruler for a time before being supplanted by Cassander. She was finally murdered by an angry mob of Macedonians. See Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl. Hist.*, 19. 51

death in 317 BCE. Upon Philip's death, Alexander IV was listed as king and the calendar of years restarted with year one.

Dra Abu el-Naga Papyrus 29-86-509¹⁸ and Dra Abu el-Naga Papyrus 29-86-512¹⁹

Both of these papyri are dated by Reich to the tenth year of Alexander IV's reign, which would have been the year 307 BCE.²⁰ It is with these papyri that we begin to enter controversial territory.²¹ According to Diodorus Siculus' account, while Cassander's army was fighting the forces loyal to Alexander the Great's mother Olympias, Olympias was killed by a group of vengeful Macedonians.²² Cassander then had almost total control of Macedonia and – almost as important – Alexander IV and his mother, the Bactrian princess Roxane, became Cassander's captives.

Knowing that he held the most dangerous pieces in the grand chess game played by Alexander the Great's former generals, Diodorus Siculus writes that Cassander had Alexander IV and Roxane imprisoned.²³ Later, when he heard rumors that word was being spread throughout Macedonia that Alexander IV was old enough to become king, Cassander became frightened (φοβηθεῖς) and had Alexander IV and Roxane murdered and secretly buried.²⁴ According to Diodorus Siculus, these events took place in 311 BCE, in what would have been the seventh year of Alexander IV's solo reign. This, then, is the controversy: how could Alexander IV be given a tenth year of reign in Egypt when, according to Diodorus Siculus, he was murdered in his seventh year as king, in 311 BCE?

Julius Reich was also intrigued by the dates of these two papyri. However, his examination of them was unusual. In an article entitled, "A Notary of Ancient Thebes," Reich examined the dates of the papyri, but did so by writing a fictional recreation of a day in the life of an Egyptian notary, with Peteshe –

18. Reich, "Papyrus," 14-15. El-Amir lists this papyrus as "Ph. III, MIZ. VII, pl. 1-2." Zauzich lists it as "Urkunde 3: P. Philadelphia 3 (= P. Kairo 89363)." See El-Amir 13-16 and Zauzich, *Schreibertradition*, 12.

19. Reich, "Papyrus," 15. El-Amir lists this papyrus as "Ph. IV, MIZ. VII, pl. 3-4." Zauzich lists it as "Urkunde 96: P. Philadelphia 4." This papyrus is not given a Cairo number because it is still in possession of the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania. See El-Amir 17-21 and Zauzich, *Schreibertradition*, 74.

20. According to Reich (using the Egyptian system of regnal years) both papyri were written on different days in the month of Tybi: March, 307 BCE. Reich, "Papyrus," 14-15.

21. Primarily because it starts to become difficult to reason out the dating of the papyri when compared to the dates in Diodorus' account. After all, the oldest dated Greek document from Egypt (Porten and Farber 409), Papyrus Elephantine 1 (P. Berlin 13500), self-dates to 310 BCE, and states that it was written "In the seventh year of the reign of Alexander, the son of Alexander, in the fourteenth year of the satrapship of Ptolemy in the month of Dios..." (Porten and Farber 408). However, it is much easier to believe that a scribe could make a one year mistake (311 BCE carrying over to 310 BCE) than the seven year discrepancy one finds in Dra Abu el-Naga Papyrus 29-86-509 & 29-86-512.

22. Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl. Hist.*, 19. 51.

23. Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl. Hist.*, 19. 52.

24. Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl. Hist.*, 19. 105.

the Egyptian scribe who actually wrote (and signed) papyrus 29-86-509—as the central character.²⁵ While it does not mention Alexander IV in the title, the focus of Reich's article is an attempt to explain how the Egyptian notary Peteshe could have made the "mistake" of dating a transaction during the tenth year of Alexander IV's reign.

After a brief recollection of the political situation in Alexandria under Ptolemy I, Reich shifts his focus to events that took place "away up the Nile at the ancient capital, Thebes...".²⁶ According to Reich, Peteshe began writing the deed, but stopped long enough to address his customers, "He explained that as he had not been officially informed of the murder of Alexander (IV), he would ignore it altogether and date the document in the tenth year of the reign of Alexander IV."²⁷ Reich has Peteshe explain his actions by reciting a number of things that the scribe had observed: "...a second reason for (his dating was) that Ptolemy, the Satrap, continued rebuilding part of the great Temple of Amon-Ra in Thebes in the name of Pharaoh Alexander (IV)... a third circumstance which made him doubt the truth of the story was that Ptolemy has ordered to be erected the great granite statue of Alexander (IV)."²⁸ Finally, Reich (as Peteshe) reasons, "if the story were actually true and Alexander (IV) had in fact been murdered, he would not know how to date the document at all because the only method of dating the document which he knew was to write the year of the reigning Pharaoh, counting the years from the beginning of his reign. Therefore, to date the document at all, it was necessary for him to assume that Alexander (IV) was still Pharaoh."²⁹

Reich then reproduces the text of papyrus 29-86-509 in its entirety and, finished with his pantomime as Peteshe, writes the following: "the interesting point to which I wish to call special attention is that the notary in dating his document as he did establishes the fact that although King Alexander IV was murdered in 311 B. C., business and official documents were dated as of his reign as late as 307 B. C."³⁰ Reich continues, "This papyrus, therefore, besides its importance for other facts of history, forms a new proof that Ptolemy I Soter continued to rule in Egypt as Satrap in the name of the murdered King Alexander IV. It would seem that he officially concealed the murder of his overlord until he became Pharaoh of Egypt himself."³¹ This strange article by Reich provides the reader with more questions than answers, but the most

25. N.J. Reich, "A Notary of Ancient Thebes," *The Museum Journal* (University of Pennsylvania) 14 (1923): 22-25. Papyrus 29-56-512 was also written by Peteshe, but is not covered in Reich's recreation of events.

26. Reich, "Notary," 23.

27. Reich, "Notary," 23.

28. Reich, "Notary," 23. Interestingly, a large temple to the Egyptian god Khnum was built on Elephantine and dedicated in the name of Alexander IV. See Bertha Porter and Rosalind L.B. Moss, *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings*, vol. 5: Upper Egypt: Sites (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937), 227. Note that Alexander IV is here called "Alexander II (Alexander the Great was the first Pharaoh named Alexander)."

29. Reich, "Notary," 23.

30. Reich, "Notary," 24-25.

31. Reich, "Notary," 25.

important question to be raised is why Reich felt it necessary to participate in such a unusual exercise in order to arrive at such an unlikely scenario, all in an attempt to explain the dates of papyrus 29-86-509, and by proxy, 29-86-512.

In response, it is important to note that 29-86-509 and 29-86-512 were written in the same year and month, but are two separate documents, written on different days. Reich certainly must have known this and also knew that this fact effectively eliminated the possibility of scribal error. Certainly, a scribe could make a mistake regarding a year or ruler once, but since both papyri were written by the same notary (Peteshe) on two separate occasions, this possibility seems highly unlikely.

Second, the existence of papyrus 29-86-523B, which describes itself as being written in the seventh year of Philip Arrhidaeus' reign (317 BCE) and papyrus 29-86-508, which self-dates itself to the third year of Alexander IV's reign (314 BCE), eliminated the possibility that the Egyptian scribes somehow backdated Alexander IV's reign into the time when he ruled as "co-regent" with his father's half-brother Philip Arrhidaeus.³² Reich found himself in a difficult situation. How could one account for the dates found on papyrus 29-86-509 and 29-86-512 and not disagree with both the account and the date of Alexander IV's death as described in Diodorus Siculus? After all, if one follows the dating in Diodorus Siculus, Alexander IV had been dead for four years when the deed was written. Perhaps out of desperation, Reich came up with the scenario described above: the Egyptians had "heard rumors" of Alexander IV's death in 311 BCE, but since no one else had declared themselves Pharaoh of Egypt, documents would continue to be dated under the reign of Alexander IV.³³

Reich's theory regarding stubborn, literate Egyptians refusing to accept Alexander IV's death for some reason was recently dusted off (without citing Reich) by Jona Lendering, writing at *livius.org*: "Although in Babylonia and Egypt, people continued to date letters according to the regnal years of the boy-king Alexander IV, the main result of the treaty (between the Diadochi in 311 BCE) was that Roxane and the twelve year old Alexander were killed: neither Cassander, nor his enemies could allow the boy to live."³⁴ This statement is

32. This "co-regent" explanation has been used by other scholars to attempt to explain aberrant dates for Alexander IV's reign, but in this particular case, the dating system utilized by the Demotic papyri do not allow for such convenient reasoning. For examples of the "co-regent" hypothesis, see Sidney Smith's excellent overview of various scholarly theories (prior to 1925) regarding the death of Alexander IV in his article, "The Chronology of Philip Arrhidaeus, Antigonos and Alexander IV," *Revue d'Assyriologie et Archéologie*, 22(1925): 179-197. Smith's own conclusions regarding the chronology, are, however, dated and should not be trusted. Also of note is that the card catalogue in the University of Pennsylvania's Museum which deals with the Demotic Egyptian papyri follows this erroneous "co-regent" hypothesis. Thus, the card for 29-86-509 and 29-86-512 dates them to 314/ 313 BCE.

33. Further, as we shall see below, according to the account of Diodorus, Ptolemy *had* declared himself king of Egypt in 311 BCE. Reich wants it both ways: he wants Diodorus to be correct and Peteshe to be correct. It is incredulous to suggest that an Egyptian official such as Peteshe would somehow follow his own impulses and continue to date government documents by the reign of the dead king Alexander IV.

34. Jona Lendering, "Alexander IV," *Livius*, last modified 21 April 2019, <https://bit.ly/2VitB8F>.

misleading, as the documents in question are not letters written by commoners ("people"), but rather government documents written by representatives of the governments in question; thus Reich's previous labyrinthine theorizing.

Louvre Demotic Papyrus 2427³⁵ and Louvre Demotic Papyrus 2420³⁶

Both of these papyri are dated as being written in the thirteenth year of Alexander IV's reign: 305/ 304 BCE.³⁷ Alexander IV would have been 18 or 19 years old. Both papyri are from Thebes and both deal with the sale of a house. El-Amir does not list these papyri. Zauzich, perhaps hoping to avoid controversy, lists the papyri and translates their contents, but spends very little time postulating as to what the dates could mean.³⁸ N.J. Reich apparently did not know of these papyri or, if he did, chose not to deal with them. In Reich's defense, they are notably difficult to deal with. How does one reason out the information that, in Egypt at least, Alexander IV was still considered to be king up until the time he would have been physically old enough to rule on his own? T.C. Skeat, a contemporary of Reich's who had an article published in Reich's journal *Mizraim*,³⁹ knew of the two Louvre papyri. It was Skeat who came up with an inventive –and influential– way of dealing with the controversial information they contained.

T.C. Skeat and "The Secret Kingship" Theory

In his short and well-organized book, *The Reigns of the Ptolemies*, Skeat at times seems to accept the dubious scenario that the Egyptian scribes knew Alexander IV died in 311 BCE, but continued to date documents by his reign for seven more years. At one point, Skeat writes, "in Egypt, the demotic scribes refused to accept (Alexander IV's death)...," an occurrence which Skeat describes as a "curious phenomenon."⁴⁰ However, in the course of his

35. Reich does not mention this papyrus. El-Amir knows of this papyrus, but only lists it in a footnote. See El-Amir, *A Family Archive from Thebes*, 20. Zauzich lists this papyrus as "Urkunde 97: P. Louvre 2427." See Zauzich, *Schreibertradition*, 74. Zauzich writes that he used photographs for his investigation of Louvre 2427 and Louvre 2440: "Für die folgende Umschrift wurde ein Foto benutzt." This indicates that his information should be more reliable than E. Révillout's handwritten copy of these two papyri. See Zauzich, *Schreibertradition*, 12 and 74. For Révillout's "handcopy" of Louvre 2427 and 2440, see Eugène Révillout, *Chrestomathie Démotique*, vol. 3 (Paris: F. Viewig, 1880), 219-223, 479-481.

36. Reich does not mention this papyrus. El-Amir does not mention this papyrus. Zauzich lists this papyrus as "Urkunde 4: P. Louvre 2440." See Zauzich, *Schreibertradition*, 12-13.

37. Dating/ translation of these papyri by Zauzich. See Zauzich, *Schreibertradition*, 12 and 74.

38. Zauzich, *Schreibertradition*, 12 and 74.

39. Theodore Cressy (T.C.) Skeat, "A Greek Mathematical Tablet," *Mizraim*, 3(1936): 18-25.

40. Theodore Cressy Skeat, *The Reigns of the Ptolemies*, 2nd edition, *Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung*, 39 (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1968), 29.

investigation, Skeat invented an influential scenario regarding the late dating of the papyri. He theorized that Ptolemy openly gave himself the title of king—as would be visible on the government documents—in 304 BCE, but had been acting as king ever since he was secretly informed about the death of Alexander IV, years earlier: "In 304 (BCE) then, Ptolemy became king in name as well as in deed."⁴¹ Skeat lists several other parallels from other parts of the empire that seem to back this date up, including the "Babylonian Tablets," which first give the title "king" to the satrap Seleucus in the same year of 304 BCE.⁴²

This "secret kingship" scenario has influenced several other scholars in the decades since it was first proposed. Erhard Grzybek,⁴³ Ludwig Koenen,⁴⁴ Reinhold Merkelbach,⁴⁵ Günther Hölbl⁴⁶ and Tom Boiy⁴⁷ all follow this scenario. However, few scholars have attempted to explain exactly why the satraps waited so long to openly declare themselves kings. Hölbl, however, does attempt an explanation of Ptolemy's reasoning and it is quite inventive: "The long period of time between (Ptolemy's) adoption of the title of (king) and the establishment of a calendar on the basis of his reign...clearly shows the coronation ceremony was planned in every detail."⁴⁸ In other words, Ptolemy held off declaring himself king to minutely plan his coronation party!

All of these theories, old and recent, revolve around attempting to somehow reason out the differences in dating between the Demotic papyri and the historical account of Diodorus. However, when one examines the events surrounding Alexander IV and the movement of the Diadochi from satraps to kings in the writings of Diodorus, one discovers a problem with the date originally given for the end of the satrapies. In his account, Diodorus records the regnal events taking place not once but twice.

Diodorus' Dates Regarding the End of the Satrapies

As we discussed previously, according to Diodorus' account, Cassander ordered the deaths of Alexander IV and Roxane in 311 BCE and ordered the murderer, Glaucias, to keep the deaths secret. In the same section, Diodorus writes that Cassander, Lysimachus, Ptolemy and Antigonus were all relieved by Alexander IV's death, "for from that point onward, with no living heir to inherit the kingdom (of Alexander the Great), each of those rulers over cities or nations had ambitions for royal power and they ruled the territories that had

41. Skeat, *Ptolemies* 28.

42. Skeat, *Ptolemies* 28.

43. Erhard Grzybek, *Du Calendrier Macédonien au Calendrier Ptolémaïque: Problèmes de Chronologie Hellénistique* (Basel: F. Reinhardt, 1990), 90, 96f.

44. Ludwig Koenen, "The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure," *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 57.

45. Reinhold Merkelbach, "Zur ENKATOXH im Sarapeum zu Memphis," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 103(1994): 293-296.

46. Günther Hölbl, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire* (London: Routledge, 2001)

47. Boiy 89, 90.

48. Hölbl 32.

been placed under their authority as if it were a kingdom... ."49 In other words, according to Diodorus Siculus, after hearing of Alexander IV's death, Alexander the Great's remaining generals no longer ruled as satraps but instead openly ruled as kings of their respective "cities or nations" in 311 BCE.⁵⁰

In a later chapter, Diodorus spins a second tale detailing the events behind the Diadochi beginning to rule as kings. This second scenario is set in 307 BCE and holds that after Antigonus (Monophthalmus) and his son Demetrius defeated Ptolemy's forces in a naval battle near Cyprus, Antigonus and Demetrius decided to declare themselves kings. Diodorus remarks that "the remaining lords (δυνάσται) were jealous of (Antigonus and Demetrius) and so they also began to call themselves kings."⁵¹ This included Ptolemy, Seleucus, Lysimachus and Cassander. This seems to be in contrast to what Diodorus recorded previously regarding events after Alexander IV's purported death in 311 BCE.

Why the discrepancy? It is possible that Diodorus had at his disposal two different accounts of exactly when the Diadochi moved from acting as satraps to openly acting as kings. Both scenarios are reasonable: the death of Alexander IV effectively did away with the need for a "satrap" or a guardian ruler and if one "lord" began calling himself "king," the others would follow suit. There is, however, cause for concern. We must not forget that this very important movement from satrap to king occurs twice in Diodorus Siculus' account, and dates for the events are contradicted by the reliable Demotic Egyptian Papyri. This raises the possibility that both dates given in Diodorus are incorrect, especially when further evidence is examined.⁵²

The "Babylonian Tablets"

A series of records from Babylon—known by the blanket term "Babylonian Tablets"—exist which provide several lists of dates of the reigns of many kings, both Babylonian and Hellenistic. These lists were written in cuneiform, inscribed on clay tablets. Two of these tablets are important to our study: the tablet known as the *Diadochi Chronicle* (BCHP 3; ABC 10, Chronicle 10) and the tablet known as *Babylonian King List of the Hellenistic Period* ("King List 6," BM 35603, Sp. III 113). To understand the *Babylonian King List...*, one must first read the *Diadochi Chronicle*.

49. Diodorus, *Bibl. Hist.*, 19.105.

50. Worthington's *By the Spear: Philip II, Alexander the Great, and the Rise and Fall of the Macedonian Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) follows this scenario. See: Ian Worthington, *By The Spear: Philip II, Alexander the Great, and the Rise and Fall of the Macedonian Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 300, 327.

51. Diodorus, *Bibl. Hist.*, 20. 52.

52. For a very good overview of several lines of criticism regarding the reliability of Diodorus' dates, see Edward M. Anson, "Diodorus and the Date of Triparadeisus," *The American Journal of Philology*, 107(1986): 208-217; Erich S. Gruen, "The Coronation of the Diadochoi," *The Craft of the Ancient Historian* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1985), 253-27 and Meeus, 76-93.

In the *Diadochi Chronicle*, we learn that when Seleucus took over Babylon, he announced that he was ruling as co-regent for Alexander IV. Therefore, dates for the reign of Seleucus would also be dates for the reign of Alexander IV: "[Seleu]cus spoke as follows: 'Year 7 of Antig[onus the general as year 6 of Alexander, son of] [Reverse iv.4] idem [i.e. Alexander] and Seleucus the general, you will count.'" ⁵³ In this section, the tablet claims Seleucus himself ordered the chroniclers to count year seven of the reign of Antigonus as year six of the co-reign of Seleucus and Alexander IV. This command is dated to 311 BCE, which means that, according to the altered Babylonian record, Alexander IV was listed as beginning his reign in 317 BCE. The co-regent status of Seleucus and Alexander IV was continued throughout the remainder of the *Chronicle of the Diadochi* tablet, which breaks off at the year 309 BCE.

Further information about this time period can be found in the *Babylonian King List*... This tablet reads, "[Obverse 3] For [n] years there was no king in the country. Antigonus, [Obv.4] general-in-chief of the army, ruled the land." ⁵⁴ This is the seven years referred to in the *Chronicle of the Diadochi*, which Seleucus ordered to be counted as six years. The *Babylonian King List*... continues, "[Obverse 5] Alexander [IV], son of Alex[ander III]: 6 years." ⁵⁵ [Obv.6] Year 7, which is year 1: Seleucus (I Nicator was) king." ⁵⁶ Here, the translator includes the following note: "this means: The 7th year of the Seleucid Era (305/304 BCE) = the first year of Seleucus I Nicator as king." ⁵⁷ Thus, according to the information from Babylon, Seleucus reigned as co-regent, or satrap, in the East until the year 305/304 BCE when he openly ruled as sole regent, or king. ⁵⁸ This date matches up with the date of the last year of Alexander IV's reign given in the Demotic papyri. It is important to note that the Babylonian dating is independent of the Egyptian scribal tradition.

The Parian Chronicle

The date of 305/304 BCE as the year when Seleucus openly declared himself king has a parallel in a source that claims Ptolemy first declared himself king in that same year. This information comes from Greece, in a

53. Translation of this section by I.L. Finkel, R.J. van der Spek and R. Pirngruber. This material is to be published in *Babylonian Chronographic Texts from the Hellenistic Period* (BCHP; Writings of the Ancient World, forthcoming in 2020). At the time the current article was written, the translation can only be found at: <https://bit.ly/2JCLVqF>.

54. Translation by R.J. van der Spek. This material will also be included in *Babylonian Chronographic Texts from the Hellenistic Period*, but currently can only be found at <https://bit.ly/2YtBmuh>.

55. After this line, the translator has entered a "?" which may mean the date is less than certain.

56. Tran.by: van der Spek.

57. Note by van der Spek.

58. Boiy claims that the Babylonian Tablets provide Alexander IV with "several posthumous years." After this brief remark, Boiy provides no other explanation for this practice on the part of the Babylonians, except to lump this occurrence in with the dates from the Demotic papyri. Boiy, 90.

section of information found on the lower register of the Parian Chronicle. Here, the account states that Ptolemy "assumed the diadem" in the year 305/304 BCE.⁵⁹ This reference is compelling for a number of reasons, but primarily because the Parian Chronicle dates from 264/263 BCE, roughly one generation after the events in question. Also of note is that the information comes from yet another Greek source and a source that can definitively be described as being independent of the Egyptian scribal tradition.⁶⁰

The "Canon of Ptolemy"

Another reference to 305/304 BCE as the year that Ptolemy declared himself king of Egypt dates from much later in history. It is the so-called "Canon of Ptolemy," a list of the years each Egyptian pharaoh or king ruled.⁶¹ The list was compiled (or possibly copied directly) by Claudius Ptolemaeus (a.k.a. Ptolemy), a well-known Egyptian mathematician and astronomer (among other achievements) whose *floruit* was the 2nd century CE.⁶² The list states that Ptolemy I's reign began in 305/304 BCE and, more tellingly, lists the years for Alexander IV's reign as 317 BCE to 305/304 BCE. This is, of course, yet another reference to 305/304 BCE as the end of Alexander IV's reign.

Eusebius of Casarea's *Chronicle* and Porphyry of Tyre

Another reference to the above dates for the end of the satrapies can be found in the *Chronicle* of the Christian historian Eusebius of Caesarea. Eusebius based his description of Alexander the Great and the Diadochi's activities in Egypt on a now lost historical account that Eusebius attributes to someone named Porphyry (Porphyrius).⁶³ Apparently, this was the pagan philosopher

59. FGrHist 239, B 23.

60. The Parian Chronicle (also known as The Parian Marble and *Marmor Parium*) was discovered on Paros, an island in the Cyclades chain. The chronicle ceases its dating with the reign of an Athenian Archon named Diognetus (3rd Century BCE).

61. The list is known by a number of names including, "The Canon of Kings," "Ptolemy's Canon" and "Canon Basileōn." For a relatively recent reconstruction and translation of the Canon see G.J. Toomer, *Ptolemy's Almagest* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 10-11. The list was also part of a group of documents Ptolemy composed known as the "Handy Tables" or "Procheiroi Kanones." They are partially preserved in the writings of Theon of Alexandria. For a recent study of these tables, see Anne Tihon, "Theon of Alexandria and Ptolemy's *Handy Tables*," *Ancient Astronomy and Celestial Divination*, ed. N. M. Swerdlow (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999), 357-369.

62. Skeat claims that the Canon contained information that came directly from the Egyptian Demotic Scribes. He writes, "*the system followed is that of the demotic scribes; rarely used by the Greeks...*" (italics by Skeat; see Skeat 5). As we have demonstrated, statements such as this no longer hold up to scrutiny.

63. Currently, only fragments remain of Eusebius' *Chronicle* (also known as the *Chronicon*) in Greek. It was preserved in Armenian and was finally brought back to the attention of western scholars in the late 18th and early 19th century. For a full account of this fascinating story, see Alden Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and the Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg: Bucknell Press, 1979).

Porphyrus of Tyre (c. 234 CE – c. 304 CE). According to the account preserved by Eusebius, Philip Arrhidaeus succeeded Alexander the Great in 324 BCE and a year after this event, Ptolemy travelled to Egypt and became satrap (323/ 322 BCE).⁶⁴ The account mentions that Arrhidaeus reigned for seven years before he was murdered by Olympias, Alexander the Great's mother.⁶⁵ Importantly, the account gives separate dates for the reign of Ptolemy in Egypt as satrap and as king: Ptolemy reigned as satrap in Egypt for 17 years and then ruled with the title of king for 38 years.⁶⁶ Therefore, this set of dates also indicates that Ptolemy gave himself the title of king in the year 305/ 304 BCE.

The Royal Macedonian Tombs of Vergina

These dates bring us to investigating the discovery of the royal Macedonian cemetery of Aegae, near the modern Greek village of Vergina, in the 1970's.⁶⁷ The find was remarkable on a number of levels. Its excavation revealed the first known tomb complex of the Macedonian royal family; the family of Alexander the Great. There were three tombs found in the complex: Tomb I had been broken into and looted at some point in the past, but Tombs II and III were undisturbed and had interiors richly appointed with gold, silver and other precious objects.

It has recently been determined that Tomb I contained the inhumed (not cremated) bones of three individuals: a man in his late forties, a woman in her late teens and a newborn of indeterminate gender or specific age.⁶⁸ Tomb II contained the cremated remains of a man in his late thirties and the cremated

64. .H. Petermann and A. Schöne, eds. and trans., *Eusebi Chronicorum Libri Duo*, 3rd ed. (1886; Zurich: Weidmann, 1999), 230-233.

65. Eusebi Chronicorum 231.

66. See: Mosshammer, 50-80. Eusebius' *Chronicle* and the *Chronicon Paschale* (written in the early 7th century CE) are in agreement that Ptolemy was king of Egypt for forty years, but Eusebius' *Chronicle* contains the extra information that Ptolemy turned the kingdom over to his son Ptolemy II for the last two years of his reign, thus technically making Ptolemy's solo reign 38, not 40 years. For an excellent introduction to the *Chronicon Paschale*, see Michael Whitby and Mary Whitby, "Introduction," *Chronicon Paschale 284-628 AD* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989), ix-xxix. Since there is general agreement between the *Chronicle* and the *Chronicon Paschale* on this point (and many scholars agree that the *Chronicon Paschale* was at least partially dependent on Eusebius' *Chronicle* for its dating), we have chosen not to examine the *Chronicon Paschale* separately regarding this particular inquiry.

67. The account by the man who discovered the tombs, Professor Manolis Andronicus, is still the best. See *Vergina: the Royal Tombs and the Ancient City* (Athens: Ekodotike Athenon, 1984).

68. Antonis Bartsiakos, Juan-Luis Arsuaga, Elena Santos, Milagros Algaba, and Asier Gómez-Olivencia, "The Lameness of King Philip II and Royal Tomb I at Vergina, Macedonia," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 112, no. 32 (2015): 9844-9848. There are, however, some who have misgivings about this study. See: Kristina Killgrove, "Twisted Knee Might Identify Alexander The Great's Father, But Some Are Skeptical," *Forbes* July 20, 2015, <https://bit.ly/2LDw2CV>.

remains of a woman in her twenties.⁶⁹ Tomb III contained cremated remains of one individual.⁷⁰ The remains were found in a solid silver hydria that had been crowned with a solid gold wreath or crown of oak leaves. The remains were wrapped in a purple cloth.⁷¹ Several intact and well preserved bones and teeth were found extant from the cremation, and, after examination, the occupant of Tomb III was estimated to have been fifteen to seventeen years old.⁷² Tomb III was determined to have been constructed after Tombs I and II; evidence was found that its construction disturbed the locus of Tombs I and II.⁷³

Previous opinion varied as to the occupants of the Tomb I: some scholars claimed it belonged to Philip II, others that it belonged to Philip Arrhidaeus.⁷⁴ A recent comprehensive reexamination of the occupants of Tomb I, utilizing new forms of technology now available to osteologists, have determined that the occupants of Tomb I were probably Philip II, his young (and recent) wife Cleopatra and their newborn daughter.⁷⁵ This identification means that the inhabitants of Tomb II are Philip Arrhidaeus and Eurydice.⁷⁶ The lone occupant

69. Bartsiokas "The Lameness...", 9844-9846; Nikolaos (N.I.) Xirotiris and Franziska Langenscheidt, "The Cremations from the Royal Macedonian Tombs of Vergina," *Archaiologike Ephemeris* 157(1981): 142-160.

70. Andronicus 212; Bartsiokas "The Lameness..." 9844-9846; Xirotiris and Langenscheidt 157.

71. Andronicus 212.

72. Andronicus 231; Bartsiokas "The Lameness..." 9844-9846; Xirotiris and Langenscheidt 157.

73. Andronicus 224.

74. Antonis Bartsiokas has long been a proponent of the theory that the remains from Tomb I are Philip II. His research on the topic is not limited to the 2015 publication cited above. See also: "The Eye Injury of King Philip II and the Skeletal Evidence from the Royal Tomb II at Vergina," (*Science* 21 Apr 2000): 511-514, Angela M.H. Schuster, "Not Philip II of Macedon: An Interview with Antonis Bartsiokas," *Archaeology* (April 20, 2000), <https://bit.ly/2VnHXob>; and Philip Chang, "New Controversy Over Occupant of Ancient Tomb," *The New York Times* (April 25, 2000), <https://nyti.ms/2WKnFqi>. Bartsiokas also participated in a published experiment that demonstrated how the large wound found on a male leg bone from Tomb I can be recreated on a cadaver, thus further demonstrating that the damage to the leg bone found in Tomb I matches historical accounts of a war injury of Philip II. See: Nicholas J. Brandmeir, Russell A. Payne, Elias B. Rizk, R Shane Tubbs, Juan Luis Arsuaga, Antonis Bartsiokas, "The Leg Wound of King Philip II of Macedonia," *Cureus Journal of Medical Science*, 10, no. 4(2018): e2501. <https://bit.ly/2VBXCVP>. It must be noted that the Arrhidaeus/ Tomb II theory is convincing as it would necessarily follow that the female occupant of Tomb II is Philip Arrhidaeus' wife, the princess (and woman warrior) Eurydice and would explain the profusion of weapons in the antechamber section of Tomb II where the female remains were found. For more information see: Elizabeth Donnelly Carney, "Commemoration of a Royal Woman as a Warrior: The Burial in the Antechamber of Tomb II at Vergina," *Syllecta Classica*, 27(2016): 109-149. Regardless, a recent article once again claims that Philip II, not Arrhidaeus, is the inhabitant of Tomb II. See: Theodore G. (T.G.) Antikas and L.K. Wynn-Antikas, "New Finds from the Cremains in Tomb II at Aegae Point to Philip II and a Scythian Princess," *International Journal of Osteoarchaeology* 26 (2016): 682-692. It is worth mentioning that Andronicus, the archeologist who discovered the Vergina tombs, believed Philip II was the occupant of Tomb II: Andronicus, 226-231.

75. Bartsiokas 9844-9848.

76. Bartsiokas 9844-9848. See also: Eugene N. Borza and O. Palagia, "The Chronology of the Macedonian Royal Tombs at Vergina," *JDAI*, 122 (2007): 81-125

of Tomb III was initially difficult to identify, primarily due to the researchers' reliance on the dating of Diodorus Siculus. How could the bones of a young man fifteen to seventeen years old possibly be those of Alexander IV when Diodorus claims Alexander IV died at a much younger age? Regardless, it now seems clear that the young man's remains found in Tomb III are those of Alexander IV; this conclusion came in spite of the dates given for Alexander IV's life in Diodorus Siculus.⁷⁷ As one might expect, the dating of the bones found in Tomb III have also been the subject of some controversy.⁷⁸ Regardless, the bones in Tomb III most likely belong to Alexander IV, and the estimated developmental age of the skeletal remains indicate that he died in the 305/304 BCE age range.

Updating the "Secret Kingship" Theory

The information above, taken from many different sources from many different areas all over the Empires of the Successors, all point to 305/304 BCE for the end of Alexander IV's reign. Accepting this information is nothing new; many scholars now adhere to Skeate's "secret kingship" theory, a clever way to blend Diodorus' date for Alexander IV's death with the well-established, non-Diodorus date of 305/304 BCE for the end of the satrapies. However, the material information revealed by the Vergina tombs is so intriguing and difficult to dispute that it allows us to propose a new theory: the satraps ruled as kings—without formally declaring themselves kings—while Alexander IV was regent in name only and described as such on government documents. During this time, Alexander IV lived a guarded existence (but was alive), he grew up and when he reached the age of 18 (or came close to that age), he died in Macedonia.

This theory is not so different from the "secret kingship" theory; it merely blends in the relatively new archaeological evidence regarding the bones of the occupant of Vergina "Tomb III" with the already existent theory. One wonders, however, if there are any other pieces of evidence that could lend further credence to this new theory. For further evidence, one need only further examine the Vergina tomb complex and also the numismatic records of Alexander IV's reign from the kingdom in which he and his mother were being held captive: Macedonia.

77 .Andronicus 231; Bartsiokas "The Lameness..." 9847; Xiotiris & F. Langenscheidt 142-160 and Winthrop Lindsay Adams, "Cassander, Alexander IV and the Tombs at Vergina," *The Ancient World*, 22 (1991): 27-33.

78. Jonathan Musgrave has written several articles and rebuttals to demonstrate his belief that the skeletal remains in Tomb III were much younger than Xiotiris & Langenscheidt's estimations, but these are clearly aimed at propping up his belief that Tomb II contained the bones of Philip II, not Arrhidaeus. See "Dust and Damn'd Oblivion: A Study of Cremation in Ancient Greece," *The Annual of the British School at Athens*, 11 (1990): 271-299. See also Jonathan Musgrave, "The Human Remains from Vergina Tombs I, II and III: An Overview," *Ancient World*, 22 (1991): 3-9. On page 3 of this article, Musgrave wrote that his goal in researching the bones was to "persuade you that the bones from Tomb II belonged to Philip II and (one of his wives)."

The existence of Tomb III rules out a secret burial for Alexander IV, like that of which Diodorus writes. The construction of a new tomb that bordered on, and actually damaged the dirt around the tomb of Philip would not have gone unnoticed by the Macedonian populace. It is important to remember that the people of Macedonia worshipped Philip II and his family as gods. We see vivid proof of this with the "heroon" or permanent sacrificial shrine Andronicus found in the strata directly above Tomb II at Vergina.⁷⁹ Granted, the royal cemetery of Aegae was approximately two kilometers from the town of Aegae, but the heroon above Tombs I & II would have been regarded as sacred and work being done around it to construct Tomb III could not have happened until after Alexander IV's death had been announced. In other words, it is difficult to believe that the people of Macedonia would have allowed anyone outside the deified Philip II's deified family to be buried in the royal cemetery of Aegae. And, again, it is important to mention that the wealth and size of the tomb indicates its royal status. Another compelling point is the fact that numerous attestations for the practice of worship sacrifices were found *in situ* above Tomb III; clearly an indication of the occupant of the tomb being worshipped as divine after his entombment.⁸⁰

The contents of Tomb III also offer compelling evidence that Alexander IV did not die in 311 BCE. The most telling items are the objects in the southwest corner: a linen cuirass, bronze greaves and a composite pectoral.⁸¹ These indicate the possessions of an adolescent being trained in the arts of war. According to Macedonian custom, this would have begun at the age of 14 when male members of the royal family were made "royal pages" and began to follow the king around on hunts and military maneuvers.⁸² Further proof of this comes from the two wreaths found in the tomb. The wreath of myrtle flowers and terracotta berries found near the southwest corner is the symbol of a young king.⁸³ In contrast, the wreath that crowned the silver hydria (in which the cremated remains were found) was a gold wreath of oak leaves; the oak being the sacred tree of Zeus. It seems clear that this was Alexander IV's crown, possibly given to him when he became a royal page.⁸⁴ Also of importance are the two cavalry spear-heads found on the same table as the hydria and crown.⁸⁵ These must have been used by the young king on his expeditions as a royal page.

Numismatic evidence seems to back up the theory that Alexander IV lived long enough to become a royal page. Although at the present only silver and bronze Macedonian coins have been found from his reign, there are a wide

79. Andronicus 65.

80. Andronicus, 224.

81. Andronicus 217.

82. See N.G.L. Hammond and G.T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia*, vol. II (New York: Oxford, 1979), 168f, 396, 401 and N.G.L. Hammond and F.W. Walbank, *A History of Macedonia* vol. III (New York: Oxford, 1988), 167.

83. Andronicus 82.

84. It is significant to note that of the Greek gold wreaths that have been discovered intact so far, only three are oak and two of the three come from the tombs at Vergina.

85. Andronicus 82.

variety of different engravings on the coins.⁸⁶ Different bronze coins feature: the head of Apollo and on the reverse a horse and rider; the head of a young Herakles (or is this Alexander IV?) and on the reverse a club and bow; the Macedonian star and a plumed helmet on the reverse. Silver coins feature what may be a portrait of Alexander IV⁸⁷ on the obverse and vary between three images on the reverse: a horse and rider, a spear head, or a three-pronged weapon. The depiction of a horse, spear and other weapon may be indicative of the young king's status as a page.

How did Alexander IV die? Was it murder? On this subject, the historical tradition seems most probable. After all, Alexander the Great's enemies had no problem murdering Alexander's older son (and thus Alexander IV's half-brother) Herakles many years before the death of Alexander IV.⁸⁸ One may speculate all one wishes regarding the how and when, but the why was never in any doubt: retention of power.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we are compelled to state that, counter to the dating one finds in Diodorus, the satraps did not declare themselves kings in either the year 311 BCE or the year 307 BCE. Instead, based on the excellent chronological information found in the Demotic Egyptian papyri—and corroborated by information from several contemporary, non-Demotic sources and discoveries from different locations around the Mediterranean—it seems much more likely that satraps ruled for Alexander IV until the year 305/304 BCE and then began to refer to themselves as kings. It further seems clear that the event which led to the satraps declaring themselves kings was the death of Alexander IV. We can therefore state with a good degree of certainty that both Alexander IV's death and the end of his reign should be dated to 305/304 BCE.

There is no controversy in suggesting that the satraps did rule independently in Alexander IV's stead. However, the amazing discovery of the royal Macedonian cemetery at Vergina and the estimated age of Alexander IV's physical remains allows us to suggest a new scenario: rather than rule as "secret kings" from 311-305/304 BCE, the satraps simply continued to do what they had done all along: rule independently. When King Alexander IV died in 305/304 BCE, the satraps logically chose the news as the right time to openly declare themselves the new kings of an already fragmented Alexandrian Empire.

We have demonstrated that the Demotic Egyptian scribes did not, in the words of Skeat, "refuse to accept" the death of Alexander IV.⁸⁹ We can now state without reservation that maintaining the reign of Alexander IV in

86. Hugo Gaebler, *Die antiken Munzen von Makedonia und Paionia*, vol. 2 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1935), 163

87. See: Hammond and Walbank, 162-163; and Gaebler, 163.

88. See: WW Tarn, "Herakles son of Barsine," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 41 (1921): 18-28; and also Hammond and Walbank, 95-98.

89. Skeat, 29.

government documents was not a "curious phenomenon" somehow limited to the Demotic Egyptian scribes.⁹⁰ Also, these scribes also did not carry over the dating from Philip Arrhidaeus' reign into the reign of Alexander IV. Further, we must regard as incorrect Reich's assumption that it is a "fact that although King Alexander IV was murdered in 311 B. C., business and official documents (from Egypt) were dated as of his reign as late as 307 B. C."⁹¹ Instead, what we see in the Demotic papyri is the preservation of information that reflects a tradition found *throughout* the Hellenistic world. Namely, that the life of the young king Alexander IV—and thus also his symbolic reign—ended in 305/304 BCE.

Bibliography

- Adams, Winthrop Lindsay. "Cassander, Alexander IV and the tombs at Vergina." *The Ancient World*, 22(1991): 27-33.
- Andronicus, Manolis. *Vergina: the Royal Tombs and the Ancient City*. Athens: Ekodotike Athenon, 1984.
- Anson, Edward M. "Diodorus and the date of Triparadeisus." *The American Journal of Philology*, 107(1986): 208-217.
- Anson, Edward M. "Dating the deaths of Eumenes and Olympias." *Ancient History Bulletin*, 20(2006): 1-8.
- Anson, Edward M. "The chronology of the third Diadoch war." *Phoenix*, 60(2006): 226-235.
- Antikas, Theodore G. (T.G.) and L.K. Wynn-Antikas. "New finds from the cremains in tomb II at Aegae point to Philip II and a Scythian princess." *International Journal of Osteoarchaeology* 26(2016): 682-692.
- Boiy, Thomas. *Between high and low. A chronology of the early Hellenistic period. Oikumene Studien zur antiken Weltgeschichte*, Bd. 5. Frankfurt: Verlag Antike, 2007.
- Bosworth, A.B. *The legacy of Alexander: politics, warfare, and propaganda under the Successors*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Brandmeir, Nicholas J., Russell A. Payne, Elias B. Rizk, R Shane Tubbs, Juan Luis Arsuaga, Antonis Bartsiokas. "The leg wound of King Philip II of Macedonia." *Cureus Journal of Medical Science*, 10, no. 4(2018): e2501. <https://bit.ly/2VBXCVP>.
- Bartsiokas, Antonis. "The eye injury of King Philip II and the skeletal evidence from the royal tomb II at Vergina." *Science*, 21(2000): 511-514.
- Bartsiokas, Antonis, Juan-Luis Arsuaga, Elena Santos, Milagros Algaba, and Asier Gómez-Olivencia. "The lameness of King Philip II and royal tomb I at Vergina, Macedonia." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 112, no. 32(2015): 9844-9848.
- Borza, Eugene N. and O. Palagia. "The chronology of the Macedonian royal tombs at Vergina." *JDAI*, 122(2007): 81–125.
- Chang, Philip. "New controversy over occupant of ancient tomb." *The New York Times* (April 25, 2000). <https://nyti.ms/2WKnFqi>.

90. Skeat, 29.

91. Reich, "Notary," 24-25.

- Donnelly Carney, Elizabeth. "Commemoration of a royal woman as a warrior: the burial in the antechamber of tomb II at Vergina." *Syllecta Classica* 27(2016): 109-149.
- El-Amir, Mustafa. *A Family Archive from Thebes*. Cairo: Government Printing Offices, 1959.
- Errington, R. Malcom. "Diodorus Siculus and the chronology of the early Diadochoi, 320-311 B.C." *Hermes* 105(1977): 478-504.
- Finkel, I.L., R. Pimgruber and R.J. van der Spek. "BCHP 3 (Diadochi Chronicle)." *Livius*. <https://bit.ly/2JCLVqF>.
- Gaebler, Hugo. *Die antiken Munzen von Makedonia und Paionia*, vol. 2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1935.
- Gruen, Erich S. "The Coronation of the Diadochoi." *The Craft of the Ancient Historian*, 253-271. Lanham: University Press of America, 1985.
- Grzybek, Erhard. *Du Calendrier Macédonien au Calendrier Ptolémaïque: Problèmes de Chronologie Hellénistique*. Basel: F. Reinhardt, 1990.
- Hammond, N.G.L. and G.T. Griffith. *A History of Macedonia*, vol. II. New York: Oxford, 1979.
- Hammond, N.G.L. and F.W. Walbank. *A History of Macedonia*, vol. III. New York: Oxford, 1988.
- Hölbl, Günther. *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Killgrove, Kristina. "Twisted knee might identify Alexander The Great's father, but some are skeptical." *Forbes*. July 20, 2015. <https://bit.ly/2LDw2CV>.
- Koenen, Ludwig. "The Ptolemaic king as a religious figure." *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1993, 25-115.
- Lendering, Jona. "Alexander IV." *Livius*. Last modified 21 April 2019. <https://bit.ly/2VitB8F>.
- Meeus, Alexander. "Diodorus and the chronology of the third Diadoch war." *Phoenix*, 66(2012): 74-96.
- Merkelbach, Reinhold. "Zur ENKATOXH im Sarapeum zu Memphis." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 103(1994): 293-296.
- Mosshammer, Alden. *The Chronicle of Eusebius and the Greek Chronographic Tradition*. Lewisberg: Bucknell Press, 1979.
- Musgrave, Jonathan. "Dust and damn'd oblivion: a study of cremation in ancient Greece." *The Annual of the British School at Athens*, 11(1990): 271-299.
- . "The human remains from Vergina tombs I, II and III: an overview." *Ancient World* 22(1991): 3-9.
- Petermann, J.H. and Schöne, A. (eds.) (trans). *Eusebi Chronicon Libri Duo*. 1886, 3rd ed. Zurich: Weidmann, 1999.
- Porten, Bezalel, Farber, J.J. and Martin, C.J. *The Elephantine Papyri in English* (Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui), 2nd edition. SBL Press: Atlanta, 2011.
- Porter, Bertha and Moss, Rosalind L.B. *Upper Egypt: Sites*. Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings, 5. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937.
- Reich, Nathaniel Julius. "A notary of ancient Thebes." *The Museum Journal*, 14(1923): 22-25. (University of Pennsylvania)
- . "A deed of gift in 317 B.C." *Mizraim*, 2(1936): 57-69.
- . "The papyrus archive in the Philadelphia University Museum, 1." *Mizraim* 7(1937), 11-19.
- Révillout, Eugène. *Chrestomathie Démotique*, 3 vols. Paris: F. Viewig, 1880.

- Schuster, Angela M.H. "Not Philip II of Macedon: an interview with Antonis Bartsiokas." *Archaeology* (April 2000). <https://bit.ly/2VnHXob>.
- Skeat, Theodore Cressy. *The Reigns of the Ptolemies*, 2nd edition. *Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung*, 39. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1968.
- _____. "A Greek mathematical tablet." *Mizraim*, 3(1936): 18-25.
- Smith, Sidney. "The chronology of Philip Arrhidaeus, Antigonos and Alexander IV." *Revue d'Assyriologie et Archéologie*, 22(1925): 179-197.
- van der Spek, R.J. "CM 4 (Babylonian king list of the Hellenistic period)." *Livius*. <https://bit.ly/2YtBmuh>.
- Tihon, Anne. "Theon of Alexandria and Ptolemy's *Handy Tables*." In *Ancient Astronomy and Celestial Divination*, edited by N. M. Swerdlow. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999.
- Toomer, G.J. *Ptolemy's Almagest*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- Whitby, Michael and Mary Whitby. "Introduction." *Chronicon Paschale 284-628 AD*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989.
- Worthington, Ian. *By The Spear: Philip II, Alexander the Great, and the Rise and Fall of the Macedonian Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Xirotiris, Nikolaos (N.I.) and Franziska Langenscheidt. "The cremations from the royal Macedonian tombs of Vergina." *Archaiologike Ephemeris* 157(1981): 142-160.
- Zauzich, Karl-Theodor (K.T.). *Die Ägyptische Schreibertradition in Aufbau, Sprache und Schrift der demotischen Kaufverträge aus ptolemäischer Zeit*. Band 1. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1968.
- _____. "Papyri, Demotische, Paris." *Lexicon der Ägyptologie*. Lieferung 25. 862-874. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1980.

Contemplation on Jurisprudence Principles and Necessities of Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri's Legitimate Constitutional Theory

By Ali Mohammad Tarafdari*

The victory of Constitutional Revolution during Muzaffareddin Shah Qajar is considered as one of the biggest political-religious developments in Iranian contemporary history during which the Shiite Ulema (clergymen) by their serious involvement in this movement and acceptance of its leadership created a modern era of various views about the constitutional political structure through using the huge legacy of the Shiite political jurisprudence. Meanwhile, a group of these Ulema by bringing up the issue of legitimate constitution tried to present a new reading of the Shiite political thinking concerning the criteria of the legitimacy or non-legitimacy of the constitutional system. Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri is considered one of the most leading religious figures whose jurisprudential thinking regarding the Iranian constitutional movement has been reviewed and analyzed in this article historically and jurisprudentially. The main point/question in the article is that why and under what religious and historical necessities a group of the Ulema, particularly Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri, stood against the constitutional system and started to bring up the plan of Legitimate Constitutional Theory? The findings of this study show that the Legitimate Constitutional Theory was formed as a result of the Shia jurisprudential necessities and the historical conditions of that period, and that based on the Nouri's viewpoint analyzed in his main works, he in the position of religious authority and religious jurist believed he was defending the bases of Islamic religion, while the sources of pro-constitutionalists have considered Nouri's defense of Islam as the result of his support for autocracy.

Introduction

The occurrence of Constitutional Revolution in Iran during late Qajar era and basically the emergence of the constitutional movement in Iran's neighboring countries and then in Iran is considered as one of the most important and huge events of the contemporary history which has left lasting and influential impacts on Iran's social, religious, and political conditions. In fact, with the victory of the Constitutional Revolution in 1906 by the constitutionalists, a new period of the political life of Iran and Iranians started with the aim of removing domestic autocracy and gaining independence from the outsiders' hegemony the kingpin of which was to create the constitutional system as well as to establish a national consultative assembly. At the same time, the massive participation of the *Ulema*

*Assistant Professor of History, National Library & Archives of I.R. of Iran.

(clergymen) in the movement's leadership and then the opposition of a group of them to this current brought about one of the most important events which led to the victory of the movement and the emergence of constitutionalism and legitimism currents. This trend has so far been noticed by many researchers of Iranian contemporary history, and accordingly serious extensive for and against positions towards Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri's views have been emerged among the researchers which are in fact considered a continuation of for and against positions of the works and publications of the Constitutional era.¹

On the other hand, it is not possible to review the current of Constitutional Revolution and the reasons behind the emergence of the Legitimate Constitutional Theory without addressing the political, ideological and jurisprudential positions of a jurist like Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri,² because in addition to being involved in all various stages of the constitutional history, he has been the founder of the Legitimate Constitutional Theory and has brought up the most important and basic jurisprudential challenges regarding the theoretical principles of constitutionalism. Moreover, in addressing the reasons for the emergence of the Legitimate Constitutional Theory by Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri, it should be noticed that he himself has been among the first proponents of the Constitutional Revolution, thus it is necessary to pay attention to Nouri's principles of jurisprudence and historical conditions in order to identify the other factors of his change of mind.

The main question in the article is that why and under what religious and historical necessities a group of the Ulema, particularly Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri, stood against the constitutional system and started to bring up the plan of Legitimate Constitutional Theory?

Rereading the Formation of Legitimism Current in Constitutional Revolution

With the victory of Iran's Constitutional Revolution as the first nationwide anti-autocratic movement of Iranians through the participation of the majority of different strata of Iranian society during the reign of Muzaffareddin Shah Qajar (Mordad 14, 1285/August 6, 1906), the ruling monarchial system in Iran turned into a new political system based on the sovereignty of parliament. The movement's aim and the ideals of the people and the leaders of this anti-autocratic move was that after the fall of the ruling autocratic system, the will of the representatives of people's strata was involved in running the country and the national sovereignty replaced the individual absolute authorities and decisions. But according to the sources of the constitutional history, a short time after the

1. For samples of such stances and the old and new views, see Nazem al-Islam Kermani, *The Awakening History of Iranians*, vol. 2, ed. by Ali Akbar Saeedi Sirjani (Tehran: Bonyad-e Farhang-e Iran, 1970).

2. For viewing the Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri's leading jurisprudential status, see also Mohammad Hassan Khan Etemad al-Saltanah, *Al-Ma'aser val-Asar*, vol. 1, ed. by Iraj Afshar (Tehran: Asatir, 1984), 151; Mehdi Malekzadeh, *The History of Iranian Constitutional Revolution*, Vol. 6 (Tehran: Elmi, 1994), 1257; Mohammad Esmaeel Rezvani, *Iranian Constitutional Revolution* (Tehran: Jibi, 1977), 199.

issuance of the constitutional order and the deployment of the constitutional system and with the appearance of modern non-religious and sometimes anti-religious approaches of the new system, first grounds of differences between the *Ulema* and their followers were emerged. The differences broadened when the Constitution was being drafted and reached its climax during its formulation and the approval of the Constitution's Amendment.³

But before reviewing the reasons and grounds of emerging such differences, it should be mentioned that the old sources and pro-constitutional history researchers in search for and explaining about the reasons of appearing the difference and basically the reasons of the opposition of Nouri and his other sympathetic *Ulema* to constitutionalism have regarded his opposition as the result of linking with Mohammad Ali Shah Qajar's Court, competition between the *Ulema*, autocracy, secularism and the like without paying attention to Nouri's attitude to the principles of constitutionalism with those of Islamic religion and his standing on this attitude until death.⁴ However, in his works and writings, Nouri presented reasons which had been derived from his jurisprudential thinking⁵ and his defense from these reasons is indicative of his religious belief in their validity, and that is partly why he became ready to sacrifice life in the way of his thought. The main factor for the continuation of the inattention of the old and new supporters of constitutionalism to the foundationology⁶ of Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri's jurisprudential thinking should be searched in the one-sided historiography of this group, because basically in the historiography of the constitutional movement in which pro-constitutional currents and contemporary intellectuals play a major role, the constitutional movement has been widely introduced as a national and patriotic movement, and the opponents of movement have been considered merely as authoritarians and pro-autocracy. In fact, during historiography which emerged following the victory of the Constitutional Revolution, the proponents and supporters of the constitutionalism share the most, and its main face is the introduction of the constitutional movement as a national revolution. In other words, the historiography of the Constitutional Revolution has fundamentally anti-autocratic and patriotic face influenced by nationalism and other modern ideologies. Their opinion about the movement is that the liberal and patriotic people of Iran started to fight Qajar's dictatorial system for freedom and improvement of their country's situation under constitutionalism,

3. Gholamhossain Zargarinejad, *The Treatises of Constitutionalism*, vol. 1 (Tehran: Kavir, 2008), P. 19

4. For viewing examples of such analysis of old sources and the works of new pro-constitutional researchers, see Nazem al-Islam Kermani, *The Awakening History of Iranians*, vol. 1, ed. Ali Akbar Saeedi Sirjani (Tehran: Bonyad-e Farhang-e Iran, 1967), 12, 236; Ahmad Kasravi, *Iran's Constitutional History* (Tehran: Amirkabir, 1994), 826; Mehdi Malekzadeh, *The Life of Malek al- Motakallemin* (Tehran: Elmi, 1946), 294; Mohammad Ebrahim Bastani Parizi, *Freedom Effort* (Tehran: Nouvin, 1957), 170.

5. As an example of Nouri's jurisprudential analysis about constitutionalism, see Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri, "The Treatise of the Constitutional Sanctity," in *The Treatises of Constitutionalism: Vol.1*, ed. Zargarinejad (Tehran: Kavir Publication, 2008), 259-273; Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri, *the Treatise of Tazkerat al-Qafel and Ershad al-Jahel* (Tehran: Stone Printing, n.d.).

6. This term is from the writer which stress on study of the root of thoughts or events.

and many of them attained martyrdom in the way toward the victory of the Constitutional Revolution and winning freedom for their home and compatriots, or suffered from imprisonment, torture and exile. In this historiography, the fighters, the dead and the constitutional leaders were the nationalists who not only promoted the conceptions like nation and freedom in the Iranian political literature of that period but did not spare even their life and property for achieving these conceptions and defending the ideals considered as holy. In the constitutional historiography, the nationalism has widely overshadowed all of its components, analyses and events and is considered a basis for the final and true judgment about the events especially its figures in a way that the constitutional opponents or in other words the legitimists and their main leader Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri due to their inevitable accompaniment with Qajar rule or the autocratic front (according to the literature of this historiography) are introduced directly or indirectly as non-national or sometimes as anti-national people who have stood against the nationalists and patriots, and are called as martyrs, patriots and liberal vis-à-vis the constitutionalists especially those who were killed in the way of the constitutional movement.⁷ Furthermore, the literature of this kind of historiography is very vitriolic along with insult toward the opponents and enemies of the constitutional movement especially Sheikh Fazlollah, and despite the modification of this literature in recent decades, the kingpins of the constitutional historiography to which were referred, also shape to a large extent the main lines of the historical reviews of proponents of the Constitutional Revolution almost until today, and pro-constitutional historiographical sources continue to express disgust or condemn Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri more or less.⁸

So, despite the existence and presence of such approaches, it is necessary to identify Nouri's jurisprudential and intellectual principles and reread his own ideas in order to review the other reasons for bringing up the Legitimate Constitutional Theory on the side of Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri, and the formation of legitimism current. Because, as it was referred, with a brief contemplation on the legitimists' works especially those of its famous leader Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri, it can be found out clearly that the opposition of the legitimists to the constitutional system and their effort for establishing the legitimate constitutional system that is the common state of the king and *Mujtahid* (religious authority) and their negative perception from the main pillars of the constitutional system and their fear and animosity with the issues like "legislation", "*Towkil*" (substituent), "freedom" and "equality" and the like has deep-rooted in the special perception of Sheikh Fazlollah and his colleagues from *Shariah* and the Shiite political philosophy and the acceptance of the reign of Shiite kings during the Greater Absence of the 12th Imam of the

7. As an example of this one-sided historiographical approach of pro-constitutional sources, see Iqbal Yaqmaee, *The Martyr of Freedom Path Seyed Jamal Va'ez Isfahni* (Tehran: Tous, 1978).

8. For instance, see Mehdi Malekzadeh, *The History of Iranian Constitutional Revolution*, vol. 3 (Tehran: Elmi Publication, 1994), 477-478; Fereydoon Adamiyat, *Freedom Thinking and the Introduction of Constitutional Movement* (Tehran: Sokhan, 1961), 254-255; Janet Afary, *the Iranian Constitutional Revolution (1906-1911)*, Persian transl. Reza Rezaee (Tehran: Bisotun, 2000), 69; Mashallah Ajoodani, *The Iranian Constitution* (Tehran: Akhtaran, 2004), 131.

Shiites Imam Mahdi and has had no substantial relationship with the competition over power. And, it is just in this case that Sheikh Fazlollah's persistence, and his refusal to express remorse may be more understood and explained. Although the opposition and conflict of the legitimists especially Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri to the constitutional system and issuance of heresy and atheism *Fatwa* -a religious edict- by the constitutionalists started after a period of his accompaniment with the constitutional movement, and unlike some other opponents⁹ of the constitutional system, he delayed for some time to announce the life and property of the constitutionalists as lawful, finally he issued *Fatwa* against constitutionalism, terming it as *Haram* or religiously prohibited and anti-Islam:

"Undoubtedly, the constitutional law is against the religion of Islam and it is not possible to bring an Islamic country under the constitutional law unless Islam is set aside. So, if a Muslim tries to make the Muslims constitutionalists, this is a measure in line with the destruction of the religion and such person is atheist and must be punished."¹⁰

It is obvious that this frank opposition could not be without religious reasons and without paying attention to Shiite jurisprudential principles. According to the *Fatwa* of the constitutional sanctity, not only many Iranians across the country were considered as atheist, and Ayatollahs Tabatabaee and Behbahani and all pro-constitutional *Ulema* were the same, but the three sources of emulation in the Iraqi holy sites and all of pro-constitutional *Ulema* and *Mujtahedins* of that area were also considered as atheist. Thus, it is natural that a *Mujtahid* like Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri who was an expert in jurisprudential principles and the famous disciple of Mirza Shirazi,¹¹ could not issue the atheism *Fatwa* of the Sources of Emulation like Akhund Khorasani, Mazandarani, Mirza Khalil Tehrani, Tabatabaee, Naeeni, Sheikh Esmaeel Mahallati, Haj Molla Rasoul Kashani, Agha Nouroollah Isfahani, Agha Najafi and so on, and call their life and property as lawful and their blood as waste without relying on *Shariah* and jurisprudential reasons.¹²

The Ups and Downs of Nouri's Positions against the Constitutional Movement

According to the sources of Iranian constitutional history, Nouri's hesitation and pessimism toward the constitutional thinking dates back to early times of the rise of the movement and the time when the horizon of the constitutional movement was not still very clear to a *Mujtahid* like Nouri, and the national and covert associations were being set up. According to a report by Nazem al-Islam who was a constitutionalist and a staunch enemy of Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri,

9. For example, see Fereydoon Adamiyat, *The Ideology of Constitutional Movement* (Tehran: Payam, 1976), P. 259

10. Nouri, "The Treatise of Constitutional Sanctity," in *the Treatises of Constitutionalism*, vol. 1, ed. Gholam Hussain Zargarinejad (Kavir Publication, 2008), 27.

11. Mehdi Bamdad, *The Profile of Iranian Statesmen in 12th 13th 14th Hijri Centuries*, vol. 3 (Tehran: Zavvar, 1968), 96.

12. Zargarinejad, *The Treatises of Constitutionalism*, 2008, 23-25.

in a talk to Sheikh Fazlollah along with Majd al-Islam for getting his approval in order to protest to the exile of Mirza Mohammad Reza, Mujtahid Kermani, and the dismissal of Zafar al-Saltanah the Governor of Kerman, Sheikh speaks about the necessity of protecting the monarchial state after hearing Majd al-Islam's remarks¹³ and although the quotation of Sheikh's remarks by Kermani is a one-sided report and his genuine remarks cannot be found out, the same report shows the basic of Sheikh Fazlollah's opposition to the demand of constitutionalists has been the existence of the central government and providing order and security as well as countering with the influence of Western thinking for protecting Islamic beliefs.

The sources of constitutional history and constitutionalists have again stressed Nouri's non-involvement in the consequent events which led to the victory of the constitutionalists like the event of bastinadoing the sugar merchants ordered by Ala' al-Doleh and closing of Tehran's bazaar by the merchants and their gathering in Shah Mosque along with a group of *Ulema* and the public (*Shawal* 1323 AD/ December 1905), and then the immigration of the protesters to the holy shrine of Hazrat Abd al-Azim in Shahr-e Ray (south of Tehran) led by Ayatollahs Tabatabaee and Behbahani known as "The Lesser Immigration".¹⁴ But, when "The Greater Immigration" was shaped in *Jamadi al-Awal* 1324 AD (July 1906), Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri joined the emigrants two days after their move toward Qom either for making them to return or for going along with them and getting the approval of the constitutionalists.¹⁵ The immigration is considered a turning point in Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri's final and firm position on the current of constitutionalism, because during the constitutionalists' sit-in in Qom, talks took place between Ayatollah Tabatabaee, the leader of the constitutionalists and Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri during which Nouri candidly expressed his final judgment and jurisprudential viewpoint concerning the constitutional system in the position of a *Mujtahid*, stressing that after the initial agreement with the constitutionalism for the expediency of Islam and the people, I regard the current as against the *Shariah* and Islam due to its contradiction with the *Shariah*.¹⁶ His viewpoint was later discussed in detail in the Treatise of the Constitutional Sanctity. However, on the basis of the report of some statesmen of that period, a number of researchers believe that the majority of the legitimists including Sheikh Fazlollah due to broadness of the constitutional current never ruled out the basis of constitutionalism in their official positions and speeches until the beginning of the period of Mohammad Ali Shah's victory over the constitutionalists and the start of the period nicknamed "The Lesser Autocracy".¹⁷

13. Kermani, *The Awakening History of Iranians*, vol. 1, 81-83.

14. For more details about such events, see Kermani, *Ibid*, 91-100; Kasravi, *The Constitutional History*, 1994, 60-66.

15. See, Kermani, *Ibid*, 263-266; Kasravi, *Iran's Constitutional History*, 106-107.

16. For the details of these talks, see Mirza Nasrollah Khan Mostofi, *The History of Iranian Revolution*, vol. 1 (Tehran: the manuscript of Malek Library no.3819), 26-28.

17. See Zargarinejad, *The Treatises of Constitutionalism*, 2008, 32; Malak al-Shoa'ra Bahar, *A Brief History of Political Parties*, vol. 1 (Tehran: Amirkabir, 1982), 2.

As the order of constitutionalism was issued and following the Greater Immigration and a sit-in in the British embassy, the first measure of the constitutionalists was to draft a constitution. In this line, due to lack of domestic sources in this regard and in view of the fact that the idea of constitutionalism has been taken from the West, the constitutions of Europe especially Belgium were mostly used for drafting the constitution, after its formulation, it was signed by Muzaffareddin Shah on *Zel-qadeh* 14, 1324 AD (December 30, 1906). Following the death of Muzaffareddin Shah and Mohammad Ali Shah's coming to power who was the enemy of the constitutionalism since he was a crown prince,¹⁸ the legitimists' public opposition to the Constitution appeared gradually. As the time of the formulation and final approval of the Constitution Amendment - in which issues like legislation, freedom and equality had been included publicly - got closer, the opposition appeared in the form of active positioning against the parliament and the constitutional system because the supporters of the legitimate constitutionalism considered such issues as a heresy in *Shariah* and atheism. At this time, Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri and his colleagues had focused more on not to let the Constitution Amendment to be approved. But since their efforts remained inconclusive due to the resistance of the constitutionalist *Ulema* especially the clear support of three Sources of Emulation in the Iraqi holy sites particularly Akhund Khorasani, they sought to concentrate their efforts on deleting some of the current articles and principles in the Amendment. The second principle of the Amendment was drafted in this line and with the proposal and insistence of Nouri and the letters he wrote to the Sources of Emulation in Iraq. Finally, it was added to the Amendment's draft with Khorasani's approval for endorsement in the parliament.¹⁹ After the Amendment's endorsement, however, Sheikh and his followers continued to oppose it because their proposed reforms in the Amendment approved also by Akhund Khorasani²⁰ had not been endorsed completely, and led to numerous clashes between the constitutionalists and legitimists, and even the publication of *Lavayeh* newspaper by Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri²¹ during which the constitutionalists tried to attribute Nouri and his colleagues' opposition to their dependence on Mohammad Ali Shah and being pressured by him.²² But the content of the *Lavayeh* foreshadows emphasis on defending Islam and support for the constitutionalism on the condition of observing *Shariah*:

"In the Name of God, the Most Compassionate, the Most Merciful; this paper is written for the religious brothers to know and understand that there is no worldly

18. See Kermani, *The Awakening History of Iranians*, vol. 2, 65-66; Kasravi, *Iran's Constitutional History*, 1994, 201-204.

19. Zargarinejad, *The Treatises of Constitutionalism*, 2008, 35.

20. For viewing the reasons for Nouri's opposition in this regard, see Mohammad Torkaman, *Treatises, communiqués, written materials, ... and Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri's newspapers*, vol. 1 (Tehran: Rasa, 1983), 267-268.

21. Homa Rezvani (ed.) *Agha Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri's Lavayeh* (Tehran: Nashr-e Tarikh-e Iran, 1983).

22. In this regard, see Sheikh Mohammad Mardoukh Kordestani, *Mardoukh History* (Tehran: Karang, 2000), 494.

purpose at all. The aim is just to protect Islam from the deviations the atheists look for. First, the auspicious word "legitimate" should be added to the word "constitutional" at the beginning of the Constitution. Second, the bill of the *Ulema's* supervision should be added without any change and the board of supervisors should be determined only by Sources of Emulation whether they determine or being determined by their own lot and the article Hojjat al-Islam Akhund Khorasani asked the honorable parliament to be added to the Constitution. Third, the reforms in the articles should be according to Islamic *Shariah* and must be included in the Constitution without any change and conversion; God willing."²³

On the other hand, the continuation of Mohammad Ali Shah's opposition to constitutionalism and the constitutionalists, and Russia's support for the Qajarid Shah for overthrowing the constitutional system finally led to a military coup against the parliament and the arrest and killing of some leaders of the constitutional movement and the closure of the parliament by Mohammad Ali Shah with the help of Russian Cossack forces on *Jamadi al-Thani* 23, 1326 (July 23, 1908),²⁴ and naturally pro-constitution sources reported of Nouri's cooperation with Mohammad Ali Shah in the measure.²⁵ The constitutionalists have called this period as "The Lesser Autocracy". But this period for the legitimists was the beginning of a new era to explain their ideas against constitutionalism largely and freer, stressing the principles of constitutionalism with *Shariah* through writing various treatises. On the other hand, when Mohammad Ali Shah bombarded the *Majlis* (parliament), the constitutionalists started a nationwide conflict to overthrow the Shah's monarchy a sharp edge of which had targeted the person of Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri. Finally, the leaders of the conflict could win over the Shah and seize Tehran on *Jamadi al-Awal* 24, 1327 (July 13, 1909) and hang Sheikh Fazlollah as the leader of the legitimists and on charges of defending autocracy on *Rajab* 13, 1327 (July 31, 1909).²⁶ But the other reasons behind the execution as it is obvious from the last words Nouri said before the gallows,²⁷ was his firm standing on its own ideas in defending Islamic values, and moreover, the execution as some researchers have said was a kind of showing power to the *Ulema* including those who were for or against the constitutionalism.²⁸

The event of hanging Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri was so important, effective and crucial that the sources of the constitutional history and the researchers of this area including opponents and proponents of constitutionalism or Nouri have stressed its importance and greatness. Because a secular current for the first time succeeded in trying and executing a senior religious authority, and if we consider the power of

23. Torkaman, *Treatises, communiqués, written materials, ... and Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri's newspaper*, 1983, 231-232.

24. Yahya Dowlatabadi, *the Life of Yahya*, vol. 2 (Tehran: Ferdowsi, 1982), 161-162; Kasravi, *Iran's Constitutional History*, 580-584; Bahar, *Brief History of Iranian Political Parties*, 2-3.

25. Mehdi Qoli Hedayat, *Memories and Risks* (Tehran: Zavvar, 1982), 161.

26. Tondar Kia, *The Secret of Gallows, An analytical report on the resultant of Ayatollah Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri's joining to the Constitutional Movement* (Tehran: Kitab-e Sobh, 2002), 56.

27. For seeing the Nouri's last words before the gallows, see Tondar Kia, *The Secret of Gallows, an analytical report on the resultant of Ayatollah Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri's joining to the Constitutional Movement* (Ketab-e Sobh Publication, 2002), 58.

28. Zargarinejad, *The Treatises of Constitutionalism*, vol. 1, 89.

the *Ulema* during Qajar era especially the Nasserī period and the incidents like Tobacco Movement, then the importance of Nouri's execution is doubled. Thus, in view of this significance, almost the majority of the sources and researchers of the constitutional history especially the proponents of the legitimate constitution have described Nouri's execution as a huge incident against Islam and *Ulema* and Islamist current.²⁹

Explanation on Jurisprudential Principles and Necessities of Legitimate Constitutional Theory in the Works of Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri

As it was discussed above, Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri criticized and rejected the constitutionalism in his statements and pamphlets since the appearance of the constitutional movement. But during the Lesser Autocracy, he particularly wrote two treatises -*The Sanctity of Constitutionalism*, and *Tazkerat al-Qafel and Ershad al-Jahel*- according to historical conditions of the society of that period, and started to explain about the Legitimate Constitutional Theory and the reasons for the contradiction of constitutionalism with Islamic bases by using the jurisprudential legacy of the Shiite world. Therefore, in view of the time of the two books' writing, they in fact cover the entire Nouri's historical and jurisprudential arguments against the constitutionalism. So, it is necessary to refer to them for better analyzing of his legitimate theory.

Among the two books, *The Sanctity of Constitutionalism* or *answering the reason for the initial agreement with constitutionalism and later opposition to it*, is a book in which the bases and reasons for being *Haram* of constitutionalism and the constitution has been discussed and explained. At the beginning of the book, it has been asked from Hojjat al-Islam Wal-moslemin Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri³⁰ that after the entry of constitution to Iran whose people divided into three groups of the enthusiasts, deniers and skeptics, why did he first defend the constitutionalism and try to spread it and then suddenly expressed his opposition? Has this agreement and opposition been on the basis of religious reasons and religious necessities or other reasons have caused his final opposition? Following this introduction which in fact explains about the reason and necessity of writing the treatise, Sheikh Fazlollah after thanking God for defending Islam courageously explained about the religious reasons for the contradiction of constitutionalism with Islam. First, he has mentioned that the origin of the event is the Western materialistic thinking, calling the constitutional event as "New Sedition".³¹ The two points are very enlightened in analyzing the religious reasons for his disagreement; because first, using the word "sedition" which has a special meaning in religious and Islamic literature and is used about anti-Islamic organized conspiracies, represents the final

29. For seeing some of these ideas, see Javad Bahmani, *The Tragedy of Century or Executing Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri, the Most Senior Religious Figure of Tehran in Public* (Tehran: 1980); Mustafa Boroujerdi, *The First Acclaimer of Legitimacy in Constitutional Injustice* (Tehran, n.d.).

30. Nouri, *the Treatise of the Sanctity of Constitutionalism*, 257.

31. Ibid, 259

interpretation and judgment of the speaker concerning the nature and root of the constitutional story, and second, relying on non-religious and even anti-religious origin (on the viewpoint of Nouri) for a movement like the constitutionalism causes a person committed to defending Islam against anti-religious and materialistic thinking to stand against such movement religiously and in a Jihad-like manner. In other words, Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri like many of his companions had the imagination of seeing the hands of various non-Islamic and even anti-Islamic sects (on the viewpoint of Nouri) and minorities such as Babbitt and Bahia³² in the constitutional movement, and because of this, as it could be seen in the continuation of reviewing the discussions of the treatise, although like many constitutionalist *Ulema*, he could also have compromised between equality, freedom of speech, press and so on with Islam, tried to introduce the basis of constitutionalism in complete contrast to Islamic laws and faith by emphasizing on the non-Islamic dimensions of the issues like legislation and equality, because he imagined the designers of such issues as enemies of Islamic community.

This is a key point for analyzing the reasons behind the deep and serious opposition of many *Ulema* and senior religious authorities like Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri to the constitutionalism, but it has been less noticed by the researchers and is seen almost in no pro-constitutional source or supporter. Meanwhile, if we pay more attention to the viewpoint of the oppositions to constitutionalism like Nouri, we realize that the fundamental reason for the opposition of legitimate *Ulema* to the constitutionalism was rooted in non-Islamic ideologies lied in the constitutional system such as nationalism and the natural backing of non-Islamic Babbitt and Bahia' sects. In other words, with the rise of nationalism thinking during the constitutional government, on one hand, the ruling monarchial system saw its interests and traditional rights especially its legitimacy in danger, and on the other hand, the backers the society's religious and traditional system, the *Ulema* who explained and executing the rights of the society's individuals as the members of an "*Ummah*" and according to religious criteria, stood against the symbols of the constitutional ideology. In fact, the most challenges and oppositions -whether by the Qajarid monarchial system or by the *Ulema*- to the constitutionalism both practically and theoretically lied in the symbols of the nationalism ideology which regarded all the people of a society as the individuals of a nation, and their land as a country not the Land of the Sultan, the Shadow of God, and was in favor of the rule of the nation under "National Rule". And this point caused almost the majority of pro-constitutional religious minorities and intellectual and practical campaigners stood against the traditional *Ulema* who were against the constitutionalism in order to set up and protect the movement. And because of this, the main part of the constitutionalists was attributed to religious sects and minorities especially Babbitt and Bahia', because the followers of various religions and faiths which were widely involved in religious-political campaigns against the Islamic rule, wanted religious freedom and the rule of a political system -if possible- more than any other groups. The British missionary, Napier Malcolm who was living in Iranian

32. For seeing an example this kind of Nouri's reading of the constitutionalism, see Torkaman, *Treatises, communiqués, written materials, ... and ... Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri's newspaper*, 267.

city of Yazd concurrent with the Constitutional Revolution refers to this point clearly and wrote that at present, the Bahia's more than any other group wanted nationwide religious freedom.³³

Thus, in view of these facts, the reason for Nouri's opposition to the symbols of the constitutional system can be better analyzed in continuation of the discussions of the treatise of the Sanctity of Constitutionalism in a way that in stressing the issue, he says in the initial discussions of his treatise: "When the purpose was started to be carried out, I saw a group of people who were always aware of some deviations, were involved in it".³⁴ Then, he considers representation and the validity of the majority of the votes as the most definite issues which is incompatible with Islamic *Shariah*. Then, for showing his emphasis on being Islamic of the article of the Constitution or as he says "that damned order", Nouri points to his efforts for including "the article of the *Mujtahedins'* supervision in every period" in the Constitution's Amendment and the constitutionalists' disagreement with it due to their animosity with Islam. But the most important discussion of the treatise is Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri's detailed involvement in the religious reasons for being *Haram* of the constitutionalism. Then, he also refers to the articles of the Constitution's Amendment or as he says "letter of deviation", one of the articles of which is the equality between all the country's people, the one which is in contradiction with the Islamic *Shariah* from Nouri's point of view. And in his response to the insistence of the constitutionalists on the importance of the article as one of the fundamental bases of the constitutionalism, he considers as impossible the existence of the equality decree in Islam, because according to his jurisprudential belief and on the basis of the edicts of the Shiite jurisprudence, there are various basic differences between "adolescent and non-adolescent, sane and crazy, healthy and ill, salve and free, father and son, wife and husband, rich and poor, scholar and ignorant, Muslim and atheist and so on",³⁵ and on this basis, he has once again recalled the non-religious origin of the constitutionalists, saying that "the atheist tribe played a major role in this game of constitutionalism for escaping from the decrees of Muslims toward the apostates from Islam".³⁶

Another article which has been seriously criticized in this treatise by Nouri from the viewpoint of Islamic jurisprudence is "the freedom of pen and freedom of press". In the viewpoint of Nouri that period was the time of presence of anti-Islamic religious and political sects and currents or as he says "the atheist" sects, and he practically saw the existence of the article in the Amendment as a tool for free publication of anti-Islamic issues by bringing up numerous intellectual and jurisprudential arguments against the article. So, he implicitly considers the designers of the article as anti-Islamist who are seeking to achieve and carry out easier anti-Islamic approaches. Therefore, he clearly says, "all the nonsense is for destroying the basis of religion and Islamic *Shariah*... they hijacked the religion

33. Napier Malcolm, *Five Years in a Persian Town* (London: John Murray, 1907), 52.

34. Nouri, *The Treatise of Sanctity of Constitutionalism*, 260.

35. Ibid, 265

36. Ibid, 266

and did their best to destroy it, unless the spread of justice does not need such arrangements."³⁷

Another treatise, Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri has writing in criticizing and rejecting the constitutionalism, as mentioned in the beginning of the present discussion, is *Tazkerat al-Qafel and Ershad al-Jahel*.³⁸ Nouri in this book first speaks about the necessity of the existence of law in the society, stressing that the best divine laws has been set in Islam for worldly life due to importance of the existence of law. He concluded that the Muslims do not need to enact or fabricate law. So, he announced the issue of legislation against the Islamic *Shariah*, and wrote:

"So, the fabrication of law is totally against Islam and this is a prophetic job. Thus, that was why the prophets were selected by God. Some decrees were signed or changed by the prophets till the last Prophet (SAWA) was selected and he totally represented the religion of God. So, he is the last prophet and the divine law brought by him is completely perfect even toward all the periods and toward all the people... the result is that nobody should fabricate the law... so the assembly the people wanted to set up and to approve laws with the majority of the votes is against the prophecy and religion."³⁹

Therefore, Nouri's statements clearly show that from his viewpoint in the position of a *Mujtahid* and a jurist, any new thinking even if its origin is ignored is against the Islamic *Shariah*. And it is merely on this basis that Nouri talks about being Islamic or non-Islamic of the laws of the constitutional system. In this line, he addresses the issue of equality and freedom, and in the book he also regards as against Islam these two principles the foundation of which is based on slavery, calling them "harmful". Finally, he concluded that the aim of constitutionalists from bringing up such principles unlike their claim has not certainly been to implement divine laws.⁴⁰ Then, he refers to the issue of "freedom of pen and language", citing a long list of anti-Islamic statements by the supporters of constitutionalism in the newspapers and pulpits as clear evidence of the harms of un-trammeled freedom. Thus, like the treatise of the Sanctity of Constitutionalism, he considers the backing of non-Islamic sects from constitutionalism as a firm reason for the non-Islamic and anti-Islamic nature of the foundation of constitutionalism:

"If the aim was to boost Islam why all atheists from Bahia' to other corrupt people such as Jews, Indian idolaters and the entire atheist countries and all the world sects except a special group of believers wanted to strengthen it. Oh, my dears, if the aim was to boost Islam, the Britain would not support it and if their purpose was to follow the holy Quran, they would not deceive ordinary people, and take refuge to atheism and would not choose them as their collaborators [He meant the constitutionalists' sit-

37. Ibid, 268

38. A number of researchers have expressed doubt in the treatise's definite attribution to Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri, but they have not achieved an absolute result, see Zargarinejad, *The Treatises of Constitutionalism*, 277-279

39. Nouri, *Tazkerat al-Qafel and Ershad al-Jahel*, 5-8.

40. Ibid, 9-10.

in in the British Embassy]. Finally, which stupid man accepts that atheism backs Islam?"⁴¹

Conclusion

As it was seen, we can present an almost comprehensive and complete image of the jurisprudential bases of the theory from Nouri's viewpoint and the reasons and necessities of raising the theory by reviewing the related historical events and by bringing up Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri's Legitimate Constitutional Theory and referring to his main works. An image which has been less noticed by the researchers of the area especially the supporters of the constitutionalism due to their opposition or agreement with it. As it was discussed, although Nouri was aware of some interests of the constitutional system, he sought to criticize and reject the theoretical bases of the constitutional system and defend the bases of Islamic religion due to the presence and interference of non-Islamic and sometimes anti-Islamic groups, individuals and currents in the movement, and was ready to sacrifice his life because of his deep religious and Islamic beliefs. Nouri's standing on his belief even sacrificing his life shows clearly that more than anything else; he, in the position of religious authority and religious jurist, had been worried about protecting Islam against anti-Islamic attacks. This is the case which has been almost entirely ignored in the sources of pro-constitutionalists, and they have considered Nouri's defense of Islam as the result of his support for autocracy, while Nouri's presence in the current of constitutionalism and sacrificing of his life clearly shows that such analyses are not complete, and that Nouri's thought has been noticed less. Furthermore, the historical conditions of that period of Iranian society has been less paid attention by the opponents of Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri for understanding and analyzing his thinking; the conditions on the basis of which Nouri concluded that the structure of constitutionalism had defects which were not able to protect Iran's sovereignty and independence as an Islamic country. Thus, from his point of view, the constitutional system was against the basis of Islam.

Bibliography

- Ajoodani, Mashallah. *Iranian Constitutionalism*. Akhtaran Publication, 2004.
 Adamiyat, Fereydoon. *The Thinking of Freedom and Start of Constitutional System*. Sokhan Publication, 1961.
 Adamiyat, Fereydoon. *The Ideology of Constitutional Movement*. Payam Publication, 1976.
 Afary, Janet. *The Iranian Constitutional Revolution (1906-1911)*, translated by Reza Rezaee. Bisotun Publication, 2000.

41. Ibid, 17-18.

- Etemad al-Saltanah, Mohammad Hassan Khan. *Al-Ma'aser val-Asar*, vol. 1, edited by Iraj Afshar. Asatir Publication, 1984.
- Bamdad, Mehdi. *The Profile of Iranian Statesmen in 12th, 13th, and 14th Hijri Centuries*, vol. 3. Tehran: Zavvar Publication, 1968.
- Bastani Parizi, Mohammad Ebrahim. *Freedom Effort*. Tehran: Nouvin, 1957.
- Bahar, Malak al-Shoa'ra. *A Brief History of Political Parties*, vol. 1. Amirkabir Publication, 1982.
- Bahmani, Javad. *The Tragedy of Century or Executing Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri, the Most Senior Religious Figure of Tehran in Public*. Tehran, 1980.
- Boroujerdi, Mustafa. *The First Acclamer of Legitimacy in Constitutional Injustice*. Tehran: n.d.
- Dowlatabadi, Yahya. *The Life of Yahya*, vol. 2. Ferdowsi Publication, 1982.
- Hedayat Mehdi, Qoli. *Memories and Risks*. Zavvar Publication, 1982.
- Kasravi, Ahmad. *Iran's Constitutional History*. Tehran Amirkabir Publication, 1994.
- Kermani, Nazem al-Islam. *The Awakening History of Iranians*, 3 vols., edited by Ali Akbar Saeedi Sirjani. Bonyad-e Farhang-e Iran Publication, 1967-1970.
- Kia, Tondar. *The Secret of Gallows, an analytical report on the resultant of Ayatollah Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri's joining to the Constitutional Movement*. Ketab-e Sobh Publication, 2002.
- Malcolm, Napier. *Five Years in a Persian Town*. London: John Murray, 1907.
- Malekzadeh, Mehdi. *The History of Iranian Constitutional Revolution*. Tehran: Elmi Publication, 1994.
- Malekzadeh, Mehdi. *The Life of Malek al- Motakallemin*. Tehran: Elmi, 1946.
- Mardoukh Kurdistan, Sheikh Mohammad. *Mardoukh History*. Tehran: Karang Publication, 2000.
- Mostowfi, Mirza Nasrollah Khan. *The History of Iranian Revolution*, vol. 1. The manuscript of Malek Library, n.d.
- Nouri, Sheikh Fazlollah. *The Treatise of Tazkerat al-Qafel and Ershad al-Jahel*. Stone Printing, n.d.
- Nouri, Sheikh Fazlollah. "The Treatise of the Constitutional Sanctity." In Gholam Hussain Zargarinejad, *The Treatises of Constitutionalism*, vol. 1. Kavir Publication, 2008.
- Rezvani, Homa. *Agha Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri's Lavayeh*. Jibi Publication, 1983.
- Torkaman, Mohammad. *Treatises, communiqués, written materials, ... and Sheikh Fazlollah Nouri's newspaper*, vol. 1. Tehran: Ferdowsi Publication, 1983.
- Yaqmaee, Iqbal. *The Martyr of Freedom Path Seyed Jamal Va'ez Isfahani*. Tous Publication, 1978.
- Zargarinejad, Gholam Hussain. *The Treatises of Constitutionalism*, vol. 1. Tehran: Kavir Publication, 2008.