

Callimachus and the Exchange of Cultural Capital at Court

Brett Charles Evans  
Fairfax, Virginia

B.A., College of William and Mary, 2013  
M.A., University of Bristol, 2015  
M.A., University of Virginia, 2016

A Dissertation presented to the Graduate Faculty  
of the University of Virginia in Candidacy for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Classics

University of Virginia  
April, 2020



## Abstract

This dissertation examines the social status of poets and the value of poetry as a cultural capital in Hellenistic court society through an investigation of the work of Callimachus. Long considered *l'art pour l'art*, Callimachus' poetry has been shown by more recent scholars to play important roles in its social, historical, and religious contexts, and it is argued that Callimachus was a fully-fledged member of the Ptolemaic court society. Little attention, however, has yet been paid to the key questions that arise from this social context: what was the function of poetry at the Ptolemaic court, and what was its value compared to that of rival courtiers' inventions, military triumphs, wide-ranging political connections, and financial assets? I analyze Callimachus' *Hymns* and *Aetia* 3-4 and argue that he positions his poetry as an invaluable gift to his kings and queens in their struggle for preeminence among rival courts and Greek cities. In so doing, Callimachus portrays himself as worthy of the most distinguished position at court.

I conceptualize Callimachus' competition with a wide range of courtiers for royal favor at court using Bourdieu's ideas of cultural capital and the struggle for distinction. I then apply this sociological theory to the case of Callimachus in Ptolemaic Alexandria by making use of inscriptions, documentary papyri, coins, archaeological evidence, contemporary literature, and later historical tradition. These different sources have been quartered off in distinct sub-fields of Classics and Ancient History, and as a result literary scholars rarely consider them together. My approach makes the literary interpretation of Callimachus significant and accessible to those outside the sub-field of Hellenistic poetry and even of Classics at large, especially scholars of court societies, patronage, and the politics of culture.

Chapter One sketches the structure of Hellenistic court society and the place of poets therein, focusing on Callimachus' Alexandria. Hellenistic courts were hierarchical, hypercompetitive social networks surrounding kings whose high-ranking members were called his *philoï*, 'friends'; courtiership was thus a long-term relationship of *philia* maintained by the reciprocal exchange of gifts. Historical sources indicate that some poets were considered royal *philoï*, and my analyses of Theocritus *Idyll* 17 and Posidippus *Anathematika* 37 AB show that poets presented themselves as *philoï* vying against a range of courtiers for their patrons' favor. Moreover, the Ptolemies positioned themselves as the legitimate arbiters of cultural production, allowing them to judge the value of poets accurately. I then argue that the state dinners served to poets at the Alexandrian Museum were a highly valuable symbolic capital comparable to civic *sitesis* and honorary portions of sacrificial meat. In the language of civic honors, the Museum dinners placed poets on a par with other public benefactors in the court society. I then demonstrate the significance of the royal symposium as a crucial site for the consumption of poets' cultural capital by the court at large. The chapter concludes by considering the evidence for Callimachus' long and distinguished career at the Ptolemaic court, both of which make him an ideal case study for how a poet might win and maintain a distinguished position at court.

Chapters Two, Three, and Four examine Callimachus' *Hymns*, a collection of six poems in honor of traditional Greek divinities, as a valuable cultural capital which contributes to the Ptolemies' religious and political aims. Chapter Two begins by reviewing recent arguments in favor of the hymns' original performances and argues that the collection of *Hymns* functions as a textual automaton reperforming its splendid Ptolemaic festivals throughout the *oikoumene*. I then compare Callimachus' strategy of aligning the Ptolemies with the Olympian gods with the contemporary religious phenomenon of deifying the Ptolemies as *synnaoi theoi* ('temple-dwelling gods') with pre-existing divinities. I both cult and Callimachus' *Hymns* the Ptolemies

are not only assimilated to the Olympians, but also the Olympians to the Ptolemies. I argue that Callimachus' presentation of the Olympian court society in the *Hymns* offers a valuable 'charter myth' legitimizing their exercise of power at court. I then demonstrate that the court which Zeus establishes on Olympus in the first hymn is shot through with realia from the courts of Alexander and the Ptolemies, anchoring their historical innovations with an Olympian precedent. In the hymn to Apollo, I show that Apollo's patronage is analogous to Ptolemaic patronage as attested in numismatic, papyrological, and historical evidence. I argue that the hymn's celebration of Apollo's epiphany in Cyrene paves the way for the city's embrace of Ptolemaic rule. In both hymns, then, Callimachus positions himself as an invaluable ambassador for the Ptolemaic court.

Chapter Three examines Callimachus' self-portrayal as an agent of deification in the third and fourth hymns to Artemis and Delos. I first compare the series of exchanges by which Artemis attains Olympian prominence to the various ways in which new members of the Ptolemaic house gained status and power at court, including negotiations for honors, performance of rituals, and participation in high-status social engagements. I then compare the gluttony of the deified Heracles, whom Artemis meets on Olympus, to Ptolemaic *tryphe* and argue that Callimachus hereby makes room for his patrons at the Olympian court. In exchange for his hymn's gift of divinity, I demonstrate that Callimachus angles for his divine patron's life-long, preferential *philia*. I then discuss the hymn to Delos in tandem with the Nicouria Decree, which records the divine honors voted by the League of Islanders to Ptolemy I Soter. I show that Callimachus positions himself in the proem as a poet of the Ptolemaic Museum offering Delos the gift of Ptolemaic cultural capital owed to her as a result of her divinization of Apollo. Callimachus thus positions himself as a crucial intermediary between the Ptolemies and the wider world. In exchange, I argue that he presents himself as worthy of public honors from both Delos and Ptolemy II Philadelphus.

Chapter Four discusses the final hymns to Athena and Demeter as warnings to those who would transgress against the Olympians and Callimachus' divine Ptolemaic patrons. In the hymn to Athena, the Cronian Law which demands Athena to punish Teiresias for seeing her against her will echoes the prohibition of the first king in Greek imagination, the Median king Deioces, that no one see the king. I argue that Callimachus offers a divine Greek precedent for Athena's and his patrons' exercise of power through court ceremonial, and I discuss how Athena's gifts of compensation to Teiresias transform him into an analogy for a court poet. I then discuss the court politics of feasting in the hymn to Demeter. I argue that Erysichthon's wish to cut down wood from Demeter's grove for a dining room in which to feast his friends ceaselessly sets him up as a rival to the divine Ptolemaic kings.

Chapter Five analyzes how Callimachus positions himself towards his patron Berenice II in *Aetia* 3-4, two books framed by elegies in her honor. Discussing the meaning of ἔδνον at the beginning of the *Victoria Berenices*, I argue that Callimachus harnesses a Pindaric metaphor of the epinician poem as a 'bride-price' to pose as a suitor competing for Berenice's hand in marriage. I then discuss the resonance of this bridal metaphor for patronage in the *Victoria*'s remaining fragments, 'Acontius and Cydippe,' and the *Coma Berenices*. I argue that Callimachus offers Berenice the 'bride-price' of a public image as an eternal bride.

Hellenistic court poetry has long been considered ivory tower and consumed only by a privileged few. My dissertation shows instead that Callimachus' poetry aimed to disseminate powerful images of their courts far beyond the royal center. His cultural capital had immense value at court in large part because of its wide ambit and social relevance. In return, Callimachus laid claim to nothing less than the most distinguished position in his patrons' court society.

## Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank the many individuals whose support have made this dissertation possible. First I wish to thank my supervisor, Professor Ivana Petrovic, who has been my steadfast mentor in all areas of my academic life for the past three years. I first began seriously exploring my ideas about Callimachus in her graduate seminar on Hellenistic poetry and then in my special author exam. Then and ever since she has raised incisive questions about my arguments, opened new avenues of exploration, and helped me to clarify my ideas. I cannot thank her enough for her support. I would also like to thank my committee members, Professors Andrej Petrovic, Sara Myers, Deborah McGrady, and Susan Stephens of Stanford University for providing their valuable feedback on this work and their suggestions for its future directions. Professor Stephens has offered her guidance throughout my research process and helped me to open Callimachus' work and Hellenistic poetry up to wider audiences. Andrej Petrovic has been a wonderful mentor who has taught me not only to read ever more inscriptions, but also to find ever new ways to inspire my students. Sara Myers has served as Chair of the department for my entire time as a graduate student and supported me and my fellow students throughout. It is a great joy to think back on my time as a member in the Department of Classics. Here I would like to offer my special thanks to Professors David Kovacs and Tony Woodman, who guided me in my early years and helped me to embark on research into Aeschylus and Horace.

Several groups at the University of Virginia provided financial support necessary for me to complete my research during this time. Chief among these is the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, which in addition to fellowship supported offered a Dean's Dissertation Completion Fellowship for this last year of writing. Additionally the University's Society of Fellows

provided me with several summer research grants, one of which allowed me to travel to Greece. The Department of Classics generously helped to sustain me with support for summer research and travel to national and international conferences. Finally I would like to thank Andrus Ashoo in the Office of Citizen Scholar Development for affording me the opportunity to work as a graduate assistant and advisor to students and alumni applying to fellowships. He has been an outstanding mentor and model educator.

I owe a great personal debt to the many friends who have encouraged me while completing my dissertation. I would like single out two former teachers I am grateful to have as friends, Lisa Grimes and Lily Panoussi. To this day Lisa inspires me to read more, and this has always been a boon. Lily advised my undergraduate honors thesis and has since been a cherished friend and mentor.

It is a great joy, finally, to thank my family. I do not think that my parents, Joanie and Dave, could ever have imagined their son completing a dissertation on ancient Greek poetry on that day in my freshman year of college when I told them that I had become so immersed in my Classics courses that I was going to applying to study Latin over the summer. Yet here we are. Thank you for supporting me as I have followed my dreams and for offering your constant love. Last, I am ever thankful to my wife, Emily. From Williamsburg to England to Charlottesville, you have been my anchor and a light that has never gone out. Your love and firm belief in me have carried us through the tough times still standing. Thank you for helping me to see this work through.

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	5
1. Hellenistic Poets' and Poetry's Value as Cultural Capital at Court .....	9
I. FRIENDS BEARING GIFTS: THE STRUCTURE OF HELLENISTIC COURT SOCIETY.....	17
<i>i. The Hellenistic Court as Social Phenomenon .....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>ii. Courtiership as Performed Philia.....</i>	<i>26</i>
II. HELLENISTIC POETS AS USEFUL FRIENDS AT COURT.....	34
III. THE PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION OF CULTURAL AND SYMBOLIC CAPITAL AT THE ALEXANDRIAN COURT .....	53
<i>i. The Kings of Verse: Ptolemies as the Ultimate Arbiters of Poetic Techne .....</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>ii. The Museum as a site of production of cultural and symbolic capital.....</i>	<i>69</i>
<i>iii. The royal symposium as site of consumption of cultural capital and production of symbolic capital .....</i>	<i>91</i>
IV. CALLIMACHUS AND THE POETICS OF CULTURAL CAPITAL AND EXCHANGE AT COURT .....	103
<i>i. Callimachus as a Poet of the Ptolemaic Court.....</i>	<i>104</i>
<i>ii. Aims and Methodology .....</i>	<i>110</i>
2. Creating the Court: Court Society and Court Poetry in the Hymns to Zeus and Apollo.....	120
I. THE <i>HYMNS</i> ' VALUE AS CULTURAL CAPITAL AT COURT.....	121
<i>i. The Hymns as a Textual Collection and the Question of Performance .....</i>	<i>121</i>
<i>ii. Gods or Men? The Analogical Relationship of the Olympians and Ptolemies .....</i>	<i>133</i>
I. <i>HYMN TO ZEUS</i> : CREATING THE OLYMPIAN COURT .....	146
<i>i. Setting Up Court: Ptolemaic Olympus .....</i>	<i>149</i>
<i>ii. The Social Field of Court .....</i>	<i>157</i>
<i>iii. Lying for Ptolemy: Callimachus' Value at Court.....</i>	<i>161</i>
III. <i>HYMN TO APOLLO</i> : ROYAL PATRONAGE OF CITIES AND THE VALUATION OF CULTURAL CAPITAL.....	170
<i>i. Apollo's Ptolemaic Patronage.....</i>	<i>171</i>
<i>ii. Apollo as Judge of Techne, Whose Taste Ptolemy (Must) Follow .....</i>	<i>182</i>

IV. CONCLUSION.....	190
3. New Gods at Court: Deification and the Poet's Gift in the Hymns to Artemis and Delos.....	192
I. BRINGING A NEW GODDESS AND GOD TO OLYMPUS: THE POET'S GIFT OF DEIFICATION IN THE HYMN TO ARTEMIS .....	193
<i>i. Getting Favors from the King.....</i>	195
<i>ii. The Princess's Grand Tour .....</i>	205
<i>iii. Olympian Etiquette and Heracles' Tryphe.....</i>	220
<i>iv. The Counter-Gift of Friendship .....</i>	225
II. POET BETWEEN CITY AND SOVEREIGN: CALLIMACHUS' HYMN TO DELOS AS POLITICAL CAPITAL.....	230
<i>i. The Traffic in Delian Praise .....</i>	232
<i>ii. Weaving Delos Into Empire.....</i>	239
III. CONCLUSION.....	244
4. Friends, Be Warned! Courtly Transgression in the Hymns to Athena and Demeter.....	246
I. CRIME, PUNISHMENT, AND THE LIMITS OF POWER IN THE HYMN TO ATHENA .....	248
<i>i. Chariclo as Court Favorite.....</i>	251
<i>ii. Cronian Laws and the Legitimation of Court Ceremonial.....</i>	254
<i>iii. Teiresias, Court Poet.....</i>	258
II. ON (NOT) FEASTING LIKE THE GODS: <i>TRYPHE</i> AND COURT PREROGATIVES IN THE HYMN TO DEMETER .....	262
III. CONCLUSION.....	272
5. Courting Poetry: Patronage as Marriage in <i>Aetia</i> 3-4.....	274
I. HERE COMES THE BRIDE: THE <i>VICTORIA BERENICES</i> AS BRIDE-PRICE (ΞΑΝΟΝ).....	278
<i>i. The poet's bride-price.....</i>	280
<i>ii. Brides and marriage in the Victoria Berenices .....</i>	292
<i>iii. Competing for the queen's hand.....</i>	301
II. READ AT YOUR OWN RISK: WRITING MARRIAGE IN 'ACONTIUS AND CYDIPPE' (FRR. 67-75) .....	303
<i>i. Cydippe and Berenice, Acontius and Callimachus.....</i>	306



ii. Verbal and textual ἔδνα at the beginning of ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ .....	314
iii. ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ and the Perks of Marrying A Writer .....	317
III. WRITTEN IN THE STARS: THE <i>COMA BERENICES</i> .....	328
i. Callimachus’ ‘Rape of the Lock’ .....	331
ii. The Coma’s as the gift of immortality as a bride .....	338
iii. The Patron’s Counter-Gift? .....	346
IV. CONCLUSION .....	351
Summary and Conclusion .....	354
Works Cited .....	364



## Introduction

In recent decades scholars have turned away from the view of Hellenistic poetry as ‘art for art’s sake’ and begun instead to examine its relationship to its historical, social, and religious contexts. Now, too, Hellenistic court society, recuperating from a long dismissal as decadent, has attracted new interest from historians. As a result, the social position of Hellenistic poets has been radically reappraised, none more so than Callimachus. No longer viewed as an ivory-tower intellectual, he is argued to have been a fully-fledged member of the court society.

Little attention, however, has yet been paid to the key questions that arise from Callimachus’ social context. What was his role at the Ptolemaic court? How did his work’s value compare to that of rival courtiers’ inventions, military triumphs, wide-ranging political connections, and financial assets? What did he hope to gain in exchange for the poetry he produced at court? By answering these questions about Callimachus, we may better understand not only why the Ptolemies invested so heavily in poets, but how poets navigated the new social field that was the court and jockeyed for status and the perks of patronage alongside courtiers whose contributions to their patrons’ house were far more tangible than their own. These research questions, which cut across various sub-fields of Classics, demand an interdisciplinary methodology. I use Pierre Bourdieu’s ideas of cultural capital and distinction to conceptualize the social competition of poets with other courtiers. I then apply this sociological theory to the Ptolemaic court by making use of inscriptions, documentary papyri, coins, archaeological evidence, contemporary literature, and later historical tradition.

In the first chapter I sketch the structure of Hellenistic court society, its social dynamics, and the place of poets in it, with an emphasis on Ptolemaic Alexandria. I first discuss the sociological approach pioneered by Norbert Elias as a model for the Hellenistic courts and

survey the historical and anecdotal accounts of them preserved in authors including Polybius, Josephus, and Athenaeus. Next I consider the evidence of poetic patronage as *philia* by examining historical evidence and Theocritus' *Idyll* 17, and demonstrate the usefulness of Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital for understanding poets' competition with other *philoï* through an examination of Posidippus' *Anathematika* AB 39. I then discuss Ptolemaic poets' role in the Alexandrian court's production and consumption of cultural capital through a Bourdieusian analysis of the Ptolemies' Museum and symposium. In particular I examine the state meals served to Museum members in comparison with civic *sitesis* and inscriptionally-attested alimentary honors; anecdotal evidence for the consumption of poetry at the royal symposium; and the link between the Museum and royal symposium made by Timon of Phlius' famous satire of the Museum scholars. Finally I consider the evidence for Callimachus' long and distinguished career at the Ptolemaic court, and I lay out the methodology for my examination of gift-exchange in his *Hymns* and *Aetia* 3-4.

In the second chapter I examine Callimachus' *Hymns* as a cultural capital valued and exchanged in the milieu of the court. First I discuss the issue of the *Hymns*' performance and argue that Callimachus portrays his collection as a literary automaton whose value lies in its ability to reperform the splendor of Ptolemaic festivals throughout the *oikoumene*. Next I demonstrate how Callimachus strategically aligns the Ptolemies with the Olympian gods in much the same way as was done in contemporary cult practice, whereby the Ptolemies were granted divine honors as *synnaoi theoi* ('temple-dwelling gods') with Olympian and Egyptian gods. I argue that *Hymns* forge a valuable analogy between the Olympian court and the Ptolemaic court which anchors the Ptolemies' innovative exercise of power in divine Greek precedent. I demonstrate how this analogy functions through detailed analyses of the hymns to Zeus and

Apollo. I compare the physical space and hierarchical structure of Zeus's Olympian court with testimonia about the courts of Alexander and the Ptolemies; examine Callimachus' running together of Zeus's contested acquisition of Olympus with Ptolemy I Soter's of Egypt; compare Apollo's patronage of Cyrene with historical, numismatic, and papyrological evidence for Ptolemaic patronage and rule; and suggest the resonance of Apollo's rejection of Phthonos in the hymn's famous *sphragis* with court life and the position of the poet there.

In the third chapter I consider Callimachus' role as an agent of deification in the third and fourth hymns of the collection to Artemis and Delos. I first compare the series of exchanges by which Artemis attains Olympian prominence to the various ways in which new members of the Ptolemaic house gained status and power at court, including negotiations for honors, performance of rituals, and participation in high-status social engagements. I then discuss the relationship between the new, gluttonous god Heracles whom Callimachus portrays on Olympus and the Ptolemies and their trademark *tryphe*. In the hymn to Delos, I examine the proem in connection with the Nicouria decree recording the divine honors granted by the League of Islanders to Ptolemy I Soter, and the intermediary role that Callimachus grants himself between Delos and Apollo in connection with his position at the Ptolemaic court. In both hymns, I show that Callimachus portrays his hymns as invaluable forms of cultural capital for his patrons as they promoted their own divinization, and that he asks for their preferential friendship and public honors in return.

In the fourth chapter I examine the final two hymns of the collection, to Athena and Demeter, from the perspective of Ptolemaic court ceremonial and divine prerogatives. I first compare the fifth hymn's Cronian Law, which requires Athena to punish Teiresias for seeing her when she did not will it, in connection with the Greek idea of court societies as founded upon the

restriction of the monarch's visibility and access, as attested in Herodotus' account of the Median king Deioces, the inventor of court society. I then discuss the relationship between the gifts of compensation that Athena bestows upon Teiresias, especially augury and an honored position among kings, as they relate to Callimachus' position as a court poet of the Ptolemies. The hymn to Demeter focuses on the goddess' punishment of Erysichthon for cutting down her trees to feast his friends. I discuss the Ptolemaic contours of Erysichthon's theomachy by discussing the importance of feasting and *tryphe* at the Alexandrian court, and discuss the value of this hymn for Callimachus' patrons.

In the final chapter I turn from the *Hymns* to Callimachus' most influential poem in antiquity, the *Aetia*, of which only fragments remain. The final books of the collection, *Aetia* 3-4, are bookended by poems in honor of the queen Berenice II, the *Victoria Berenices* and *Coma Berenices*, and have a remarkable emphasis on brides and marriage. In this chapter I argue that Callimachus develops marriage as a metaphor for the relationship of patronage he wishes to enjoy with Berenice. First, I discuss how Callimachus portrays his *Victoria Berenices* as a bride-price he offers to his victorious queen and the thematic significance of marriage in that poem's extant fragments. I next consider how 'Acontius and Cydippe,' the famous elegy from *Aetia* 3, fashions an analogy between the textually-brokered marriage of the title characters and Callimachus and his queen. Finally, I discuss the value of the *Coma Berenices*, the elegy on the queen's catasterized lock of hair, for Berenice's public image as an eternal bride. While *philia* may have been the terms of patronage between poets and their kings, my analyses show that the emergent phenomenon of queens as prominent rulers in their own right required – and rewarded – creative approaches to their power and patronage from their courtiers.

## Chapter One

### Hellenistic Poets' and Poetry's Value as Cultural Capital at Court

The name Callimachus, thanks to his later emulators, has long endured as a byword for the slender Muse, a poetics of *l'art pour l'art* concerned with erudition and craft. Yet this same Callimachus wrote encomia for the Ptolemies, their queens, and their courtiers; and recent scholars have illuminated that his entire oeuvre participates in the social, political, religious, and intellectual currents of its Ptolemaic moment. To appreciate Callimachus, it has become clear that we must view his work and career firmly situated in its various contexts. This dissertation focuses squarely on the socio-political context of the Ptolemaic court society of Alexandria, in which Callimachus lived and for which he wrote. It is my aim to demonstrate what his work may tell us about the social value and functions of court poetry in the Hellenistic period and the social status of poets at court.

For a taste of the riches we may discover by reading Callimachus as an active player in the court milieu, let us consider a brief passage from one of his earliest and best-known works, the hymn to Zeus. In this hymn Callimachus celebrates Zeus's development from infancy to regency. After dismissing the controversy over his accession to the throne, Callimachus praises the god's choice of the eagle as his messenger: θήκαο δ' οἰωνῶν μέγ' ὑπείροχον ἀγγελιώτην / σῶν τεράων: ἅ τ' ἐμοῖσι φίλοις ἐνδέξια φαίνοις ('And you chose for yourself by far the best of birds as the messenger of your portents; may you show favorable ones to my friends,' *Hymn* 1.68-9).<sup>1</sup> Although the eagle's association with Zeus is traditional, the spotlight Callimachus

---

<sup>1</sup> All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

shines on its selection is striking, all the more so when we compare Callimachus' account to his model Hesiod's in the *Theogony*, where the eagle is almost entirely absent.<sup>2</sup>

Callimachus' special interest in the eagle becomes clear when we consider its importance at the Ptolemaic court. Already in the fourth century several Macedonian kings, including Alexander the Great, adopted the bird for their court iconography in order to showcase their descent from and favor with Zeus.<sup>3</sup> Ptolemy I Soter, eager to assert his connection to the late Alexander and to Zeus, followed suit and made the eagle his court's most distinctive symbol. A notice in the *Suda* s.v. *Λάγος* illustrates the bird's political function well. The Macedonians told a story that Ptolemy, who was the son of Lagus, was in fact the illegitimate child of Philip II, the father of Alexander the Great. Lagus exposed the boy at birth, but, miraculously, an eagle swept down and sheltered the baby with his wings. It has been plausibly argued that this tale was likely promoted at Ptolemy's court in order to forge a blood-relationship between the monarch and the late Alexander.<sup>4</sup>

Over and above connecting Ptolemy I to Alexander, the eagle linked him directly to Zeus and thereby had the power to suggest Ptolemy's divinity. Ptolemaic coins illustrate this effect

---

<sup>2</sup> Hesiod mentions the eagle only in connection with Zeus's punishment of Prometheus (*Th.* 523-5); it plays no role in Zeus's accession to power. For Callimachus' relationship to Hesiod see Reinsch-Werner (1976).

<sup>3</sup> See Lianou (2010), 129-30 with bibliography for the use of the eagle by Argead kings beginning with Archelaus; Philip II is a major exception.

<sup>4</sup> See discussion of the political value of this anecdote by van Oppen de Ruiter (2013), 87-8; Worthington (2016), 9-10.



well. In the years when Alexander was king and when Ptolemy, after his death, ruled Egypt as a satrap, coins minted in Alexandria display Zeus seated on the throne with an eagle perched on his outstretched right hand. After Ptolemy assumed the title of king in 306, coins bearing the eagle without Zeus begin to appear; in the most characteristic of these, the bird occupies the entire field, its wings either folded or slightly spread as it clutches Zeus's thunderbolt in its talons.<sup>5</sup> Now uncoupled from Zeus, the eagle's presence on Ptolemy's coins suggested to all who used them that the bird belonged to the king as much as it did to Zeus. In this way the eagle forges an analogy between Zeus and Ptolemy, one which would make Ptolemy's later divinization feel as familiar as a coin pressed between one's fingers.

We may now appreciate why Callimachus emphasizes the bird which might otherwise seem a decorative detail. Indeed, if we return to the text again, we see that Callimachus accurately reflects the eagle's iconography on current Ptolemaic coins: his description of the bird as 'messenger of your portents' (ἀγγελιώτην / σῶν τεράων, *Hymn* 1.68-9) suggests the coins' image of the eagle clutching the thunderbolt, which was Zeus's major portent (τέρας).<sup>6</sup> Moreover, Callimachus focuses on the eagle just after describing Zeus's royal seat (δίφρου, *Hymn* 1.67); the image of Zeus on his throne in the presence of his eagle not only echoes the

---

<sup>5</sup> For the change in eagle iconography on Ptolemaic coins see Ghisellini (1999), 47-8 with images and further bibliography; for images see also Le Rider and De Callataÿ (2006), 50-51 (nos. 34-5). On Ptolemy I Soter's assumption of the title of king (βασιλεύς) in 306 see e.g. Hölbl (2001), 20-1.

<sup>6</sup> See for example *Od.* 20.98-114.

earlier coin series discussed above, but also other Ptolemaic art as well.<sup>7</sup> Yet, if we read closely, it is possible to see Callimachus doing more here than passively reflecting familiar iconography: he plays an active role in establishing and legitimizing it. Zeus, he tells us, chose the eagle as ἀγγελιώτην / σῶν τεράων ('messenger of your portents,' 68-9). The genitives σῶν τεράων, emphasized by enjambment, in fact sound remarkably close to Σωτήρων; through this clever echo Callimachus suggests that Zeus chose the eagle not only as the messenger of his portents, but also 'of the Saviors' (Σωτήρων), reflecting Ptolemy's epithet 'Soter.'<sup>8</sup> In this way

---

<sup>7</sup> A fine example comes from the famous *dodekatheon* of the Greco-Roman Museum of Alexandria (inventory n. 27064 [17007]), an altar of the twelve gods excavated from Mazarita, which corresponds to the ancient palace district, and dated to the latter part of the third century BC. Here we see Zeus seated on his throne, with a large eagle perched on the ground to his left, its wings slightly open. For image see Ghisellini (1999), 17 (figures 5 and 6), 45-51. At 47 Ghisellini notes that the prominence given to the eagle elevates it from the level of an attribute of Zeus to an autonomous entity 'sottilmente allusiva alla dinastia regnante'; Callimachus' emphasis on the eagle seems to do the same.

<sup>8</sup> The Rhodians were the first to worship Ptolemy as a god in 304 after he aided them while they were besieged by Demetrius Poliorcetes: see e.g. Hölbl (2001), 93. According to Diodorus (20.100.3-4) the Rhodians consulted the oracle at Siwah, who agreed that they should worship Ptolemy as a god; Pausanias (1.8.6) reports that they gave him the name *Soter* ('Savior'). After his death in 283 and that of his wife Berenice I in 279, the couple received cult in Egypt as the *Theoi Soteres* ('Savior Gods'). On the cult of Soter see Fraser (1972), 1.217-20, 224-5; on the

Callimachus makes Zeus himself the author of Ptolemaic iconography: the bird which Soter appropriated is his god-given right.<sup>9</sup>

By so anchoring<sup>10</sup> Ptolemy's iconographical program in his hymn about Zeus's rise to power, Callimachus positions his poetry as a valuable asset for his patrons which offers legitimacy to their royal style through divine precedent. In fact, Callimachus seems to flaunt his value to his patrons the prayer he utters next: 'And may you send favorable omens to my friends' (ἄ τ' ἐμοῖσι φίλοις ἐνδέξια φαίνοις, 69). Favorable omens are always welcome, of course, but bird signs had particular cachet at the Ptolemaic court. As Baumbach and Trampedach have demonstrated, augury surged in significance in the Hellenistic courts; they persuasively attribute this phenomenon to the kings' emulation of Alexander and Homeric heroes, both of whom were distinguished by prominent bird omens.<sup>11</sup> The Milan Posidippus papyrus' section of epigrams called *Oionoskopika*, fifteen epigrams on augury (AB 21-35), attests to the interest in omens, especially famous ones, at court. In this light, I would suggest that Callimachus' prayer that Zeus grant his friends favorable bird signs has an important metapoetic dimension: Callimachus prays that his friends will enjoy favorable omens *in verse*, omens that could be celebrated alongside the

---

Ptolemaic legacy of 'Soterism' and especially its reflection in Hellenistic poetry see Brumbaugh (2019), 177-83.

<sup>9</sup> This move is of a piece with the tale of Ptolemy's exposure, in which the eagle of its own accord shelters Zeus's favored descendent.

<sup>10</sup> I use the term 'anchoring' in the sense proposed by Sluiter (2017).

<sup>11</sup> Baumbach and Trampedach (2004).

famous omens about Alexander and other kings. After all, Callimachus has just now appropriated the eagle for the Ptolemies in his hymn.

This metapoetic interpretation is further supported by an allusion these lines make to one of the most spectacular eagle omens in Greek literature. In the last book of the *Iliad*, the Trojan king Priam sets out to ransom his son Hector's body from Achilles, who has slain him in battle and now ceaselessly mutilates his corpse. Before Priam embarks on this dangerous mission, his wife Hecuba entreats him to ask Zeus for an eagle as a favorable sign. Priam acquiesces, repeating her plea in the following prayer to Zeus:

πέμψον δ' οἰωνὸν ταχὺν ἄγγελον, ὅς τε σοὶ αὐτῷ  
φίλτατος οἰωνῶν, καὶ εὐκράτος ἐστὶ μέγιστον,  
δεξιόν... (*Il.* 24.310-12; cf. 24.292-4)

And send a swift bird as a messenger, the one who is most beloved **of birds** to you yourself, and whose strength is greatest; [send him] on the right-hand side...

The genitive plural οἰωνῶν bolded above occurs in this metrical *sedes* only here and in

Callimachus' hymn to Zeus (θήκας δ' οἰωνῶν μέγ' ὑπείροχον ἀγγελιώτην, *Hymn* 1.68).<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> At *Hymn* 1.68 οἰωνῶν is Stephanus' correction for the reading of the archetype οἰωνόν.

Stephanus' correction has been accepted by e.g. Pfeiffer (1952), 4, D'Alessio (1996), 74, and Stephens (2015), 53. McLennan (1977), 106 ad loc. argues in favor of the archetype reading οἰωνόν on the grounds that at *Hom. Hymn Herm.* 296 ἀγγελιώτην (the only attestation of the word before Callimachus) is predicate to the noun οἰωνόν (295), and so Callimachus must have done the same. This argument, however, is not cogent, for Callimachus need not have replicated the syntax of that hymn exactly; moreover, there are good parallels for the construction οἰωνῶν μέγ' ὑπείροχον at e.g. Hdt. 5.92G.1 (τοὺς ὑπείροχους τῶν ἀστῶν), Theocr. 7.28 (συρικτὰν μέγ' ὑπείροχον, where συρικτὰν is the Doric genitive plural. Also, with Stephanus' correction

Moreover, each of Priam's underlined words finds an echo in Callimachus' hymn: θήκας δ' οἰωνῶν μέγ' ὑπεύροχον ἀγγελιώτην / σὼν τεράων: ἅ τ' ἐμοῖσι φίλοις ἐνδέξια φαίνοις. The dovetailing of meter and diction thus make allusion a possibility. What makes it especially attractive here is the relevance of this passage of the *Iliad* to Callimachus' friends at court for whom he is praying. Zeus in the *Iliad* heeds Priam's prayer. He sends down an eagle, and the poet adorns it with a glorious simile, comparing the bird to a wealthy man's treasury. Let us consider the passage in full:

αὐτίκα δ' αἰετὸν ἦκε τελειότατον πετεηνῶν  
 μόρφον θηρητῆρ' ὃν καὶ περκνὸν καλέουσιν.  
 ὅσση δ' ὑπορόφοιο θύρῃ θαλάμοιο τέτυκται  
 ἀνέρος ἀφνειοῦ ἐν κληῖσ' ἀραρυῖα,  
 τόσσ' ἄρα τοῦ ἐκάτερθεν ἔσαν πτερὰ: εἶσατο δέ σφι  
 δεξιὸς ἄξιας διὰ ἄστεος: οἳ δὲ ἰδόντες  
 γήθησαν, καὶ πᾶσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμὸς ἰάνθη. (*Il.* 24.315-21)

And straightaway he [Zeus] sent a black eagle, the most perfect of birds, the hunter, which they also call dusky. As great as the doors of a rich man's high-ceilinged treasury are built, fitted well with bolts, so great were its wings on either side; it darted through the city and perched on Priam's right-hand side. The onlookers rejoiced, and the spirit warmed in every chest.

As Zeus's bird's size is measured against a magnate's storeroom,<sup>13</sup> wealth and wingspan collapse. This simile is particularly fitting for the eagle sent to Priam, whose vast riches were famed throughout the world. By alluding to this eagle omen, it is as if Callimachus makes the eagle sent by Zeus to Priam's right-hand side (δεξιός, *Il.* 24.320) take textual wing, flying to settle down on the right-hand side (ἐνδέξια, *Hymn* 1.69) of his own 'friends' (ἐμοῖσι φίλοις). The

---

the line is syntactically parallel to *Hymn* 1.70 εἶλεο δ' αἰζηῶν ὅ τι φέρτατον. I thus accept Stephanus' correction.

<sup>13</sup> For this meaning of θάλαμος see LSJ s.v. 1.2b.

allusion celebrates not only its recipient's magnificent treasures, but also his textual, cultural wealth, appropriating as it does a jewel of the Homeric text. Who would have wanted to be Callimachus' 'friend' and beneficiary more than Ptolemy himself? In fact, friendship (φιλία) was precisely the term for the relationship that the king shared with members of his court.

In this short passage of two lines, then, Callimachus positions himself as a valuable friend for his king to have. He offers an invaluable cultural capital for his kings to possess as they cultivate their dynastic image; in return, he lays claim to all that a friend is entitled to.

The purpose of this chapter is to lay the foundation for a systematic evaluation of Callimachus' poetry as it reflects the competitive dynamics of court patronage in Ptolemaic Alexandria. In the first section I describe the structure of Hellenistic court society as a competitive social network in which courtiers are linked by *philia*, 'friendship' with the king, consisting of an exchange of gifts and services. The second section situates poets in this court society. I show that Hellenistic poets present themselves as friends of the king offering him the gift of their poetry, and that they compete for royal favor not only with other poets, but also with courtiers of all stripes. The kings, in turn, benefited from this productive competition by putting their poets' competition to important political uses.

In the third section we focus specifically on the position of poets in Ptolemaic Alexandria and how their poetry was valued and evaluated there as a 'cultural capital.' I first discuss how the Ptolemaic kings positioned themselves as the ultimate arbiters of cultural capital, and that poets consented to and benefited from this arrangement. The king's authority as the supreme judge of culture is nowhere better expressed than the Museum, whose head priest he alone appointed. I then examine the Museum in Bourdieusian terms as a site not only for the Ptolemies' production of cultural capital, but also for the production of symbolic capital for poets and scholars,

especially in the form of the prestigious meals they received from the king. Finally I turn to a major site for the court society's consumption of this cultural capital, the royal symposium. Here courtier competed with courtier, each wielding his own form of capital as a weapon for his own distinction, and I suggest that several features deemed characteristic of Hellenistic poetry are owed to the competitive dynamics at this exclusive occasion.

In the final section I re-evaluate Callimachus' position in light of the social dynamics of the Ptolemaic court society and its uses of cultural capital. After outlining what we know of his social status at court, I discuss how analyzing his portrayal of exchange and the value of different forms of capital at court can illuminate his own investment in and interrogation of court society.

## I. Friends Bearing Gifts: The Structure of Hellenistic Court Society

### *i. The Hellenistic Court as Social Phenomenon*

The problem of defining court is an old one, and we may do no better than to begin with the opening of the serio-comic *De nugis curialium* (*On the Trifles of Courtiers*) by Walter Map, a courtier of Henry II in the twelfth century.<sup>14</sup> He boldly sets out his work by comparing the court to time itself, and his own project to Augustine's treatment of time in his *Confessions*:

in tempore sum et de tempore loquor, ait Augustinus, et adiecit: nescio quid sit tempus. ego simili possum admiratione dicere quod in curia sum, et de curia loquor, et nescio, Deus scit, quid sit curia.<sup>15</sup>

I exist in time and I am speaking about time, said Augustine, and he added: I do not know what time is. I can say with similar wonder that I am in court, and I am speaking about court, and I know not, God does, what court is.

---

<sup>14</sup> On the date of *De nugis*, see Brooke and Mynors (1983), xxiv, xxx.

<sup>15</sup> I cite the text from James (1914).

Part of the problem Map runs up against with defining court stems from the word's ambiguity in reference, meaning variously a place, a social group, or an event.<sup>16</sup> But the more fundamental problem Map identifies, adapting it from Augustine, is the instability of the court itself. He explains his introductory paradox as follows:

Scio tamen quod curia non est tempus: temporalis quidem est, mutabilis et uaria, localis et erratica, nunquam in eodem statu permanens. In recessu meo totam agnosco, in reditu nichil aut modicum inuenio quod dereliquerim; extraneam uideo factus alienus. Eadem est curia, sed mutata sunt membra.

Nevertheless I know that court is not time; assuredly it is temporal, changeable and manifold, local and wandering, never persisting in the same state. On my departure I know it entirely; in returning I find little or nothing that I left behind; made a stranger, I see that it is foreign. It is the same court, but its members have changed.

Through paradox and negation, central features of Map's style and project in *De nugis curialium*,<sup>17</sup> the court changes before our eyes. While it first appears to be a physical entity that stays put or moves (*localis et erratica*) and that one may leave and return to (*recessu, reditu*), on closer reading it emerges as a social organization: Map's phrase *nunquam in eodem statu permanens*, which alludes to Job's image of man as a flower that fades or shadow that vanishes (14:2), refers specifically to the changing political organization of the court;<sup>18</sup> and his concluding image of the court's changing *membra* gets purchase on the common metaphor of people as the

---

<sup>16</sup> Noted by Erskine, Llewelyn-Jones, and Wallace (2017), xvi.

<sup>17</sup> The programmatic import of Map's negation for his literary project is discussed recently by Edwards (2007), with a brief overview of literary scholars' approaches to his work.

<sup>18</sup> L-S s.v. *status* 2.b.3.



‘limbs’ of a political formation.<sup>19</sup> When Map, returning to court, sees it as *extranea* and himself *alienus*, his alienation is social as much as physical. The palace has not changed, but the people inside of it and the relationships that bound them to the king and to each other have, and he is no longer part of its body.<sup>20</sup>

Following Map, modern scholarship on the court has emphasized that it is not simply a collection of people<sup>21</sup> or a place where power resides,<sup>22</sup> nor even a simple combination of both.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> L-S s.v. *membrum* 2.b.1.

<sup>20</sup> Dinshaw (2012), 60-3 discusses the pain and alienation at the center of Map’s court in connection with Augustine’s idea of the pain of time.

<sup>21</sup> Elton (1983), 39 defines court as ‘those who at any given time were within “his grace’s house”,’ adding that ‘all those with the right to be there were courtiers’; Starkey (1987), 5 excludes people at court of lower social status than the king’s companions (servants, guards, etc.). These definitions overlook both the importance of regulated space and the form of interactions between individuals at court.

<sup>22</sup> Rodríguez-Salgado (1991), 207. Strootman (2014), 31-2 rightly notes the problem that this definition presupposes a fixed residence, which was untrue for many of the Hellenistic courts (e.g. the Seleucids). Another obvious criticism is that it does not take into account the human factor.

<sup>23</sup> Compare the criticism of Elias’ definition of court (the extended households of the king and his dependents and the people associated with them) by Herman (1997), 202-3 as it implies a fixed residence. This bifurcation is also adopted by Erskine, Llewellyn-Jones, and Wallace (2017), xxi.

Instead, court is a sociological phenomenon in which a monarch at the center is socially isolated both from the world outside the court and from the courtiers themselves to varying degrees according to their favor.<sup>24</sup> It is telling, for instance, that the first extant anecdote Map includes about court (1.9 – a lacuna precedes it) concerns the repulsion of several foresters from the door to the room where the king was at the moment, at which a courtier chided the king for refusing them entry, for the same would be done to him at the gates of heaven.

Doors and walls likewise stand at the origin of court and kingship in Greek imagination. At the beginning of the *Cyrus logos*, Herodotus recounts the history of the Medes, including how they came to accept kingship through the machinations of Deioces, the first Median king and founder of Ecbatana (1.96-101). His first action was to surround Ecbatana with no fewer than seven circles of walls (1.98.4-6). Not only did he then live inside and the people outside, but he also established ordinances isolating himself from them completely. As Herodotus reports,

...πρῶτός ἐστι ὁ καταστησάμενος, μήτε εἰσέναι παρὰ βασιλέα μηδένα, δι' ἀγγέλων δὲ πάντα χρᾶσθαι, ὁρᾶσθαι τε βασιλέα ὑπὸ μηδενός, πρὸς τε τούτοις ἔτι γελάειν τε καὶ ἀντίον πτύειν καὶ ἅπασιν εἶναι τοῦτό γε αἰσχρόν.  
(1.99.1)

...he was the first to lay down that no one should enter the presence of the king, but that everything should be done through messengers, and that the king should be seen by no one, and still in addition to these laughing and spitting in his presence, this was shameful also for everyone.

---

<sup>24</sup> On favor, see Strootman (2014), 35.

The importance of this passage for the Greeks' conception of kingship cannot be overstated.<sup>25</sup> The Greeks viewed Persian court ceremonial as borrowed entirely from the Medes, and since they viewed the Persian Great King as the embodiment of kingship itself – they do not use the definite article when referring to the Persian King, for he is 'the king' – Deioces' actions offer a kind of charter myth legitimizing the essence of kingship.<sup>26</sup> Deioces' use of barriers, both physical and social, to remove himself from the gaze of all suggest his ultimate distinction from other men. Moreover, that he may see others while they cannot see him or act freely in his presence suggests his power over all.<sup>27</sup>

Hellenistic archaeologists have confirmed that the careful regulation of space structured royal palaces: often set apart from the city center at a higher elevation, king's residences supported their claims to superiority and distinction.<sup>28</sup> Here, however, Alexandria was different:

---

<sup>25</sup> Asheri at Asheri, Lloyd, Corcella (2007), 150-1 on this passage describes the relation of Median and Persian court ceremonial, which were closely linked in the Greek imagination; see also Savalli-Lestrade (1998), 314-15.

<sup>26</sup> While scholars have identified Deioces with the historical figure *Daiakku* in Neo-Assyrian sources, Helm (1981) argues that Herodotus' portrayal of the king draws on contemporary Persian court practices and stock Greek notions of tyrants. Herodotus' Deioces thus serves an ideological function.

<sup>27</sup> Llewellyn-Jones (2013), 44-8 discusses the importance of vision in the Achaemenid court: the king is not to be seen, but is all-seeing.

<sup>28</sup> See the archaeological analysis of Hellenistic palace architecture with a view towards ideology by Strootman (2014), 54-90.

the palace district made up a large portion of the city and was conspicuous for all to see.<sup>29</sup> But although the court was visible, entry to it was highly regulated: we must remember that the best literary account of an entry to the palace district, Theocritus' *Idyll* 15, takes place not on any day but on a festival day for the worship of Adonis sponsored by Arsinoe, the wife of Ptolemy II Philadelphus. The Ptolemaic court was therefore purposefully conspicuous and integrated into the life of the city, but social custom locked the door to all but the favored few. For these reasons, I consider court in this dissertation not primarily as a place, but as a highly regulated social phenomenon characterized by physical *qua* social differentiation.<sup>30</sup>

Modern sociological analysis of the court begins with Norbert Elias' *Die höfische Gesellschaft* (1969), translated into English as *The Court Society* (1983), which has guided subsequent studies of courts ancient and modern.<sup>31</sup> Influenced by Weber, Elias sought to describe the ideal type of court through an historical analysis of Louis XIV's Versailles, for

---

<sup>29</sup> On the topography of Alexandria, see Fraser (1972), 1.7-37.

<sup>30</sup> Erskine, Llewellyn-Jones, and Wallace (2017), xviii, quoting Bishop (1998), 89: 'the court often functioned like a series of locked rooms, with those on the outside always trying keys, and those on the inside constantly changing the locks.' Beyond architecture, ceremonial regulated the movement of king and courtiers to maintain distance appropriate to rank: see Duindam (1994), 103: '*cérémonial domestique*...laid down the monarch's daily schedule and determined who would be received, as well as the circumstances of each encounter, thus tying rank to distance from the king.'

<sup>31</sup> For a brief description of his model, see Duindam (1994), 31-2; his entire monograph is a useful critique of Elias' model point by point.

which he made profitable use of descriptions of the court's daily rituals in the diary of Saint-Simon and other court literature. He argued that court was the sword with which the king dominated and pacified the landed elite. By bringing them into his household and making them compete for his favor through the performance of etiquette, the king made his courtiers overlook the real power that they had handed over at the gate. Although scholars have made valuable criticisms and corrections to Elias' description of court,<sup>32</sup> his sociological framework and method remain fundamental.

Hellenistic historians in recent decades have undertaken sustained analyses of the Hellenistic court from a sociological perspective,<sup>33</sup> and Gabriel Herman and Rolf Strootman in particular have drawn on Elias' method to great profit.<sup>34</sup> Herman's incisive article of 1997

---

<sup>32</sup> A notable criticism of Elias is that he failed to recognize the power which some courtiers actually gained by coming to court and the degree to which the king was himself bound by the conventions of court life; to maintain his status, he had to make massive expenditures which risked his financial solubility: for these points, see Duindam (1994), 35-95. For an analysis of Elias' achievement and criticisms of his work from the vantage point of Hellenistic history, see Strootman (2014), 33-4; Erskine, Llewellyn-Jones and Wallace (2017), xviii-xx.

<sup>33</sup> Bickerman (1938) was ahead of his time, studying the Seleucid court as a social institution.

<sup>34</sup> Two studies not reliant on Elias are nevertheless fundamental: Weber (1993), 130-82 provides an invaluable prosopography of courtiers, notably including non-*philoi*, and the various occasions at which they gathered for the recitation of poetry; Savalli-Lestrade (1998), 289-398 offers a sociological study of the Hellenistic court societies, tracing their influences from the

applied Elias' concept of the court as a hyper-competitive arena fostered by the king to keep his courtiers in check to Polybius' description of politics and intrigue at Hellenistic courts. He emphasizes that, while the Hellenistic court never developed the elaborate and formal pageantry characteristic of some modern courts, a Hellenistic courtier's every move was nonetheless regulated by a subtle, flexible, and all-pervasive etiquette.<sup>35</sup> Recently Strootman has offered a synchronic analysis of Hellenistic court society which brings to light its composition and social dynamics, emphasizing the role that court architecture, etiquette, and royal ceremonial played in sustaining the idea of divine kingship.<sup>36</sup> A recent collection of essays edited by Erskine, Llewellyn-Jones, and Wallace now offers detailed explorations of many facets of court life united by Elias' approach to the court society.

Following these scholars, Herman and Strootman in particular, I define the Hellenistic court as the hierarchical social network immediately surrounding the king, access to whom is

---

Macedonian Argead court and the Achaemenid court, then studying the social dynamics of the inner circle of court consisting of friends and king.

<sup>35</sup> Herman (1997), 223-4; see especially his analysis of the courtier Apelles' fall from favor and the charges against breach of court etiquette made against his followers at 218-22. On the precise meaning of etiquette, see Duindam (1994), 97-136; he prefers the more specific term *politesse* to refer to the regular bearing of courtiers.

<sup>36</sup> Strootman (2014). He is particularly indebted to Duindam (1994), who offers critiques of Elias' and Kruedener's models of court society through comparison of the court of Versailles, which Elias focused on exclusively, with the Habsburgs and other modern courts.

regulated by favor.<sup>37</sup> Royal favor is the ‘principle of proximity to the throne,’ which replaced social status as the determining factor for one’s position at court and closeness to the king.<sup>38</sup> The pages of Polybius and Athenaeus are filled with the kings’ favorite *hetairai* and eunuchs who acted as his power brokers, completely dependent on him and therefore completely loyal.<sup>39</sup> Life at court under the reign of favor verged on the unpredictable and alienating, recalling Map’s sentiments about exclusion from the ever-changing court. After the downfall of the courtier Apelles, Polybius reflects in a famous passage:

ὄντως γάρ εἰσιν οὗτοι παραπλήσιοι ταῖς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀβακίων ψήφοις: ἐκεῖναί τε γὰρ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ψηφίζοντος βούλησιν ἄρτι χαλκοῦν καὶ παραυτικά τάλαντον ἰσχύουσιν, οἳ τε περὶ τὰς αὐλὰς κατὰ τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως νεῦμα μακάριοι καὶ παρὰ πόδας ἐλεεινοὶ γίνονται. (Polyb. 5.26.13)

---

<sup>37</sup> Herman (1997) pragmatically avoided defining Hellenistic court, rather confirming at 203-5 that it met three criteria: (1) that there emerged ‘norms, rules of conduct (in particular those regulating access to the ruler) and ceremonial practices which affect, and to a certain extent regulate, the behaviour of the ruler and that of the individual members’ (203); (2) that there were physical palaces where these ‘courts’ were centered; and (3) that ‘courtiers,’ people who made their careers dealing with kings at court, were a recognized social group. He also identified two further distinguishing features of Hellenistic courts: (4) ‘the specialization of courtly functions’ (205); and (5) *tryphe* as ideological display.

<sup>38</sup> Kruedener (1973), 57, cited by Strootman (2014), 35 n. 15. Often of course the two coincide, as the king must show favor to those with status, who form a powerful interest group: see Duindam (1994), 90.

<sup>39</sup> On *hetairai* see Buraselis (2017); on eunuchs, non-Greeks and non-Macedonians, see Strootman (2014), 175-84.

For in reality these men [courtiers] are very much like pebbles on an abacus: for the latter, according to the wish of the reckoner, are at one moment worth a copper piece, and immediately afterwards a talent; and courtiers, according to the nod of the king, become blessed and suddenly piteous.

One's favor was one's worth and variable, as Polybius' comparison with counting pebbles brings out clearly. A simple nod from the king was all it took for the edifice to crumble. Subtle gesture betokened great significance in regulated, restraining court societies, and courtiers themselves were often the ones most invested in the maintenance of ceremonial.<sup>40</sup>

Accordingly, courtiers strove to earn and maintain their 'blessed' state, often at others' expense. Herman has argued that it was positively in the king's favor to sow discord among his courtiers, for by this strategy he might hinder them from uniting as a group to oppose and dethrone him.<sup>41</sup> More than dividing to conquer, however, the king pitted courtier against courtier to reap the benefits of their productive competition: when courtiers vied to outdo each other in raising larger armies, securing honors for the king in *poleis* where they had influence, or building shrines and making dedications, the king always stood to gain. It is to this endemic competition, as we shall see, that the innovative cultural production of the Hellenistic age is owed.

## *ii. Courtiership as Performed Philia*

For more than a century after Alexander's death, no formal titles designated the position or rank of each member of the court. Courtiers were simply φίλοι τοῦ βασιλέως, 'friends of the

---

<sup>40</sup> See the brilliant analysis of Herman (1997), 218-22 of Philip's arrest of the courtier Apelles on the grounds of improper behavior at a symposium. On courtiers' investment in etiquette and ceremonial more generally, see Duindam (1994), 97-136.

<sup>41</sup> Herman (1997), 215.



king.<sup>42</sup> Some scholars have rejected the idea that courtiers were true friends of the king on the grounds that friendship in the Greek world demanded equality of members, and so what was called friendship was actually a relationship of service.<sup>43</sup> But the reality of royal ‘friendship’ has no import, for friendship was the ideological construction of courtiership, the terms that king and courtier agreed to, true or not. To make an analogy: Callimachus’ professions of queen Berenice II’s *charis* (‘grace, beauty, charm,’ *Ep.* 51 Pf = 15 G-P) do not offer proof of the poet’s true feelings for her, nor, for that matter, an unbiased appraisal of her beauty. Rather they can, and even should, be read as a prescription for the courtier’s performance of his emotional reaction to the queen’s presence, in service of a particular ideology of queenship.<sup>44</sup> Accordingly, I follow

---

<sup>42</sup> Mooren (1975) is a key study of the aulic titulature and prosopography of Ptolemaic Alexandria. On the development of court titles and their adoption at the Ptolemaic court, see Strootman (2014), 165-72, although his argument that the king deployed it as a means to regain or strengthen control of the *philoï* is not wholly convincing; it would seem at best to offer a short-term solution with severe long-term consequences.

<sup>43</sup> e.g. Herman (1987), 164; Walbank (1984), 70; Meißner (2000); Mehl (2003), 159-60. *Contra* Weber (1997); Gehrke (2003), 53.

<sup>44</sup> I discuss Callimachus’ strategy of presentation vis-à-vis the queen in detail in Chapter 5. My view of the affective quality of court friendship therefore differs from Konstan (1997), 121, who tries to affirm the persistence of emotional commitment in royal *philia*, despite his overarching argument that such relations degenerated into relations of service.

those scholars who describe courtiership as a performance, and courtier as a social role or persona.<sup>45</sup>

Current scholarly consensus, arising from the seminal study of Christian Habicht, holds that the *philoï* were overwhelmingly Greek and Macedonian elites, like Callicrates of Samos, many of whom held priesthoods and/or military commands.<sup>46</sup> But we should not on the basis of this evidence assume that individuals not so named were not considered *philoï*, too, or did not have a relationship of *philia* with the king. The very title ‘friend,’ in fact, slippery as the notion is, seems deliberately informal to undergird the vagaries of favor. I thus maintain that the number of people who acted and were accepted as *philoï* was most certainly greater than the sum of those called *philoï* in our fragmentary historical sources for the period.

---

<sup>45</sup> On Hellenistic courtiership as a role or persona, see Savalli-Lestrade (1998), 342-5; (2017), 102; Berrey (2017), 103-9. See also the remarks of Duindam (1994), 100: ‘The line dividing role from person and convention from content is thin. The non-conformist who mocks roles and social conventions is just as authentic or artificial as the polished courtier.’

<sup>46</sup> Habicht (1958). Sherwin-White and Kuhrt (1993) challenged Habicht’s conclusions on the grounds that his data was incomplete and that a Greek or Macedonian personal name does not offer evidence that the person was in fact Greek or Macedonian. Habicht’s conclusions are still widely held; Strootman (2014), 125-6 observes that even if there were more significant numbers of non-Greco-Macedonian *philoï*, their Greek names suggest they adopted the dominant culture of the ruling class.

The backbone of this *philia* was the mutual exchange of gifts and services.<sup>47</sup> Herman has suggested that courtiers were recruited as *xenoi* ('guest-friends'), whom he argues are elite, 'ritualized friends' linked by 'a bond of solidarity manifesting itself in an exchange of goods and services between individuals originating from separate social units.'<sup>48</sup> Other institutions that conditioned Hellenistic courtiership, namely the band of Macedonian *hetairoi* and the Achaemenid king's 'friends,' likewise found expression in the exchange of gifts.<sup>49</sup> Gift-exchange, we might say, was the necessary condition of *philia*.

Hellenistic kingship has long been described in Weberian terms as dependent on the king's charisma. An essential component of this charisma was *tryphe*, a 'luxuriousness' (LSJ s.v. 2) manifested in the conspicuous consumption of wealth. All kings competed in this display of *tryphe*, and the Ptolemies claimed it as their particular excellence.<sup>50</sup> Moreover, as both Greek and Persian ideologies of kingship promoted the ideal king as generous to his friends,<sup>51</sup> one of the king's most important displays of *tryphe* was bestowing lavish gifts to his *philoï*. Ivana Savalli-

---

<sup>47</sup> On reciprocal exchange in *philia*, see e.g. Blundell (1989), 31-7; Mitchell (1997), 1-21. I discuss the nature of gift-exchange in detail in section IV.

<sup>48</sup> Herman (1987), 10; he discusses the origin of Hellenistic ritualized friendship at 155-6 and 164, followed by Strootman (2014), 145-7.

<sup>49</sup> For a discussion of these court societies see Savalli-Lestrade (1998), 291-321.

<sup>50</sup> For a brief overview of Ptolemaic *tryphe* see Hölbl (2001), 92 and Pfeiffer (2016), 8-9; for further discussion see Heinen (1983); Tondriau (1946); Müller (2009), 159-172. Ager (2006) even argues that the Ptolemies practiced incest in order to display their *tryphe*.

<sup>51</sup> See examples collected in Savalli-Lestrade (1998), 329-33.

Lestrade reminds us that, for talented individuals, the Hellenistic courts were a sellers' market, and kings competed amongst themselves to offer the best gifts to attract the best friends.<sup>52</sup> Kings alone could grant 'top-rank'<sup>53</sup> gifts like estates or even cities as sources of revenue to their *philoi*, along with large gifts of money or grain; they also distributed symbolic gifts such as purple clothing, golden crowns, tableware from their symposia, and even offices, commands, and aulic titles.<sup>54</sup> With every gift the king confirmed and increased his prestige as a generous benefactor and a fabulously wealthy, and hence successful, ruler.

For this reason there was no shame in asking a king for a present so long one did not ask too often. When one of Theocritus' rustics Thyonichos advises his friend Aeschinas, who wishes to go abroad as a mercenary, to seek out Ptolemy's court, his praise of Ptolemy as the 'best paymaster for a free man' (μισθοδότας...ἐλευθέρωι...ἄριστος, *Id.* 14.59) concludes with the following image of his beneficence: 'giving many people many things, not refusing when asked, as a king ought – but you must not be asking on every occasion, Aeschinas' (πολλοῖς πολλὰ δίδους, αἰτεῦμενος οὐκ ἀνανεύων, / οἷα χρή βασιλῆι· αἰτεῖν δὲ δεῖ οὐκ ἐπὶ παντί, / Αἰσχίνα,

---

<sup>52</sup> Savalli-Lestrade (1998), 327. In a telling anecdote Plutarch contrasts Cleomenes, who attracted courtiers with conversation and his good character, with all other kings: 'For the other kings hunted men by enticing them with money and gifts/estates and corrupting them...' (ἄς μὲν γὰρ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν βασιλέων ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους θήρας ἐποιοῦντο, χρήμασι καὶ δωρεαῖς δελεάζοντες αὐτοὺς καὶ διαφθείροντες..., *Plut. Vit. Cleom.* 13.5).

<sup>53</sup> On top-rank gifts see Gregory (1982), 48-50 and Kurke (1991), 94-6.

<sup>54</sup> Strootman (2014), 153-9; on gifts of land and cities by Hellenistic kings see also Herman (1987), 106-15. Strootman (2014), 165-72 argues that aulic titles functioned as gifts.

*Id.* 14.63-5).<sup>55</sup> It even seems to have been customary, at least on occasion, for kings to give more than what was asked in order to mark their superior status over the recipient. When a *hetairos* asked Alexander for ten talents, an enormous sum, as dowries for his daughters, Alexander famously promised him fifty, saying ten was ‘enough for you to receive but not enough for me to give.’<sup>56</sup> While this anecdote may be *ben trovato* rather than *vero*, it illustrates nevertheless how kings should ideally act.

All those who wished to be or continue being the king’s friends showered him with their own gifts and services in turn. One of the most important services of *philoï* was as representatives of the king’s imperial interests at the civic level in their home *poleis*.<sup>57</sup> The upper echelon of friends also advised the king in his war council (*synedrion*), led armies, and levied troops.<sup>58</sup> In addition to these services, *philoï* gave kings material gifts of a variety of kinds.

---

<sup>55</sup> While I translate οἷα adverbially, it is possible that it modifies πολλά and that one should translate ‘giving many people many things, not refusing, when asked, the sorts of things a king ought [to give].’ On this reading, Thyonichus would gesture to a class of gifts that were considered appropriate for kings to give. Gow (1950), 2.260, however, on 64 οἷα cites *Id.* 17.105 and 22.47 as parallels for the adverbial construction and thus suggests it to be the more likely interpretation of the passage.

<sup>56</sup> Plut. *Mor.* 127b. The king’s inability to refuse public requests is illustrated by the amusing anecdote about Lysimachus putting a dead scorpion in a courtier’s cloak; to get back at him, he requested a counter-gift, as it were, of a talent (Athen. 246e); see Strootman (2014), 158.

<sup>57</sup> Strootman (2014), 146-7.

<sup>58</sup> Strootman (2014), 172-4 (on the *synedrion*), 159 (on military service).

Callicrates of Samos, for instance, famously founded a shrine for Arsinoe-Aphrodite-Zephyritis at Cape Zephyrion to establish and adorn the queen's new cult.<sup>59</sup> Others joined in and made dedications there: Selenaiia, the daughter of a courtier Cleinias, dedicated a conch shell to the goddess, which was accompanied or celebrated with a famous epigram of Callimachus (5 Pf = 14 G-P). Precious objects could be given on special occasions, as for instance Josephus describes after the birth of the king's son,<sup>60</sup> and it is possible that gifts of money could be given as well.<sup>61</sup>

It is plain to see how the exchange of high-status gifts became the nexus of competition between courtiers for royal favor.<sup>62</sup> The intertwining of gifts and favor is on full display in Josephus' story I have just referred to about the birthday presents for Ptolemy V's son. The protagonist Hyrcanus has agreed to go to the Alexandrian court on business for his father. His brothers, however, want him dead, and so have written to Ptolemy's *philoï* asking them to destroy their brother who will soon be their king's guest. Hyrcanus has his work cut out for him.

---

<sup>59</sup> Fraser (1972), 1.239-40. For ancient sources on Callicrates, see Mooren (1975), 58-60 (no. 10). We shall consider this shrine in more detail in the following section.

<sup>60</sup> Jos. *AJ.* 12.196, 215-16.

<sup>61</sup> Strootman (2014), 159 comes close to suggesting that *philoï* even offered kings direct gifts of cash as well when he was in financial need, yet the two examples he cites (Diod. 29.29, Polyb. 5.50.1-3) rather suggest, as he later says, that the king at least on occasion depended on *philoï* to pay soldiers or levy them. Thus these examples offer evidence for another possible service of *philoï*.

<sup>62</sup> Strootman (2014), 157.

On the day before the celebration of the birth of Ptolemy V's son, Hyrcanus visited the *philoi* individually to show his respect to them and to learn from their servants how much their masters were planning to give as gifts. Some planned to give ten talents, and some even more. Having told all the servants that he would only be able to give a gift of five talents, the *philoi* were delighted: 'and they rejoiced that Joseph [Hyrcanus' father] would be looked down upon by the king and that he would give him offence by the smallness of his gift' (χαिरούντων δ' αὐτῶν ὡς καταγνωσθησομένου τοῦ Ἰωσήπου καὶ προσκρούσοντος τῷ βασιλεῖ διὰ τὴν βραχύτητα τῆς δωρεᾶς, *AJ* 12.217). Josephus here reveals the competitive mentality of giving at court. Each *philos* seeks to make as great a display of his wealth as he can, for giving less than this can make the scales of favor swing. The hierarchy of court, in other words, is performed and preserved by the giving of gifts, and any deviations from the status quo have the ability to change it.

In the event, Hyrcanus upstaged all of the *philoi* and took them down with gifts. While the *philoi* brought their expected presents of ten talents or more, Hyrcanus presented the royal couple with the spectacle of 100 boys and 100 girls he had purchased for them to keep, each processing to them with a talent in his or her hands; in addition, Hyrcanus gave each *philos* a gift worth many talents (12.217-18). His conspicuous consumption of wealth forces the friends' collective hand: having received gifts worth as much or more than they themselves gave to the king and queen, they are both shown up and silenced, lest they act as an enemy to their new, generous friend. The king, pleased at his generosity (τὴν μεγαλοψυχίαν ἀγασάμενος, 219), bid Hyrcanus take whatever gift he wanted; when Hyrcanus asked him only to write a letter to his father and brothers about him, the king obliged him, 'after he honored him, with distinction and gave him resplendent gifts' (τιμήσας οὖν αὐτὸν φιλοτιμότατα καὶ δωρεὰς δούς λαμπράς,

220). Ptolemy had offered Hyrcanus the greatest gift, a blank check; when Hyrcanus asked only for a letter, an unquantifiable service, Ptolemy was obliged by the law of generosity to bestow further gifts in addition. These gifts, in addition to the letter, distinguish Hyrcanus from the other *philoi*, of whom no more is spoken, and as an undeniable sign of the king's favor guarantee his favorable reception by his brothers when he returns home.

## II. Hellenistic Poets as Useful Friends at Court

Such was the competitive atmosphere at court in which the poets and intellectuals whom the Ptolemies gave royal patronage lived, wrote, and presented their work. Was the poet a *philos* like any other courtier? Strootman has argued that they were. In an illuminating analysis of Theocritus' *Idyll* 16, he demonstrates that Theocritus portrays the royal patronage he asks for as *xenia* ('guest-friendship') offered in return for Theocritus' 'graces' (χάριτες), that is, his gift of poetry;<sup>63</sup> on this basis, he concludes that poets and other intellectuals were 'genuine courtiers, *philoi tou basileōs*.'<sup>64</sup> Despite the attractions of Strootman's reading, we must step lightly here. None of our sources designate Callimachus, Theocritus, Apollonius, Posidippus or other major Hellenistic poets and scholars as *philoi*, as they do Callicrates of Samos or Sosibius.<sup>65</sup> To my knowledge there are two poets called *philoi* in historical sources: the New Comic poet

---

<sup>63</sup> Strootman (2011), 37-9, slightly expanded in Strootman (2017), 104-8.

<sup>64</sup> Strootman (2014), 160.

<sup>65</sup> For ancient sources on Sosibius, see Mooren (1975), 63-6 (no. 18).



Philippides, called by Plutarch a ‘friend of Lysimachus’ of Thrace (Λυσιμάχου φίλος, Plut. *Vit. Demetr.* 12.5); and Hegesianax, the author of poetry and a 15-book history of the Trojan war, said to have been named a *philos* by Antiochus III after reciting his poetry at a royal symposium (Athen. 4.155b). It is entirely possible that more poets than these were officially styled *philoi*, and there is good evidence that Callimachus was, too, as we shall see in the final section of this chapter. But we should not conclude as a rule that poets at court were titled *philoi*. Rather, on the basis of *Idyll* 16 and other such poems, we may conclude that poets *presented* themselves as *xenoi* or *philoi*, so that even if they were not called by the same name as the king’s military advisors and other high-ranking officials, they affected, and as we shall see effected, the same form of courtiership, namely *philia*.

Marquis Berrey’s recent study of Hellenistic kings’ patronage of science has shown persuasively that scientists routinely presented themselves as *philoi* offering the king their work as a gift and praising his φιλομαθία (‘love of learning’). In so doing, the scientists enjoined the king to treat them as a *philos*, accepting their gift and offering a gift in return: patronage is *philia*.<sup>66</sup> Building off Berrey’s work, I argue that poets, too, harnessed the language of *xenia* and *philia* to insinuate themselves into the ranks of the king’s friends along with those whose gifts and services differed greatly from their own.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Berrey (2017), 91-5.

<sup>67</sup> On a related note, Duindam (1994), 101 discusses how prospective courtiers could first master and deploy the ceremonial behavior requisite for belonging to court to assert their fitness to be a courtier; if no negative reactions were received, this precedent could later be appealed to. Thus ‘trying to set a precedent was the standard form of “usurpation” of a higher rank.’

Of all the Alexandrian poets, Theocritus is the most obvious in adopting the rhetoric of *philia* and gift-exchange in his poetry for kings. His encomium for Ptolemy Philadelphus (*Id.* 17) represents Ptolemy's patronage of the arts in terms of the exchange of gifts when he describes the prizes previous poets have won from Philadelphus at Dionysian festivals:<sup>68</sup>

οὐδὲ Διωνύσου τις ἀνὴρ ἱεροὺς κατ' ἀγῶνας  
ἵκετ' ἐπιστάμενος λιγυρὰν ἀναμέλψαι ἀοιδάν,  
ὣι οὐ δωτίναν ἀντάξιον ὥπασε τέχνας.  
Μουσάων δ' ὑποφῆται αἰέδοντι Πτολεμαῖον  
ἀντ' εὐεργεσίας. (*Id.* 17.112-16)

And a man knowledgeable of how to raise a clear-sounding song does not come to holy competitions of Dionysus in which he [Philadelphus] does not make him a present worth as much as his *techne*; and the expounders of the Muses sing of Ptolemy in exchange for his benefaction.

Richard Hunter writes that the awarding of monetary prizes was a “sordid” subject’ requiring Theocritus to dress up politely the money he hoped for by using an elevated, epic word

δωτίνη.<sup>69</sup> But there is no evidence that Theocritus considered the exchange of song for the gift of Ptolemaic money shameful or in need of euphemism. Rather, coming from the king himself royal wealth would have had symbolic value over and above its economic value.<sup>70</sup> Indeed, the

---

<sup>68</sup> While some (e.g. Fountoulakis [2017], 85) have suggested that Theocritus is referring to the awarding of prizes to the guild of Dionysian *technitai* on one occasion (he suggests the marriage of Philadelphus and Arsinoe), the present tense seems rather to indicate a general practice. On the *technitai* of Dionysus and their relationship to the Ptolemies, see Fountoulakis (2017), 82-7.

<sup>69</sup> Hunter (2003), 183-4 on 112-14 δωτίναν; he there offers a useful discussion of the history of cash prizes in poetic competitions.

<sup>70</sup> I consider the anthropological distinction between gifts and commodities that Hunter tacitly relies upon in the final section of the chapter.

four Homeric uses of the word δωτίνη firmly set Ptolemy's presents to poets in the context of relationships of reciprocity. In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus requests a δωτίνη (*Od.* 9.268) from the Cyclops to which guests are entitled, and likewise Alcinous says he will grant Odysseus a δωτίνη (11.352), in this case a Phaeacian escort home, to complete his stay as a *xenos*. These uses of δωτίνη thus cast Ptolemy as a host to poetic *xenoi*, inaugurating a long-term relationship of reciprocity. The use of δωτίνη in the *Iliad* is even more striking. In the embassy to Achilles, Agamemnon promises to give the affronted hero a gift that will keep on giving, prosperous cities whose wealthy inhabitants will honor him with δωτῖναι (*Il.* 9.155, 297) as if he were a god. Pressing this intertext, Theocritus portrays Ptolemy, himself a divine king, as offering skilled poets gifts such as those owed to the gods themselves; this is a subtle suggestion by Theocritus of the power skilled poets like himself possess. Whether or not we go this far in interpreting Theocritus' use of δωτίνη, however, Homeric usage suggests that Ptolemy's rewards to successful poets at festivals were not given in a one-time transaction of song for cash, but were – or should be – gifts that instantiated long-term relationships of giving and giving in return.

A second Theocritean passage clarifies that this ongoing exchange was understood in the context of *philia*. We earlier considered part of the herdsman Thyonichus' advice in *Idyll* 14 to his friend looking to serve as a mercenary abroad to head to Ptolemy Philadelphus; here we consider the entire passage. In Thyonichus' words, Philadelphus is

εὐγνώμων, φιλόμουσος, ἐρωτικός, εἰς ἄκρον ἀδύς,  
εἰδῶς τὸν φιλέοντα, τὸν οὐ φιλέοντ' ἔτι μᾶλλον,  
πολλοῖς πολλὰ διδούς, αἰτεύμενος οὐκ ἀνανεύων,  
οἷα χρή βασιλῇ· αἰτεῖν δὲ δεῖ οὐκ ἐπὶ παντί,  
Αἰσχίνα. (*Id.* 14.61-5)

Reasonable, loves the Muse, amorous, utterly sweet, knows his friend, knows his enemy even better, giving many things to many people, doesn't shake his head 'no' when asked the sorts of things a king should be [asked for]; but don't be asking on every occasion, Aeschinas.

The word φιλόμουσος suggests not that Philadelphus is generically ‘cultured,’ as Gow translates,<sup>71</sup> but literally a ‘friend of the Muse,’ as demonstrated by his patronage of the Museum and its members as his *philoï*. Moreover, hailing Ptolemy as φιλόμουσος not only acknowledges his past support of poets, but also puts a renewed obligation on him to continue acting as the Muses’ friend in the future.<sup>72</sup> In fact, speaking through Thyonichus, Theocritus makes the consequences of not treating poets like *philoï* perfectly clear when he says in the following line: ‘he knows his friend, knows his enemy even better’ (εἰδῶς τὸν φιλέοντα, τὸν οὐ φιλέοντ’ ἔτι μᾶλλον, 62). This is to say that, if Philadelphus spurns Theocritus, he will know the poet’s wrath even more than he did his friendship. Skilled poets like Theocritus, then, were not powerless wage-laborers of an all-powerful king; they were powerful friends and more powerful enemies.<sup>73</sup>

Theocritus appears to have written *Idyll* 17 for a festival competition much like the one he describes in lines 112-16; all Hellenistic poets, however, seeking to earn or maintain royal patronage were in competition for the king’s favor for them and their work. Consequently, competition among poets seems to have been as strong as that between the *philoï* we considered in the previous section. Here we enter upon one of the most well-known qualities of Hellenistic

---

<sup>71</sup> Gow (1950), 1.107.

<sup>72</sup> Berrey (2017), 89-91 discussing scientists does draw analogy to Theocritus’ discourse of *philia* in *Id.* 17.89-91. We might note that this same strategy was also adopted by *poleis* who voted divine honors for Hellenistic kings, for in this way they would pressure the king to continue his euergetism lest he be shown to be less than a god: see Chaniotis (2003), 440.

<sup>73</sup> I return to *Idyll* 17 in the following section, where I discuss Theocritus’ praise of Philadelphus as giving to poets what they deserved.

poetry, the bitter rivalries between its authors attested both by the poets themselves and the ancient scholarly traditions about them. Scholars like Mary Lefkowitz have long demonstrated that neither the poets nor ancient authorities writing about them may be trusted as offering actual evidence of historical quarrels, and more recently scholars have argued that Hellenistic poets' criticism of their peers and claims to be beset by critics themselves were strategies aimed at distinguishing themselves from competitors.<sup>74</sup> Jacqueline Klooster in particular makes valuable use of Bourdieu's concept of the field of cultural production, a space of social positions that members of the field, in this case poets, occupy and usurp in their struggle for preeminence and distinction.<sup>75</sup>

The recent publication of the Milan Posidippus demonstrates the utility of Bourdieu's theory of the field for the competitive dynamics of Hellenistic poetry. Ancient tradition ascribes

---

<sup>74</sup> Asper (2001) argues that the Telchines of the *Aetia* prologue are not a specific group of poets but rather an unspecified outgroup against whom Callimachus construes himself and his readers; he builds off of Lefkowitz (1981), 120-1, who compared Callimachus' practice of creating quarrels with other poets to that of the Archaic poets like Pindar. Klooster (2011), 115-45 examines Hellenistic poets' criticism of their contemporary poets more broadly. These scholars' approaches can be contrasted to e.g. Cameron (1995), 185-232, who suggests that much early Hellenistic realia still can be gleaned from the biographical traditions of the ancient poets.

<sup>75</sup> See her discussion at Klooster (2011), 120-1; see especially Bourdieu's essay 'The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed' reprinted in Bourdieu (1993), 29-73.

a feud to Callimachus and Posidippus, who both wrote poetry in praise of the Ptolemies.<sup>76</sup> Stephens has demonstrated that these poets consistently portray their patrons differently: Posidippus roots them firmly in a Macedonian context, while Callimachus weaves them into Egyptian ideology.<sup>77</sup> Stephens therefore suggests that the poets' quarrel was not over *techné* or artistry, but over imperial image-making, and that the two portrayed their differences as professional disagreement in order to galvanize the king in support of their work over their competitor's.<sup>78</sup> The king, of course, got to choose both and benefited immensely from Callimachus' and Posidippus' competition, as he had need of different representations for different audiences. Nevertheless, it is interesting that the poets act as if favor were a zero-sum game in claiming for themselves a distinctive position in the field of cultural production.<sup>79</sup>

Scholarship on Hellenistic poetry, however, has not yet taken full stock of the fact that poets competed not only with other poets for royal favor, but with the entire lineup of courtiers, as we saw in the case of Callimachus' elegy on the Sicilian cities. In a recent article, Ivana Petrovic has suggested that the epigrams written by Callimachus, Posidippus, and Hedylus for the temple and dedications of Arsinoe-Aphrodite Zephyritis bear witness not only to competition among themselves for patronage, but also between these poets and Callicrates of Samos, the

---

<sup>76</sup> Posidippus is named in the Florentine scholia (fr. 1b.5 Harder) as one of Callimachus' Telchines, his famous critics from the *Aetia* prologue.

<sup>77</sup> Stephens (2005).

<sup>78</sup> Stephens (2005), 248.

<sup>79</sup> We shall consider the Ptolemaic king's position as judge of cultural capital in detail in section three.

Ptolemies' *nauarch* and eponymous priest of the *Theoi Adelphoi* who donated the temple and founded the cult of Arsinoe-Aphrodite, to see who could offer the greatest gift.<sup>80</sup>

Here Bourdieu's theory of capital and the structure of the dominant class provides a helpful theoretical tool to explain this competition among different 'types' of courtiers. In his seminal work *Distinction*,<sup>81</sup> he argues that Marx's sole focus on economic capital as determining one's social class fails to explain observable differences in life-style among those who possess the same amount of economic capital. He proposes instead that one's class is determined by the total volume of capital of different types that one possesses, focusing above all on the sum of economic and cultural capital. The dominant class, then, can be divided into class fractions whose members possess different compositions of capital types: the 'dominant' fraction possesses a high amount of economic capital but little cultural capital, and the 'dominated' fraction possesses a high amount of cultural capital but little economic capital.<sup>82</sup> The dominated fraction struggles against dominant by trying to assert the higher value of its cultural capital over

---

<sup>80</sup> Petrovic (2019). On Callicrates and his active role in promoting the Ptolemies in Egypt and in old Greece, see Bing (2002/3).

<sup>81</sup> Bourdieu (1984), especially 99-168 ('The Social Space and its Transformations'), 226-59 ('The Dynamics of the Fields'), and 260-317 ('The Sense of Distinction').

<sup>82</sup> Bourdieu (1984), 114-25. As we shall see in the discussion of the royal symposium in section three, Bourdieu's dominant fraction does not represent well the wealthiest fraction of the Ptolemaic court society, for they too possessed great amounts of cultural capital. This difference, however, is not critical at this stage in my argument.

economic capital; the dominant fraction keeps the dominated fraction down, among other strategies, by appropriating their cultural capital for their own consumption.

Bourdieu's theory is invaluable for understanding the dynamics of competition for distinction at the Ptolemaic court, for here we have courtiers with very different compositions of capital, like poets, scientists, and commanders, competing for the same symbolic capital of royal favor and distinction. The usefulness of his ideas for understanding the competitive dynamics of Hellenistic poetry can be explained by any number of examples: let us begin with one of the epigrams Petrovic discusses for the shrine of Arsinoe-Aphrodite Zephyritis, one of the epigrams from the Milan Posidippus:

καὶ μέλλων ἄλα νηὶ περᾶν καὶ πείσμα καθάπτειν  
χερσόθεν, Εὐπλοῖαι 'χαῖ'ρε' δὸς Ἀρσινόῃ,  
πό]τνιαν ἐ<κ> νηοῦ καλέων θεόν, ἦν ὁ Βοῖσκου  
ναυαρχῶν Σάμιος θήκατο Καλλικράτης,  
ναυτίλε, σοὶ τὰ μάλιστα· κατ' εὐπλοῖαν δὲ διώκει  
τῇσδε θεοῦ χρήζων πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλος ἀνὴρ·  
εἴνεκα καὶ χερσαῖα καὶ εἰς ἄλα δῖαν ἀφίεις  
εὐχὰς εὐρήσεις τὴν ἐπακουσομένην. (AB 39)

Both when you are about to cross the sea by ship and when you are about to tie fast the stern-cable from dry land, give greetings/farewell to Arsinoe Euploia ['Of Good Sailing'], calling out from her temple the revered goddess, whom the son of Boiskos, the Samian Callicrates, while he was *nauarch* set up for you, sailor, most of all. Another man, too, imploring many times the goddess present here, is speeding on with good sailing; for this reason, both when you are on dry land and when you are casting off into the resplendent sea, you will discover the goddess attentive to prayers.

Previous scholars have interpreted this epigram as referring to Callicrates' dedication of the shrine and statue of Arsinoe Euploia, with an emphasis on the shrine.<sup>83</sup> I would like, however, to

---

<sup>83</sup> See the translations of Bing (2003), 255; Stephens (2004), 172; Wessels and Stähli (2015), 171.



refocus attention on the statue, to which Posidippus strongly draws the reader's gaze with the phrase ἦν...θήκατο ('[Arsinoe] whom he set up, 3-4). The three preceding epigrams of the ἀναθηματικά sequence (AB 36-8) accompany dedications made to Arsinoe at her shrine, and the first two even address the divine queen directly (Ἀρσινόη, σοί, 'for you, Arsinoe,' AB 36.1, 37.1). It is thus fitting that the fourth and likely final epigram of the sequence, AB 39, brings the statue of the goddess fully into view. Indeed, the sequence, culminating as it does in this epigram, may even suggest to the reader that those earlier dedications and dedicatory epigrams paved the way for Arsinoe's divinization.<sup>84</sup>

Although some have cast aspersions on the quality of this epigram,<sup>85</sup> it is a masterful demonstration of the value of epigram as a cultural capital to the imperial project. Callicrates is emphatically named, along with the goddess he dedicated, in the second couplet, where each element of his name is emphasized by its metrical position (ὁ Βοΐσκου at line end, Σάμιος and Καλλικράτης each capping their hemistich). Moreover, his act of setting the goddess' statue up in her temple stands firmly in the poem's center. Yet Callicrates' dedication is framed by a dizzying array of motion. The epigram opens with an image of the reader, when he leaves the

---

<sup>84</sup> Bing (2003), 257 argues persuasively that this epigram was composed after the deification of Arsinoe in light of Posidippus' use of the term πότνια (AB 39.3), which is reserved for divinities.

<sup>85</sup> Nisetich (2005), 250-3 considers it an inferior composition and even a rough draft of the more 'poetic' 'old' Posidippus AB 119. I do not share his assessment: his frustration with Posidippus' introduction of ἄλλος ἀνὴρ (6), for example, seems misguided; I discuss the importance of this part of the poem below.

shrine, hailing Arsinoe when he sets out from a harbor or comes onto dry land. Following the dedication, Posidippus provides the reason the reader is to do so: another sailor in the present moment of reading is now enjoying good sailing because he has invoked this goddess many times. The epigram then concludes, in ring composition, that the reader should hail Arsinoe Euploia by bidding her hail or farewell on dry land or setting out to sea.

The epigram's effect, made emphatic through this ring composition, is to turn the reader into the 'other man' he reads about in lines 5-6: once he leaves and begins his prayers to Arsinoe, he becomes part of the international network of successful sailors who have read this epigram and enter all ports of call safely. What is more, Posidippus sets not only his reader in motion, but also the goddess. When the reader follows the epigram's instruction and prays to Arsinoe wherever he may be, he is 'summoning her out of her temple' (πό]τνιαν ἐκ νηοῦ καλέων θεόν, 3) where Callicrates had stationed her to his current port of call. So, amazingly, at the same time as Posidippus celebrates Callicrates' dedication of Arsinoe's new statue, he shows that, without his words, the goddess remains in one place. It is his own epigram, a gift not only to Callicrates but also to the Ptolemies, that makes Arsinoe travel. He is the one responsible for filling the world with sailor-readers calling her out of her temple to wherever they are, whether they read the epigram in person at Zephyrion or in a book-roll with them even now. Moreover, unlike Callicrates, Posidippus does not need to expend a lavish amount of economic capital to promote imperial cult. All he needs is his cultural capital. His sailor-readers, in turn, do not offer costly gifts, but hails and farewells (ἄχαῖρε δός, 2), which, though they cost nothing, are priceless, for they spread Arsinoe's *kleos* throughout the world and thereby generate future prayers and dedications. Posidippus' epigram, then, rich in cultural capital but low in economic

capital, is of immeasurable value as it plays again and again. For this gift Posidippus, like Callicrates, deserves to fetch high honors for his imperial service.

We have here considered a case of competition between courtiers possessing different amounts of cultural and economic capital. Poets, however, also competed with courtiers who possessed equal amounts of cultural capital as they did, but in different fields: artists, for example, musicians, doctors, and engineers. The competition between courtiers of different kinds of cultural capital for the same royal favor, and the value of this ‘interdisciplinary’ competition for Hellenistic kings can be clearly shown through a case study of the *Syracusia*, the marvelous ship designed by the famous engineer Archimedes and presented to King Hieron II of Syracuse. The *Syracusia* attracted the attention of at least two writers, the poet Archimelus who wrote an epigram praising it and Moschion of Phaleris who wrote a treatise describing its construction, design, capacity, and amenities; to this work, abstracted by Athenaeus, we owe all our knowledge of the ship (Athen. 5.206d-209e = *FGrHist* 575 F 1). She was not only a massive wonder made possible by the latest technologies but also opulently and comfortably apportioned for her guests; for example, the *Syracusia* was outfitted with a catapult specially designed by Archimedes (208c) as well as large *andrones* decorated with mosaic floors depicting the plot of the entire *Iliad* (207c-d).

Throughout his treatise Moschion emphasizes Archimedes’ role and particular inventions for the ship. In so doing he not only grants glory to Archimedes, but also, I would argue, emphasizes the immense symbolic value of the *Syracusia*, as not just any marvelous ship, but one designed by the leading engineer Archimedes, in order to display the full value of the gift Hieron had received. It comes as a surprise, therefore, that the epigram on the ship by Archimelus which Moschion, or perhaps only Athenaeus, cites makes no mention of Archimedes

whatsoever. The lengthy epigram (Athen. 5.209c-e = *SH* 202) begins by asking who set up the ship, asking progressively more and more technical questions about its construction, so that we assume that the poet will end by revealing that Archimedes made the ship. In fact, when the answer finally comes in line 15, it is Hieron to whom all credit for the ship is owed. Archimelus has elided Archimedes, and polemically: by suppressing Archimedes' name, Archimelus not only elevates Hieron above the architect, but even appropriates Archimedes' ship for himself; that is, through his ekphrastic encomium he has made the ship his own, textual creation. An epigram could do, in fact, what the ship itself could not: while the *Syracusia* was so large that it only sailed once (from Sicily to Alexandria as a present to Ptolemy), the epigram could sail to every port of call, announcing the praise of Hieron. Archimelus's composition met a great counter-gift, in fact: Hieron granted him 100 *medimnoi* of grain for his composition (Athen. 5.209b).

The *Syracusia*'s reception, however, does not end with Archimelus, but with Moschion's own treatise. Jacoby considered Archimelus' epigram and the story of Hieron's gift to him part of Moschion's original treatise and not a further reminiscence by Athenaeus; indeed, I would argue that Moschion intended to turn a polemical profit off of it. Jacoby has plausibly argued that Moschion was a contemporary of Hieron, Archimedes, and Archimelus, and so likely hoped like Archimelus to receive a gift or patronage for his writing.<sup>86</sup> Including Archimelus' epigram,

---

<sup>86</sup> See his commentary at *FGrHist* 575, calling Moschion's treatise 'offensichtlich eine kleine Gelegenheitsschrift, eine art 'fliegendes Blatt', zu ehren Hierons, der den uns unbekannten Dichter Archimelos für sein Epigramm auf die *Syrakusia* fürstlich belohnt hatte, und *von dem sich der Verfasser des Prosablattes natürlich ähnliches erhoffte*' (emphasis mine).

especially near the close of his own prose account, is an effective strategy to attract a counter-gift. He not only reminds Hieron of a previous gift he gave for a work on Archimedes' ship, but implicitly suggests by juxtaposition the superiority of his own treatise to Archimedes' epigram: Moschion's work is longer, it catalogues Archimedes' inventions that compose the ship and its material and cultural value; the prose treatise also launches the *Syracusia* into another genre, the prose ekphrasis of cultural or engineering marvels à la Callixenus of Rhodes, thus putting Hieron on a par with earlier kings whose wonders had been praised in prose. If Archimedes received 100 *medimnoi* of wheat for an epigram, Moschion, we are to suppose, ought to receive as much and more besides.

Archimedes' *Syracusia*, then, was not his alone but rather trafficked between courtiers appropriating it for their own benefit. And the exchanges do not stop here: the ship finally became a weapon in the competition between kings and courts. Upon completion, the *Syracusia* was loaded with 60,000 units of grain, 10,000 jars of Sicilian fish, 20,000 talents of wool, and another 20,000 talents of miscellaneous wares; but after finding out that no Sicilian harbor could hold her, Hieron sent it on its maiden voyage to Alexandria as a gift for Ptolemy, likely Euergetes.<sup>87</sup> This was no loss for Hieron, nor was the ship an innocuous gift as the circumstances of its gifting reveal; Moschion explains (Athen. 5.209b) that Egypt was reeling from the blows of a massive grain shortage when Hieron gifted the ship to Ptolemy. In so doing he made a competitive display both of himself as a euergetist and savior, and of Sicily as abundantly fertile.

Both claims seem intended to show up Ptolemy in his own dynasty's fields of distinction, as a brief examination of Theocritus' *Idyll* 17, his encomium for Ptolemy II Philadelphus

---

<sup>87</sup> Athen. 5.209a-b.

considered above, reveals. Theocritus' praise of Ptolemy's good use of his vast wealth at lines 95-120 reveals a competition between kings as to who could give the most. Here Theocritus claims that Philadelphus 'could outweigh all kings with wealth' (ὄλβωι μὲν πάντας κε καταβρίθωι βασιλῆας, *Id.* 17.95). καταβρίθω is a poetic gloss, a rare word whose only other attestations are in Hesiod's *Works and Days*, where it describes wool weighing down sheep in the just ruler's kingdom (*WD* 235), and in Theocritus' *Idyll* 7, where abundant fruits weigh down the boughs of a tree in the countryside near the end of the poem (*Id.* 7.146). In *Idyll* 17 Theocritus seems to use καταβρίθω in a metaphorical sense, as LSJ s.v. II argue, as if there were a weighing contest between kings whom Ptolemy 'outweighs.' Yet, as the encomium continues, it becomes apparent that the literal meaning 'weighs down' is equally appropriate. At line 110, Theocritus writes that Ptolemy 'has gifted much [wealth] to strong kings' (πολλὸν δ' ἰφθίμοισι δεδώρηται βασιλεῦσι). By piling them high with his own wealth he overburdens them like Hesiod's sheep or Theocritus' fruit trees, crippling them with his gifts.<sup>88</sup> We should understand Hieron's free gift of the Syracusia, then, in much the same way. With it, Hieron intended to outweigh Ptolemy III in much the same way as his father Philadelphus had outweighed other kings, thereby giving the lie to Theocritus' praise. Even further, if Ptolemy III

---

<sup>88</sup> It is tempting to think that Theocritus savored the pastoral context of Hesiod's use of καταβρίθω of wool weighing down sheep in the *Works and Days*: by employing the gloss in *Id.* 17 for Ptolemy's wealth, might he have pointed to the specifically pastoral wealth of Ptolemy in the form of pastoral poetry, that is his own corpus of *Idylls*?

had already assumed the title Euergetes at the time of Hieron's gift,<sup>89</sup> Hieron would pointedly outdo the king in his particular sphere of excellence.

Hieron's gift of the Syracusia seems also to have set its sights on Ptolemaic claims about Egypt's superlative fertility. Theocritus famously praises the riches of the Nile in the following lines of *Idyll* 17:

μυρία ἄπειροί τε καὶ ἔθνεα μυρία φωτῶν  
λήιον ἀλδήσκουσιν ὀφελόμεναι Διὸς ὄμβρῳι,  
ἀλλ' οὔτις τόσα φύει ὅσα χθαμαλὰ Αἴγυπτος,  
Νεῖλος ἀναβλύζων διερὰν ὅτε βώλακα θρύπτει,  
οὔδ' τις ἄστεα τόσσα βροτῶν ἔχει ἔργα δαέντων. (77-81)

Both countless countries and countless tribes of men, increased by Zeus's showers, grow wheat, but none grows as much the lowlands of Egypt when the Nile, welling up, breaks up the clod, soaked; nor does anyone possess as many cities of men skilled in labor.

As in wealth, this passage reveals that kings competed in their lands' productivity, and the Ptolemies prided themselves on the Nile which made the Egyptian plains the most fertile on earth. By loading the Syracusia with cargo, not only wheat but also other alimentary delights, and sending it to Egypt when the country was struggling under drought, Hieron meant to vaunt Sicily's plenitude when Egypt's was at its weakest. We must also keep in mind that Egypt's fertility was a political issue of central importance for the Ptolemies, who had adopted Egyptian

---

<sup>89</sup> Hölbl (2001), 81 describes how Ptolemy III received and adopted the name Euergetes after returning to Egypt in 245 from a campaign in Mesopotamia; according to Porphyry of Tyre (*FGrHist* 260 F 43 lines 23-8) the Egyptians called him Euergetes for returning 2,500 statues of the gods from the Seleucids; Euergetes thus expressed an Egyptian idea of the pharaoh as caretaker of the gods and their temples: see Hölbl (2001), 111. By 243 Ptolemy III and Berenice II were addressed as the *Theoi Euergetai*: see e.g. Koenen (1993), 52-3.

ideology that linked the Nile flood and its resultant agricultural abundance to the person of the pharaoh and his efficacy.<sup>90</sup> Hieron's gift, then, not brought food for the starving but also salt for Ptolemy's wounds.

Finally, we must consider Hieron's gift of the *Syracusia* as a polemical statement of his holdings of cultural capital and his superlative *tryphe*, which we saw above was central to the Ptolemies' self-representation. The ship was a neat package of promotional materials, a *Gesamtkunstwerk* advertising Hieron's entire 'brand' of patronage. Bristling with Archimedes' newest inventions and war machines, the ship showed off Hieron's patronage of state-of-the-art military technologies. The *andrones*, in turn, whose floors were decorated with mosaics of the entire *Iliad* displayed Hieron's taste in and support for literary and artistic excellence, as well as his stupendous *tryphe* as the host of huge banquets and symposia on board. The statues and paintings demonstrated his patronage of the visual arts; and so on. As a display of his distinction in all spheres of craftsmanship and luxury, coupled with the fact that he could afford to give away such a marvelous gift, Hieron was making a show of outdoing Ptolemy in the Ptolemies' own game. Docked in the Alexandrian harbor and traveling wherever epigrams and prose works were read and discussed, the *Syracusia* proclaimed to all who saw it that to see the most lavish court and find the best patron, all a man of talent, whatever his field, had to do was board a ship and sail away to Hieron's Syracuse.

The traffic in inventions, poetry, pamphlet literature, cargo, and ships surrounding the *Syracusia* affair illustrates both how courtiers possessing different types of capital competed with one another for the king's favor and how the kings turned all this interdisciplinary competition to

---

<sup>90</sup> Stephens (2003), 97-8.



symbolic profits on the international stage. This case study shows how a poet like Archimelus could be useful in adding to and celebrating a king's cultural capital; the examples of Callimachus' 'Sicilian cities' and Posidippus' epigram, however, show that poets could serve broader cultural goals. We close this section by considering a case of a Hellenistic poet whose value to his king directly served political goals.

The poet Philippides was known to the *Suda* only as a poet of New Comedy and the author of 45 plays;<sup>91</sup> other sources, however, including Plutarch's *Demetrius* and an Athenian honorary inscription (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 657*, 283 BC), reveal that Philippides was an influential courtier of Lysimachos (Λυσιμάχου φίλος, *Plut. Vit. Demetr.* 12.5) who mediated on many occasions between his native city of Athens and the king.<sup>92</sup> Among many specific accomplishments, the Athenians praise him as always intervening with Lysimachos on their behalf at court. On the other side, Lysimachus found him a boon to his empire: Plutarch reports that Philippides' good character enhanced Lysimachus' own reputation, and that Lysimachus thought it was a good omen to see Philippides before he did anything important (*Plut. Vit. Demetr.* 12.5).

His value to Lysimachus when it came to his relations with Athens was immense. For instance, after the battle of Ipsos, which Antigonos and Demetrius, who had controlled Athens, lost to Lysimachus and the other Diadochs, Philippides was praised by the Athenians in an honorary inscription for having had a conversation with Lysimachus advising him to give a new *peplos* for the Panathenaea: 'and it was discussed about the yard and the mast, that they might be

---

<sup>91</sup> *Suda* s.v. Φιλίππιδης (Adler Φ 345).

<sup>92</sup> For the dates of his career, see Paschidis (2008), 116-18, concluding that after he left Athens in 303 he resided at the court of Lysimachos.

given to the goddess for her *peplos* for the Panathenaea which was put on when Euctemon was archon' (διελέχθη δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ κεραίας καὶ ἱστοῦ ὅπως ἂν | δοθεῖ τῇ θεῷ εἰς τὰ Παναθήναια τῷ πέπλῳ ἃ ἔκο | μίσθη ἐπ' Εὐκτήμονος ἄρχοντος, *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 657.14-16). Paschidis explains that in 307, the Athenians had had the images of Antigonos and Demetrius Poliorcetes woven into the Panathenaic *peplos*; after the other Diadochs defeated them, Philippides, a native Athenian, gave Lysimachos the shrewd idea to replace that sycophantic *peplos* with a new one, presumably free of any such overtly political imagery of the new overlords.<sup>93</sup> Philippides thus helped Lysimachos coopt local religion to assert himself as a new and better benefactor of Athens.

When we look at what has survived of Philippides' poetry, we see that it was another tool by which Philippides ingratiated himself to Lysimachus and Lysimachus profited in Athens and abroad, wherever the plays were reperformed. Thanks to Plutarch, we know that in at least one comedy he attacked Stratocles, an Athenian partisan of Demetrius, for having proposed flatteries for Demetrius that were tantamount to impiety; Plutarch reports that his worst proposal was that the Athenian legates to the king be called *theoroi*, 'sacred delegates' as alike to those the city sent to Delphi, Delos, and other sanctuaries (Plut. *Vit. Demetr.* 11.1). The biographer then cites a fragment of an unnamed comedy attacking Stratocles as the cause of portents around Attica, including the wind's tearing of the Antigonid Panathenaic *peplos*:<sup>94</sup>

δι' ὃν ἀπέκαυσεν ἡ πάχνη τὰς ἀμπέλους,  
 δι' ὃν ἀσεβοῦνθ' ὁ πέπλος ἐρράγη μέσος,  
 τὰς τῶν θεῶν τιμὰς ποιοῦντ' ἀνθρωπίνας.  
 ταῦτα καταλύει δῆμον, οὐ κωμωδία. (Plut. *Vit. Demetr.* 12.4)

---

<sup>93</sup> Paschidis (2008), 118-20.

<sup>94</sup> The historicity of the portents here described along with the others in Plut. *Vit. Demetr.* 12.2-3 has been doubted by Paschidis (2008), 116-18.

On account of whom [Stratocles] the frost blighted the vines, on account of whose impious behavior the *peplos* ripped down the middle, since he made the honors of the gods prerogatives of men. These things break apart a people, not comedy.

Beyond his good advice on how to handle Athenian relations, Philippides was a valuable *philos* because he gave Lysimachus access to the Athenian stage to promote and broadcast his imperial goodwill for Athens, and from there, Philippides' plays like the rest of New Comedy would have traveled to city theaters across the *oikoumene*. Philippides was no second-rate poet, but one of the foremost exponents of New Comedy<sup>95</sup> who won the Dionysia in 311 for his Μύστις ('The Initiate,' otherwise unknown). We should assume, then, that his attacks on Stratocles reverberated not only in Athens but also far afield, where the comic stage became a political platform for the war between the Diadochs and their supporters. Indeed, the last line of this tantalizing fragment evokes a previous exchange of abuse between Philippides and Stratocles, or other Antigonid partisans: ταῦτα καταλύει δῆμον, οὐ κωμῳδία seems to respond to real or fictive criticism that his comedy, probably in its political, partisan form, was dissolving the Athenian people. Philippides sets himself up as a victim, and his partisan comedy as only redressing wrongs done to him and to Lysimachus by extension. Like Posidippus, Archimelus, and Callimachus, Philippides knew how to make himself an indispensable *philos*.

### III. The Production and Consumption of Cultural and Symbolic Capital at the Alexandrian Court

---

<sup>95</sup> Philippides is named as one of the ten most remarkable poets of New Comedy in one of the so-called *prolegomena* found at the beginning of manuscripts of Aristophanes; the relevant text in the edition of Koster (1975) is III.53-4 (p. 10).

Thus far we have considered the position of poets and the value of their poetry broadly across the Hellenistic courts. We now hone in on Alexandria, where Callimachus and the best-known Hellenistic poets wrote. Who decided the value of poetry? Were poets classified as a particular group at court? Where and by whom was poetry produced and consumed?

*i. The Kings of Verse: Ptolemies as the Ultimate Arbiters of Poetic Techne*

In the previous section we considered Theocritus' description of Philadelphus' patronage of poets who compete at his festivals in *Idyll* 17. Hunter argues that this passage, especially in its conclusion that poets sing of Ptolemy in exchange for his generosity (Μουσάων δ' ὑποφῆται αἰδόντι Πτολεμαῖον / ἀντ' εὐεργεσίας, 115-16), expresses Ptolemy's 'traditional role as a generous patron.'<sup>96</sup> But is there nothing innovative in this passage? Let us consider the passage afresh:

οὐδὲ Διωνύσου τις ἀνὴρ ἱεροὺς κατ' ἀγῶνας  
ἵκετ' ἐπιστάμενος λιγυρὰν ἀναμέλψαι ἀοιδάν,  
ὥι οὐ δωτίναν ἀντάξιον ὥπασε τέχνας.

And a man knowledgeable of how to raise a clear-sounding song does not come to holy competitions of Dionysus in which he [Philadelphus] does not make him a present worth as much as his *techne*.

Thanks to Philadelphus, monetary gifts and *techne* have found a wholly accurate and impartial conversion: Ptolemy makes *techne* visible for all to see and apprehend as a cultural capital. In other words, Ptolemy is the perfect judge of poetry.

---

<sup>96</sup> Hunter (2003), 38.

Scholars seem to have passed over the significance of these lines for our understanding of the ideology of Ptolemaic patronage of the arts. This is perhaps unsurprising for two reasons. *Idyll* 17 was long kept in the shade, of course, as an embarrassing specimen of flattery from a poet who had to praise in order to earn the bread he needed to sustain his ‘real’ poetry, the bucolic *Idylls* which have received the lion’s share of scholarly attention. Even now that this Romantic Theocritus has receded with waxing interest in Ptolemaic ideology, empire, and literary culture, it is still so easy to disregard Theocritus’ praise of Ptolemy’s infallible poetic judgment as mere flattery.<sup>97</sup> This response, I suspect, reveals more about our own assumptions about who has legitimate authority in judgments of cultural capital than it does Theocritus’ and Hellenistic poets’. To take an example from our own universities: although wealthy donors fund our chairs, they concede the decision of who should fill them to promotion and tenure committees filled with academics, who possess legitimate authority in matters of cultural capital. To avoid relying uncritically on our assumptions, we must analyze available ancient evidence for whether the Ptolemies had legitimate authority in the fields of cultural capital, as Theocritus claims he did.

The Ptolemies belong to a long tradition of Argead kings of Macedon who aggressively appropriated cultural capital, beginning as early as the fifth century. At that time, the king Archelaos is said to have invited many Greek literati and artists to stay for periods at his court, and Christine Hecht’s recent reappraisal of the evidence confirms that the visits of Euripides and

---

<sup>97</sup> Fraser (1972) 1.311-12, for example, describes dedications to the Ptolemies and ‘the elaborate compliments of poets’ as ‘often, certainly, *mere acts of homage*’ (emphasis mine).

Agathon are likely historically accurate.<sup>98</sup> Archelaus' motivation seems largely to derive from the Macedonians' desire to be accepted as Greeks by Greeks: Euripides wrote plays for the Macedonian and Athenian stages to showcase the good Greek cultural pedigree of the ever-dubious Macedonians, and indeed his tragedy *Archelaos* about the king's eponymous ancestor opens with a genealogy linking the Argead house to the greatest Greek hero Heracles. The stays of these cultural professionals at the Argead court presumably began a process of taste formation among the Macedonian elites, so that knowledge of Greek literature, art, and other forms of cultural capital became necessary for success at court.

It is in this context that we can appreciate Philip II's decision to engage Aristotle as the teacher of his son Alexander. A letter from Alexander written to Aristotle while he was on campaign, even if a forgery, reveals that social distinction was the real or presumed motive for hiring such a prominent teacher. On campaign in Asia, Alexander was reading some of Aristotle's books when he happened to recognize some of the doctrines Aristotle had taught him in private lessons. Alexander chides him for publishing these ideas as follows:

οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἐποίησας ἐκδοὺς τοὺς ἀκροαματικούς τῶν λόγων· τίτι γὰρ δὴ διοίσομεν ἡμεῖς τῶν ἄλλων, εἰ καθ' οὓς ἐπαιδεύθημεν λόγους, οὗτοι πάντων ἔσονται κοινοί; (Plut. *Alex.* 7.4)

You acted wrongly by publishing those of your arguments taught orally; for, as you see, in what respect will we differ from the rest, if the arguments according to which we were educated shall be common possessions for all?

---

<sup>98</sup> Hecht (2017), 18-37. After a literary analysis of Timotheus' and Choerilus' works at 127-75, she suggests that ancient scholars, taking note of their works' experimental features, may have created the tradition that they stayed at the court of Archelaos by analogy to Ptolemaic practice; see 187-8.

The future minatory conditional (διοίσσομεν...ἔσονται) conveys the vehemence and urgency of the king's complaint: how is he to retain his distinction if everyone can learn at the price of a book-roll what Philip acquired for Alexander only at a great price? The more people possess a cultural capital, the less social dividends it can pay.<sup>99</sup>

The Ptolemies continued this Argead practice of investing dearly in renowned teachers: Ptolemy I Soter, for instance, brought both Strato of Lampsacus, head of the Athenian Peripatos, and the poet and scholar Philitas of Cos to Alexandria to teach his son Ptolemy II Philadelphus, and Diogenes Laertius reports (5.58) that Strato received no less than 80 talents for his services. Here it is important to note that these royal tutors are said to be the teachers of the king's children: there is no mention of tutoring pages as well.<sup>100</sup> While Strootman has assumed that the

---

<sup>99</sup> Here Bourdieu's discussion of the effect of inflation on the value of diplomas is instructive: see Bourdieu (1984), 143-54.

<sup>100</sup> See for example the *Suda* life of Zenodotus ('he taught the children of Ptolemy,' τοὺς παῖδας Πτολεμαίου ἐπαίδευσεν, Adler Z 74) and *POxy* 1241 containing the famous so-called list of the Librarians of Alexandria, which describes Apollonius of Rhodes as the teacher of the first Ptolemy, which is chronologically impossible (οὗτος ἐγένετο καὶ διδάσκαλος τοῦ πρώτου βασιλέως· τοῦτον δ[ι]εδέξατο Ἐρατοσθένης, col. ii.13-14), and Aristarchus as the teacher of Philopator's children (οὗτος καὶ διδ[ά]σκαλος [ἐ]γένε[το] τῶν τοῦ Φιλοπάτορος τέκνων, col. ii.22-4). Murray (2012) offers an important re-evaluation of this papyrus: she persuasively refutes the claim made since the *editio princeps* of Hunt and Grenfell that the list refers to the Librarians of Alexandria and further suggests that it is a humorous work in the tradition of Ptolemy the Quail rather than an authoritative scholarly work.

royal tutor would have taught all the children at court,<sup>101</sup> Alexander's letter to Aristotle should give us pause. It would have been in the kings' best interest to give their children an exclusive education, a distinguishing cultural capital to set them apart from the *philo*i who might challenge their right to rule. While children at court probably did receive a distinguished education,<sup>102</sup> it seems more likely that the king's own children received a different education, perhaps in the form of private lessons, if not also having different teachers. Beyond paying huge sums for such educators for their children, there is a tantalizing piece of evidence for the Ptolemies' particular concern with their childrens' education: when treating the conspiracy of the royal pages against Alexander, Arrian reports that Ptolemy I Soter said in his history of Alexander that the pages blamed Callisthenes, Alexander's historian who was teaching the page Hermolaus philosophy (Arr. *Anab.* 4.13.2), for encouraging them to conspire (4.14.1). Children need not only a distinguished teacher, he seems to say, but a good one who will not endanger them or their family, intentionally or not.

In addition to receiving and providing for their own childrens' distinguished educations, many of the Ptolemies were authors themselves. Ptolemy I Soter wrote the history of

---

<sup>101</sup> Strootman (2014), 141-2. *Pace* Strootman Plut. *Alex.* 5 and 7 do not support his claim at 141 that Aristotle educated the pages along with Alexander, as only Alexander is mentioned here.

<sup>102</sup> That pages received a distinguished education seems secure from an anecdote from the court of Alexander. Callisthenes of Olynthus, Aristotle's nephew and Alexander's historian, seems to have been available as a tutor to the pages: see Arrian's detail that the page Hermolaos wanted to learn philosophy and Callisthenes 'was tending to that purpose' (θεραπεύειν ἐπὶ τῷιδε, 4.13.2), where the present infinitive indicates an ongoing relationship.



Alexander's campaigns just mentioned (*FGrHist* 138);<sup>103</sup> Ptolemy IV Philopator wrote a tragedy *Adonis* (schol. Ar. *Thesm.* 1059); Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II wrote *Hypomnemata*, 'Memoirs' in 24 books (*FGrHist* 234),<sup>104</sup> and other Ptolemies seem to have kept *hypomnemata* as well;<sup>105</sup> some wrote literary epigrams;<sup>106</sup> and Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II even made an emendation to the text of Homer.<sup>107</sup> The Ptolemies, then, were not intellectual poseurs but peers to their professional intellectuals, producing as well as consuming cultural capital.

Accordingly, many anecdotes portray the Ptolemies as taking the top position in the field of cultural production by pronouncing judgment upon the works that their professional

---

<sup>103</sup> The bibliography on this work is vast owing to the question of Ptolemy's influence on Alexander historiography. For a brief overview of the work with an emphasis on its autobiographical elements, see Bearzot (2011), 59-63.

<sup>104</sup> For a brief description of the work see Fraser (1972), 1.515; for a new study of Ptolemy VIII see Nadig (2007).

<sup>105</sup> See the discussion of Bearzot (2011), 53-7

<sup>106</sup> An epigram praising Aratus' *Phaenomena* (*SH* 712) is attributed to 'king Ptolemy of Egypt,' often considered Philadelphus; see discussion below.

<sup>107</sup> This Ptolemy claimed that at *Odyssey* 5.72 ἀμφὶ δὲ λειμῶνες μαλακοὶ ἴου ἢ δὲ σελίνου ('and around there were soft meadows of violet and celery') the text should read σίου 'marshwort' for ἴου 'violet' because 'marshwort grows with celery, not violets' (Athen. 2.61c). He thus asserts his expertise in botany as grounds for emending the Homeric text, a move that shows the interdisciplinary environment fostered in the Hellenistic courts.

intellectuals offered them. Plutarch, for instance, reports the following incident in which Soter takes a grammarian to task:

Πτολεμαῖος δὲ γραμματικὸν εἰς ἀμαθίαν ἐπισκώπτων ἠρώτησε τίς ὁ τοῦ Πηλέως πατήρ ἦν· κάκεῖνος ἄν σὺ πρότερον εἴπηις· ἔφη ‘τίς ὁ τοῦ Λάγου·’ τὸ δὲ σκῶμμα τῆς δυσγενείας ἤπτετο τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ πάντες ἠγανάκτησαν ὥς οὐκ ἐπιτήδειον ὄν καὶ ἄκαιρον· ὁ δὲ Πτολεμαῖος ‘εἰ μὴ τὸ φέρειν’ ἔφη ‘σκωπτόμενον, οὐδὲ τὸ σκώπτειν βασιλικὸν ἐστίν. (Plut. *Mor.* 458a-b)

And Ptolemy [Soter], mocking a grammarian for a lack of learning, asked him who was the father of Peleus; the grammarian said ‘[I will tell you] if you first say who was the father of Lagus [Ptolemy’s father].’ This mockery of his ignoble lineage hit the king hard, and everyone was indignant at how undeserved and poorly timed it was; but Ptolemy said ‘if putting up with being mocked is not kinglike, neither is mocking.’

Soter here displays the ‘feel for the game,’ to borrow a phrase of Bourdieu, that signals his ability to make legitimate judgements of others’ learning, for the insult he fires reveals his learnedness of learnedness. Ptolemy does not ask him a question so obvious that anyone could answer it, like who was the father of Achilles. Rather, he asks a question any *grammatikos* should know off the top of his head: although Peleus’ father Aeacus is not a frequent figure in myth, he is mentioned at least ten times in the *Iliad*. The grammarian is in a sticky situation, for answering Soter’s question correctly will neither prove his professional competence nor reverse the damage done him by the damning question. So, he tries in reply to turn the tables on Ptolemy: he suggests that the really mysterious grandfather is not Achilles’, but Ptolemy’s. In so dodging Ptolemy’s question, I suggest that he tacitly acknowledges the king’s authority as a judge of his cultural capital. Indeed, a further detail of the story reveals the strength of Soter’s legitimacy. When the grammarian mocks Ptolemy’s lineage, the courtiers in the background go wild, vociferating, for the king to hear, how socially unacceptable the grammarian’s insult was. Soter’s judgment of the scholar’s capital is like a match, and the courtiers as a body cheer for the

king. Unless they had more cultural capital than he, they could hardly gain anything by contradicting his judgment of the scholar. Moreover, this grammarian's social death meant one less courtier to contend with.

The Ptolemies' acumen as critics of professional intellectuals is even better illustrated by Philadelphus' mockery of the grammarian Sosibius *Lytikos* ('Problem-Solver') as told by Athenaeus (11.493e-94a). This Sosibius, Athenaeus tells us, was famous for solving literary *zetemata* by the procedure of ἀναστροφή, that is, rearranging words. For example, to explain why the young, strong heroes Diomedes, Ajax, and Achilles allow old Nestor to lift his heavy cup himself (*Il.* 11.636-7), Sosibius moved the word γέρων from the middle of line 637 to the beginning of 636 so that the lines declare that Nestor was the strongest of the old men (Athen. 11.493c-e). Philadelphus, Athenaeus tells us, 'made pleasant fun' (οὐκ ἀχαρίτως διέπαιξε, 493e) of Sosibius for these 'solutions' as follows: having instructed his financiers to withhold Sosibius' royal stipend (σύνταξις βασιλική, 493f),<sup>108</sup> when Sosibius complained to him about this, Philadelphus looked at the books containing the names of those who received a stipend and told him:

ὦ θαυμάσιε λυτικέ, ἐὰν ἀφέλῃς τοῦ Σωτῆρος τὸ σω- καὶ τοῦ Σωσιγένους τὸ -σι- καὶ τοῦ Βίωνος τὴν πρώτην συλλαβὴν καὶ τὴν τελευταίαν τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου, εὐρήσεις σαυτὸν ἀπειληφότα κατὰ τὰς σὰς ἐπινοίας (Athen. 11.494a)

Marvelous solver, if you take the *so* from Soter, the *si* from Sosigenes, the first syllable from Bion and the last from Apollonius, you will find that you have taken your payment, according to your own conceits.

By conjuring the unpaid Sosibius' name out of those who had received their stipend, Philadelphus makes clear the financial consequences of Sosibius' 'imaginative' scholarship that

---

<sup>108</sup> I discuss the evidence for stipends paid to Museum scholars in the next part of the section.

claims to solve problems only by ‘finding’ something in the text that is not there. As his *coup de grâce*, Ptolemy quotes a line from ‘marvelous’ (θαυμάσιος) Aeschylus (fr. 139.4) about an eagle shot down with an arrow made from its own feathers to describe his vanquishing of Sosibius; in so doing he sets up ‘marvelous’ Aeschylus and his poignant verse as a positive foil to Sosibius, ‘marvelous’ (ὦ θαυμάσιε λυτῖκέ) for his laughable, ineffective solutions. In so beating Sosibius at his own game of literary scholarship, Ptolemy displays his expertise as the basis of his role as the legitimate judge of the field of cultural production.

To solidify their uncontested<sup>109</sup> dominance in the field of cultural production, the Ptolemies channeled their personal authority based on their holdings of cultural capital into institutional structures. We shall consider the Museum in detail in the next section; what is salient about the institution here is that Strabo reports that there is ‘a priest in charge of the Museum, appointed then by the kings, but now by Caesar’ (ἱερεὺς ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ Μουσείῳ, τεταγμένος τότε μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων, νῦν δὲ ὑπὸ Καίσαρος, Strab. 794). The head of the Museum, the most prestigious position in a highly prestigious institution, was not chosen by

---

<sup>109</sup> Admittedly, it is true that these anecdotes about the Ptolemies’ dominance in the field of cultural production can be countered by a plethora of anecdotes depicting philosophers and other intellectuals besting the Ptolemies and other kings in intellectual conversation: see Strootman (2017), 101-2 for a collection. But, as Strootman has argued, the popularity of such anecdotes can be ascribed in large part to later intellectuals’ denigration of their Hellenistic predecessors as flatters and parasites in order to extol their own independence, and hence superiority, in their own field. There is no evidence that the Hellenistic poets privately resented or chafed under the Ptolemies’ position of superiority in their fields.

professional intellectuals and/or Museum members, but rather by the Ptolemies themselves. By inscribing their authority in the field of cultural production into the very structure of the Museum, they further legitimized their own status as taste-makers and judges of cultural capital.<sup>110</sup>

The Ptolemies' active role in promoting their own legitimate authority in the field of cultural production can also be seen in the epigram attributed to 'Ptolemy the king' in the first *Vita* of the Hellenistic poet Aratus:

πάνθ' Ἡγησιάναξ τε καὶ Ἑρμιππος <τὰ> κατ' αἴθρην  
τείρεα καὶ πολλοὶ ταῦτα τὰ φαινόμενα  
βίβλοις ἐγκατέθεντο, τὰπὸ σκοποῦ δ' ἀφάμαρτον†  
ἀλλ' ὃ γε λεπτολόγος σκῆπτρον Ἄρατος ἔχει. (SH 712)

Both Hegesianax and Hermippus and many [others] committed to books all the constellations in the sky and these phenomena, [text unclear], but Aratus of the slender words holds the scepter.

Which 'king Ptolemy' wrote this epigram is a matter of scholarly dispute. If Hermippus is 'the Callimachean' and this Hegesianax is the *philos* of Antiochus III, then Philadelphus cannot be

---

<sup>110</sup> As judges of cultural capital legitimized through institutional structure, they may even be seen as occupying a position previously reserved only for divinities. In Athens, for instance, the winner of the dramatic competition of the Greater Panathenaia was decided not only by the judges, who submitted rankings, but by lot, which was conceived of as allowing the god to make his choice: on the judges' procedure, details of which are hotly disputed, see Marshall and van Willigenburg (2004). Aristophanes makes this procedure literal in his *Frogs*, where the competition between Aeschylus and Euripides in the underworld is judged by Dionysus himself.

correct as some have claimed.<sup>111</sup> I thus prefer a later Ptolemy, Ptolemy IV Philopator.<sup>112</sup>

Whoever he is, the imagery this Ptolemy uses to express literary supremacy is thoroughly regnal: Aratus holds the scepter just as Ptolemy himself does. A further implication seems irresistible: that, as a scepter-holder king, Ptolemy is the best and sole judge to pronounce Aratus' supremacy.

In this context, it is worth noting that Philopator's authority over cultural capital was being promoting in regnal terms elsewhere. *SH* 979, an epigram which scholars agree celebrates the dedication of the Homereion by Philopator, praises Ptolemy as ὁ ἄριστος ἐν δορὶ καὶ Μούσαις κοίρανος, 'the best king both among spear and the Muses' (*SH* 979.6-7). He is not generically 'pre-eminent in letters,' as Fraser translates,<sup>113</sup> but king among the Muses, and the best one at that, as ἄριστος takes a jab at other kings' inferior patronage of the arts. The Ptolemies, then, did not merely choose the Museum's priest: they were the Museum's and Muses' king.

We are now in a better position to discuss Theocritus' portrayal of Philadelphus' literary judgment in *Idyll* 17. In this passage, we recall, Theocritus describes the poet who wins prizes from Philadelphus as 'learned in raising a clear-sounding song' (ἐπιστάμενος λιγυρὰν ἀναμέλψαι ᾠοιδάν, *Id.* 17.113) and says that Ptolemy 'makes him a prize equal in worth to his *techne*' (δωτίναν ἀντάξιον ὥπασε τέχνας, 114). Theocritus' declaration of his total allegiance

---

<sup>111</sup> Most notably Page (1981), 84; Cameron (1995), 323. Cameron's argument that Hegesianax and Hermippus are 'surely predecessors rather than successors' is not cogent.

<sup>112</sup> So Fraser (1972), 2.1090, citing older scholarship on the issue.

<sup>113</sup> Fraser (1972), 1.611.

to Philadelphus' taste as accurate and impartial is thoroughly in keeping with Ptolemaic ideology: to say anything else would court disaster. Whether or not Theocritus is a flatterer misses the point: let us see how Theocritus makes the playing field work to his advantage. At the beginning of his encomium Theocritus proudly declares: 'Since I am knowledgeable of speaking well, I would hymn Ptolemy' (ἐγὼ Πτολεμαῖον ἐπιστάμενος καλὰ εἰπεῖν / ὑμνήσαιμ', 7-8): will Ptolemy agree that Theocritus is learned, deserving of a gift like the other 'learned' poets that have received his prizes before (ἐπιστάμενος λιγυρὰν ἀναμέλψαι ἀοιδάν, 113)? Theocritus has thus played a gambit: whatever the value of the gift he receives from Ptolemy, he will have to accept it as the accurate appraisal of its *techne*. If he fails, he will fail spectacularly.

But Theocritus is far from powerless in this situation: there are ways to incline his judge's favor. The gift he offers Ptolemy is an attractive one, even irresistible. As a professional poet who declares himself ἐπιστάμενος, he offers to lend his own authority in the field of cultural production to Ptolemy, thereby further legitimizing the king's status as a taste-maker. What is more, Theocritus binds his statement of Ptolemy's cultural authority to his broader praise of the king's conversion of economic capital into capital's other forms. In the lines leading up to the description of Philadelphus' patronage of poets, Theocritus declares:

οὐ μὰν ἀχρεῖός γε δόμῳ ἐνὶ πίνι χρυσός  
 μυρμάκων ἅτε πλοῦτος αἰὲ κέχυται μογεόντων·  
 ἀλλὰ πολὺν μὲν ἔχοντι θεῶν ἐρικυδέες οἴκοι,  
 αἰὲν ἀπαρχομένοιο σὺν ἄλλοισιν γεράεσσι,  
 πολλὸν δ' ἰφθίμοισι δεδῶρηται βασιλεῦσι,  
 πολλὸν δὲ πτολίεσσι, πολὺν δ' ἀγαθοῖσιν ἐταίροις.  
 οὐδὲ Διωνύσου τις ἀνὴρ ἱεροὺς κατ' ἀγῶνας... (*Id.* 17.106-12)

Gold, I assure you, is not useless in his wealthy home, just like the riches of ants, ever toiling, pile up; but the far-famed dwellings of the gods have much [gold], for he is always offering first-fruits with other prizes; and much is gifted to

mighty kings, and much to cities, and much to good companions. Nor does a man come to the holy competitions of Dionysus...

Theocritus has constructed the situation masterfully. If Ptolemy does not grant Theocritus a generous gift, he will call into question his own distinction from the covetous, insatiable ants, thereby courting blame. Theocritus formulates this threat more directly in *Idyll* 16, a poem praising Hieron, when he asks:

τίς εὔ εἰπόντα φιλήσει;  
οὐκ οἶδ'· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἄνδρες ἐπ' ἔργμασιν ὥς πάρος ἐσθλοῖς  
αἰνεῖσθαι σπεύδοντι, νενίκηνται δ' ὑπὸ κερδέων. (*Id.* 16.13-15)

Who will be a *philos* to one who has praised him? I don't know, for no longer are men eager to be praised for good deeds as before, but they have been conquered by profits.

If Hieron fails to offer Theocritus a gift for his encomium that comes at the poem's end, he will be shown to the world as cowed by penury or avarice. The same fate would obtain for Philadelphus in *Idyll* 17 should he fail to honor Theocritus. By accepting *Idyll* 17, however, with a splendid counter-gift, Ptolemy would receive with thanks all the praise that Theocritus offers him in this poem, none less than the claim at the poem's end that Philadelphus is already a demigod (*Id.* 17.136).

Theocritus, then, is not requesting or demanding patronage,<sup>114</sup> but rather making Ptolemy a gift he cannot turn down. Sweetening the deal, or reminding him of the consequences of a bad

---

<sup>114</sup> Gow (1965), 2.325 suggests that this hymn is less a 'definite appeal for patronage' in the style of *Id.* 16 than 'a formal tribute from a poet already recognised at court.' But the ideas of paying tribute and recognition of patronage unhelpfully downplay the importance even for an 'established' poet to continue offering gifts and seeking renewed patronage: we must always remember Polybius' image of courtiers as markers on the king's abacus.



decision, Theocritus caps his section on Ptolemy's past patronage of skilled poets with a reminder of the future poems of thanks he will receive for his generosity: Μουσάων δ' ὑποφῆται αἰδόντι Πτολεμαῖον / ἀντ' εὐεργεσίας (115-16). In the final analysis, a large portion of Theocritus', and with him the other Hellenistic poets', *technē* and *epistēmē* consists of knowing how to make himself useful, indeed indispensable, to a king who had a vested interest in dominating the field of cultural production.

The Ptolemies, then, not only commanded vast wealth and armies, but also wielded the scepter over cultural capital with a legitimate authority supported by the intellectuals themselves. Their pole position in the fields of cultural and well as economic capital has significant ramifications for the status of poets in the hypercompetitive court society. Bourdieu argues that the social struggle in the dominant class, structured as it is by members' different holdings of capital, is over how 'to impose the definition of the legitimate stakes and weapons of social struggles; in other words, to define the legitimate principle of domination, between economic, educational or social capital...' <sup>115</sup> Unlike 1960s Paris, Ptolemaic Alexandria had only one figure who could 'define the legitimate principle of domination': the king himself who excelled in and controlled every field. As such, the king became a focal point of Hellenistic poets' strategies of distinction.

I have focused in this section on the Ptolemaic kings, but what, then, of the queens? Like their husbands, the queens seem also to have had legitimate authority over matters of cultural capital on the grounds of their frequent association with goddesses associated with poetry. Pausanias reports that there was a statue of Arsinoe II Philadelphus set up on Mt. Helicon

---

<sup>115</sup> Bourdieu (1984), 254.

(9.31.1) in the company of a statue group of the Muses (9.30.1).<sup>116</sup> This evidence coheres with poets' representation of her: Posidippus wrote an epigram accompanying the dedication of a lyre to Arsinoe (AB 37),<sup>117</sup> and it is plausible and even likely that Callimachus alluded to her as the tenth Muse at the beginning of his *Aetia*.<sup>118</sup> In the next generation, a famous epigram of Callimachus explicitly praises Berenice II as a fourth Grace (51 Pf = 15 G-P), thereby ascribing to her the literary power of the *Charites* who give life to poetry.<sup>119</sup> As Muses and Graces, these queens are associated with the creation, quality, and preservation of literary works. Whether this association reveals an authority commensurate with the king's is a question we will explore in Chapter five, dedicated to the representations of the queen as a patron in *Aetia* 4. For now,

---

<sup>116</sup> See Rice (1983), 90; Cameron (1995), 142.

<sup>117</sup> For discussion of this and other epigrams' portrayal of Arsinoe as patron of the arts, see Stephens (2004), 173-6.

<sup>118</sup> fr. 2a.1 Harder, a lemmata from the London scholia which must be describing something in the context of Helicon, reads δεκάς ('ten'). As Harder (2012), 2.106-7 ad loc. explains, the number refers to the nine Muses plus another individual, and the scholia's suggestion at fr. 2e.1-5 Harder that Arsinoe was the tenth Muse is only a scholarly inference. Even so, Posidippus' epigram AB 37 and Pausanias' testimony of Arsinoe's statue on Helicon suggest that Callimachus may well have expected his readers to understand Arsinoe as his unnamed tenth Muse.

<sup>119</sup> At *Aetia* fr. 7.13-14 Harder Callimachus prays that the Graces will wipe their hands upon his elegies, i.e. the *Aetia*, so that they will be preserved for many years. See Petrovic and Petrovic (2003), 194-204 for a literary interpretation of *Ep.* 51 Pf.

however, we will retain our focus on the king and his role in the production and consumption of cultural capital in Alexandria.

*ii. The Museum as a site of production of cultural and symbolic capital*

In Greek imagination kings had invested in poets and their cultural capital since the age of heroes, as witness the bards Phemius and Demodocus of the *Odyssey* who entertain at festivals and receive meat in exchange for their song.<sup>120</sup> In the Archaic and Classical periods kings and tyrants offered patronage to poets at their courts, thereby converting their economic capital into cultural capital (poets hosted at their home, poetry performed at their house, poems written about them) and symbolic capital (*kleos*) which earned them distinction both at the local and supralocal level. Further, courts at the margins of the traditional Greek worlds engaged Greek poets in order to assert their Greek identity, such as the Argead king Archelaus of Macedon in the late-fifth/early-fourth century.<sup>121</sup> The Ptolemies, however, far exceeded these earlier courts' systems of patronage, not only in their number of state-supported intellectuals, but also in founding the

---

<sup>120</sup> At *Od.* 8.474-3, for example, Odysseus presents the Phaeacian king Alcinous' bard Demodocus with a choice cut of meat because 'singers have a share of praise and reverence' (τίμης ἔμποροί εἰσι καὶ αἰδοῦς, 480, punning on ἀοιδός and αἰδώς) since the Muse taught them song and loves them.

<sup>121</sup> Weber (1992) offers a thorough review of pre-Hellenistic court patronage as attested in literary and historical sources; for the court of Archelaos see now Hecht (2017). Kurke (1991) is the seminal study of epinician as the genre of *kleos* or symbolic capital.

Museum and its Library.<sup>122</sup> The Museum was an institution unsurpassed in its appropriation of cultural capital, objectified in the form of books, and scholars able to produce new cultural capital: metadata expressing mastery over the objectified cultural capital, scholarship on the objectified cultural capital, and new poetry and prose to be objectified in turn as papyrus-rolls within the Library's collections.<sup>123</sup> This massive conversion of wealth into books and scholars working with them positioned Alexandria, a new city without any Greek cultural heritage, as the center of Greek culture and indeed the world as Greeks imagined it: the Museum's inclusion in

---

<sup>122</sup> The standard discussion of the Museum and Library remains Fraser (1972), 1.305-35, with ample references to ancient sources.

<sup>123</sup> The Ptolemies' goal seems to have been to acquire books of all of the (Greek) texts of the world (*Letter of Aristeas* section 9); Galen records that he was so rivalrous (φιλοτιμος) in acquiring these books that he would have ships inspected for books, have scribes copy them, and deposit the copies on the ships while keeping the originals for the Library: he reportedly even forfeited a security of fifteen talents of silver to the Athenians for taking their copies of the texts of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides and returning them copies (Gal. 17a.606-7 Kühn). Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012), 15 describe the Library's possession of Homer and creation of Homeric scholarship as an 'icon of state power'; Strootman (2017), 92-3 describes the Museum in terms of imperial 'appropriation and accumulation' marking Alexandria out as a new cultural center.

Herodas' first *Mimiamb* (1.31) as evidence that one could find anything in the world in Alexandria is a significant early witness to the institution's ideological purpose.<sup>124</sup>

The only extant description of the Museum is provided by Strabo, writing over three centuries after its foundation. It is thus both invaluable and problematic as a source for the function of the Museum in the early Hellenistic period when Callimachus was writing; wherever possible, we must rely on comparisons to contemporary institutions to see if what Strabo describes is plausible for the Hellenistic period. Here is his full description:

τῶν δὲ βασιλείων μέρος ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ Μουσεῖον, ἔχον περίπατον καὶ ἐξέδραν καὶ οἶκον μέγαν ἐν ᾧ τὸ συσσίτιον τῶν μετεχόντων τοῦ Μουσείου φιλολόγων ἀνδρῶν. ἔστι δὲ ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ αὐτῇ καὶ χρήματα κοινὰ καὶ ἱερεὺς ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ Μουσεῖῳ, τεταγμένος τότε μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων, νῦν δὲ ὑπὸ Καίσαρος. (Strab. 793-4)

And the Museum too is a section of the royal precinct, possessing a covered walk and arcade and a large residence in which there is the common dining room of the learned men participating in the Museum. And in this association there are both common funds and a priest in charge of the Museum, appointed at that time by the kings, now by Caesar.

The first important point to note is that the Museum was a part of the royal precinct, and thus part of the Ptolemies' extended *oikos*. The books in its Library were the Ptolemies' possessions, just as its intellectual members were supported by the crown. By extension, it would seem that any cultural capital produced by these *philoï* was in some sense a Ptolemaic possession as well. The second important point is that Museum was a religious association, a *σύνδοξ*, whose head was a priest (*ἱερεὺς*) appointed by the Ptolemies, as we saw in the last section. The poets' use of religious terms to describe their relationship to the Muses reflects this nature of the institution: at

---

<sup>124</sup> For the significance of Herodas' testimony for the cultural politics of Ptolemaic patronage, see Dillery (2015), 18-19.

*Idylls* 16.29 and 17.115, for instance, Theocritus describes poets who sing Ptolemy in exchange for his benevolence as Μουσάων ὑποφῆται, literally ‘interpreters of the Muses,’ suggesting that they are priests expounding the goddesses’ oracles contained in the Museum’s books.

Membership in this religious σύνοδος entailed several benefits attested by Strabo. At members’ disposal were common funds (χρήματα κοινά) endowed to the Museum. Strabo does not specify their purpose, but we may speculate here by drawing a comparison for similar institutions. Fraser compares a mid-third century inscription from Istria honoring a certain Diogenes, whose father ‘Diogenes son of Glaucios had founded a Museum and left three hundred gold pieces for a sacrifice to the Muses and a feast for the people’ (ἀ[ν]ατεθ[εικ]ότος δὲ τὸ Μουσεῖον τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Διογέ[ν]ους τοῦ Γλαυκίου καὶ λελοιπότος εἰς θυσίαν ταῖς Μούσαι[ς] καὶ συν[όδο]ν τῷ δήμῳ χρυσοῦς τριακοσίου).<sup>125</sup> This inscription suggests that in Alexandria, too, the funds provided by the Ptolemies would have been used for the organization’s religious celebrations, including sacrifices, feasts, and symposia.<sup>126</sup>

Fraser has suggested that the Museum’s common funds were also the source of stipends paid out by the crown to Museum scholars; there is, however, no evidence for this practice, and his argument is based on the assumption that intellectuals listed in sources as receiving payments

---

<sup>125</sup> I print the text of the inscription (*IScM* 1.1, lines 15-17) improved by the readings of Robert and Robert (1955), 239-40, as does Fraser (1972) 2.467 n. 53. On σύνοδος meaning ‘banquet’ see Robert and Robert (1955), 240.

<sup>126</sup> Callixeinus’ description of the grand *pompe* of Ptolemy Philadelphus mentions priests and priestesses of Dionysus marching in the procession; we might imagine the Museum’s σύνοδος performing similarly public rituals in addition to those they performed among themselves.

from the Ptolemies were not Museum members.<sup>127</sup> Let us consider the evidence anew. There are three anecdotes about such payments, two of which we have already discussed: Straton of Lampsacus was given 80 talents for tutoring Philadelphus (D.L. 5.3), and Sosibius ὁ λυτικός received a ‘royal stipend’ (σύνταξιν βασιλικήν, Athen. 11.493f). To these we can add that an obscure philosopher Panasepsis, student of Arcesilaus, received twelve talents annually (Polem. fr. 84 Prell). We do not know enough about Panasepsis to decide whether he was a Museum member, and so his annual payment is not much use here. Straton seems more likely than not to have been a member, but the gift of 80 talents is too large to have been a regular stipend.

Everything comes down to Sosibius. Famous for solving Homeric *zetemata*, his scholarly work situates him comfortably in the ranks of the Museum scholars. If, then, he was a Museum scholar, how he gets paid is extremely significant. Philadelphus, we remember, was displeased at his scholarly ‘solutions’ and so withheld his pay: he did this by instructing his financiers (ταμίαι) not to deliver his payment; and when Sosibius came to Ptolemy to complain, Philadelphus produced ‘books of those receiving a royal stipend’ from which he made his joke about Sosibius being written there. That Sosibius’ name is listed in records containing the names of all those receiving royal stipends, not just scholars, is of great significance: if Sosibius was a Museum scholar, as seems probable, then this institutional detail lends further support to my argument that poets and scholars were courtiers like any other, royal stipendiaries all. In sum, it seems more likely that Museum scholars’ stipends were not paid from the Museum’s common funds.

---

<sup>127</sup> Fraser (1972), 1.317.

Sticking with financial benefits of Museum membership, it is possible and even seems likely that scholars were exempted from taxes. In the Roman period, the scholars were called οἱ ἐν τῷ Μουσείῳ σιτούμενοι ἀτελεῖς:<sup>128</sup> while some translate this phrase ‘those fed in the Museum without payment,’<sup>129</sup> the placement of ἀτελεῖς after σιτούμενοι, not before, suggests that the correct translation is ‘those fed in the Museum, who are exempt from taxes.’<sup>130</sup> As this designation is only attested centuries after the early Hellenistic period, it cannot be accepted as certain proof of Hellenistic practice. We do know, however, that Ptolemy Philadelphus exempted ‘the [teachers] of letters and educators and those [tending to] matters pertaining to Dionysus and the victors of the [penteteric] competition and the Basileia and the Ptolemaia...from the salt tax, both them and their [descendants]’ (τού[ς τε διδασκάλους] τῶν γραμμάτων καὶ τοὺς παιδοτρίβας [κ]αὶ τ[οὺς νέμοντας] τὰ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ τοὺς νενικηκό[τ]ας τ[ὸν πενθετηρικὸν] ἀγῶνα καὶ τὰ Βασίλεια καὶ τὰ Πτολε[μ]α[ῖ]α...τοῦ ἀλὸς το<ῦ> τέλο<υ>ς αὐτοῦς τ[ε] καὶ [ἐκγόνους]).<sup>131</sup> Presumably some members of the Museum would have fallen in these categories of those exempt from the salt-tax – the royal tutor was presumably a Museum member – and it is possible, but by no means certain, that all Museum members were considered ‘[teachers] of letters.’ Taken together, the Roman title and third-century tax-exemptions for teachers suggest that already in the Hellenistic period Museum scholars may have been honored with ἀτέλεια. This policy would have sent the very clear message that literary cultural capital

---

<sup>128</sup> For sources, see Fraser (1972), 2.470-1 n. 84.

<sup>129</sup> So Hunter (2003), 33.

<sup>130</sup> So Lewis (1963), 259 and *passim*; Fraser (1972), 1.316-17.

<sup>131</sup> *P. Hal.* 1.260-5.



was highly valued: those exempted were elevated to the same level as the victorious athletes at the panhellenic games and the Ptolemies' own isolympic festivals.

The final perquisite of Museum membership did much the same and, I argue, was the most distinctive and distinguishing honor bestowed upon the scholars. Strabo informs us that in Roman times there was a common dining room (τὸ συσσίτιον) of the Museum, where the 'feeding' of οἱ ἐν τῷ Μουσείῳ σιτούμενοι ἀτελεῖς took place. We can safely assume that this aspect of the Museum was coeval with the institution itself. The earlier Peripatos in Athens, upon which the Museum was partially modeled,<sup>132</sup> had *syssitia*. Diogenes Laertius preserves the will of Straton, royal tutor of Philadelphus and later the head of the Peripatos; from this document we know that the leader of the Peripatos owned the furniture of the room, including the tableware, cushions, and cups, which he passed on to his successor.<sup>133</sup> In light of other similarities between the Museum and Peripatos, it seems reasonable to assume that the Museum too had a dining room and shared meals from its earliest days.

There was, however, a crucial difference between the meals served at the Peripatos and those at the Alexandrian Museum. The Peripatos had no civic or royal patron, and so members presumably had to supply their own food. The Ptolemies, however, seem to have provided personally for the maintenance of their scholars, who, as we have seen, were a part of their extended royal household. Athenaeus has preserved a few precious lines from the third-century poet Timon of Phlius' satirical portrait of the Museum scholars in his *Silloi* which corroborate this conclusion:

πολλοὶ μὲν βόσκονται ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ πολυφύλῳ

---

<sup>132</sup> See especially Fraser (1972), 1.313-15.

<sup>133</sup> D.L. 5.62; cf. Fraser (1972), 1.314

βιβλιακοὶ χαρακῖται ἀπείριτα δηριόωντες  
Μουσέων ἐν ταλάρῳ (*SH* 786)

In Egypt of many tribes are fed many fenced-in men of books, wrangling without end in the Muses' basket.

Modern scholars have debated the precise interpretation of Timon's parody as fiercely as the squabbling scholars he describes. All are agreed, however, on what matters here: that this fragment alludes to the Ptolemies' provision of meals to the Museum scholars.<sup>134</sup>

In what context are we to understand the meaning of these meals? Other religious institutions might provide a clue: to take one example, Diogenes, the founder and benefactor of the Museum of Itria discussed above, provided gold to fund sacrifices to the Muses and a public banquet. Timon's parody, however, along with the Roman-era title οἱ ἐν τῷ Μουσείῳ σιτούμενοι suggests a more regular feasting than the periodic celebrations funded by Diogenes. Accordingly, Hunter suggests a comparison between the Museum meals and the classical and Hellenistic polis institution of σίτησις, 'dining privileges' awarded to a city's benefactors.<sup>135</sup> In what follows I build off Hunter's suggestion and argue that the Ptolemies adopted this honorary

---

<sup>134</sup> So Athenaeus, who quotes the fragment, explains it: ἐπισκώπτων τοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ [sc. ταλάρῳ] τρεφομένους φιλοσόφους, ὅτι ὥσπερ ἐν πανάγρῳ τινὶ σιτοῦνται καθάπερ οἱ πολυτιμότατοι ὄρνιθες ('mocking the philosophers fed in it [i.e. the basket], since they are fed as if in a net, like the most expensive birds,' Athen. 1.22d). This fragment is discussed further below. Some scholars, like Hunter (2003), 33 allow that Timon's parody may imply only that the Ptolemies paid their scholars, metaphorically 'feeding' them; but the parallels to *sitesis* discussed below suggest that we can understand Timon's parody fairly literally.

<sup>135</sup> Hunter (2003), 33.

practice of *poleis* in order to attract intellectuals hungry for international distinction to Alexandria.

Our knowledge of *sitesis* is owed largely to Athenian inscriptional and literary evidence, which clearly demonstrates the institution's social, political, and religious significance.<sup>136</sup> Those who were awarded *sitesis* were entitled to dine in the *prytaneion*, the civic building in the Athenian *agora* which housed the city's public hearth; here the city agreed to provide meals cooked over the sacred flame at public expense. Scholars have argued that the meal itself was a ritual activity: in Aristophanes' *Knights*, for example, when Demosthenes accuses Pericles of going to the *prytaneion* to take some bread, meat, and fish to staunch his hunger, he calls them ἀπόρρητα, 'ineffable, sacred things' (*Eq.* 282), a religious term especially associated with the Eleusinian Mysteries.<sup>137</sup> The meals served at the Museum would have had similarly civic and religious dimensions. Consisting of food delivered from the royal kitchen and served within the royal precinct, the dining of the Museum scholars was likewise connected to the 'hearth' of empire; moreover, the Museum was a religious association, lending its occasions of breaking bread together the quality of ritual.

---

<sup>136</sup> For a brief overview of Athenian *sitesis* and the different individuals to whom it was granted, see Rhodes (1993), 308 on *Ath. Pol.* 24.3 ἔτι δὲ πρυτανεῖον; for more detail see Osborne (1981), 158-66 (permanent *sitesis*), 153-8 (one-time invitations).

<sup>137</sup> See Sommerstein (1981), 158 on *Eq.* 282. Differently, Blok and van 't Wout (2018), 195-6, suggest that Aristophanes was elevating the *sitesis* meal to the level of the Mysteries for comic effect. For the religious dimension of *sitesis*, see Schultheß (1927), 389.14-26.

Who in the *polis* was entitled to the privilege of *sitesis*? The so-called ‘*prytaneion* decree’ (IG I<sup>3</sup> 131), inscribed and set up in Athens in the early- to mid-420s, offers the best evidence for Athenian practice.<sup>138</sup> The decree is very fragmentary, but nonetheless a list of those granted the honor is reasonably well-preserved. First are mentioned the descendants of the tyrant-slayers, Harmodius and Aristogeiton (lines 5-7); next comes a group selected by Apollo, perhaps seers (7-11); then victors in the pan-hellenic games, with special consideration given for victors in horse-races (11-18); finally the inscription breaks off with apparent provisions for military victors (19). These four groups are united in the exceptional service they have rendered to the Athenian state, as σωτῆρες (‘saviors’: tyrant-slayers, military victors, perhaps those chosen by Apollo) and/or as εὐεργέται (‘benefactors’: victors at the pan-hellenic games who increase the city’s *kleos*). Although these terms are not attested in the decree, they are the ones that Athenians used in the Classical period to describe individuals worthy of *sitesis*. For example, the late-fifth/early-fourth century orator Andocides describes how, to the Athenians’ discredit, the wicked Diocleides was treated to *sitesis* ‘as if he were a savior of the city’ (ὡς σωτῆρα ὄντα τῆς πόλεως, Andoc. 1.45). When Plato’s Socrates famously claims that he deserves *sitesis* far more than a victor of a two- or four-horse chariot race at Olympia, he claims it is an honor worthy of a ‘benefactor’ (εὐεργέτη, Pl. *Ap.* 36d) such as himself.

Although the *prytaneion* decree does not list poets among those granted *sitesis*, we know from other sources that as early as the fifth century they were among those feasted at the *prytaneion*, and that poets and intellectuals were making their cases to have merited the meal.

---

<sup>138</sup> The decree’s date, contents, and historical context have been recently re-evaluated by Blok and van ‘t Wout (2018), with references to older bibliography.

Peter Wilson has drawn attention to several Aristophanic scholia mentioning that the Athenian politician Agyrrhius, a target of Aristophanes' verse, and Archinus, associated with him on occasion, proposed in the late-fifth/early-fourth century that *sitesis* be granted to visiting melic poets; at the same time, this Agyrrhius reduced the pay the Athenians gave to comic poets, much to Aristophanes' chagrin.<sup>139</sup> While we can only guess at his particular motivations, his message is clear: melic poets are benefactors of the state and deserve their highest honor, whereas comic poets deserve even less than they are currently getting.

The comic poet Aristophanes took up the issue of poets' utility to the state in his *Frogs*, in which Dionysus goes to the underworld on a quest to bring Euripides back from the dead. Once the action reaches Plouton's palace, a steward tells Dionysus' slave Xanthias that a quarrel has broken out between Aeschylus and Euripides which is causing political upheaval (cf. στάσις, *Ra.* 760 and πράγμα μέγα κέκίνηται, 759). Their quarrel is over who will be judged the better tragedian; what is particularly of interest here are the honors that the winner will receive. As the steward says to Xanthias,

Οἱ.                    νόμος τις ἐνθάδ' ἐστὶ κείμενος  
 ἀπὸ τῶν τεχνῶν, ὅσαι μεγάλοι καὶ δεξιοί,  
 τὸν ἄριστον ὄντα τῶν ἑαυτοῦ συντέχνων  
 σίτησιν αὐτὸν ἐν πρυτανείῳ λαμβάνειν  
 θρόνον τε τοῦ Πλούτωνος ἐξῆς—  
 Ζα.                    μανθάνω. (*Ra.* 761-5)

Steward: There is a law established here that, of the crafts which are great and noble, the man who is the best of his fellow craftsmen receives *sitesis* in the *prytaneion* and has seat next to Plouton...Xanthias: I get the picture.

The honors of underworld *sitesis* and *prohedria* are totally familiar to Xanthias, and hence Aristophanes' audience, as they are the same honors granted in Athens. But if the honors are the

---

<sup>139</sup> See Wilson (2010), 202, discussing scholia to *Ar. Ra.* 367, 585; *Nub.* 332a, 332b.

same, the reason for them is very different. In the underworld, unlike in Athens, there is no unwritten requirement that those receiving *sitesis* be saviors or benefactors of their cities; rather all the best in the ‘great and noble crafts’ (μεγάλοι καὶ δεξιοὶ τέχναι, 762) are so honored. But lest we think that Aristophanes is suggesting that the same criterion should be used for Athenian *sitesis*, the comedy ends with Dionysus judging Aeschylus the greater tragedian, apparently on the basis of the ‘good’ advice he has just offered for how to save Athens in her tragedy after losing the Peloponnesian War (431-404). Plouton then sends Aeschylus off on his procession to the upper world with the instruction ‘Save our city with good pieces of advice and educate the blockheads: for there are many’ (σῶιζε πόλιν τὴν ἡμετέραν / γνώμαις ἀγαθαῖς καὶ παίδευσον / τοὺς ἀνοήτους; πολλοὶ δ’ εἰσὶν, 1501-3). In having Dionysus send Aeschylus back to save Athens, Aristophanes suggests to his Athenian audience that some poets are worthy of *sitesis*, provided their works can save the city from those who would destroy her. A politician like Agyrrhius might try to attract melic poets with *sitesis*, but Aeschylus – and Aristophanes, of course – can actually advise the city in her times of need.

Aristophanes was not alone in arguing for the usefulness of his cultural capital for the city. Following in the footsteps of Plato’s Socrates, mentioned above, in the mid-fourth century Isocrates argues in *Antidosis* that if any of his students have gone to deserve Athens’ praise, like the general Timotheus, then he himself deserves the city’s thanks all the more by far for having taught them as his students. Naturally, the saving and beneficial effects of his education should be rewarded with a grant of *sitesis* (*Antid.* 95). While it is true that none of these intellectuals aside from Agyrrhius’ melic poets actually received *sitesis*, their arguments were already there in the Classical period.

Later epigraphic evidence confirms that in the Hellenistic period cities and civic associations bestowed *sitesis* on poets who glorified them in verse and otherwise contributed to their welfare. In 165 BC, for example, the Athenian *demos* at Delos set up an honorary inscription detailing the award of *sitesis* to Agathocles of Rheneia, son of Philoxenus of Delos. The inscription records the following grounds for his award and the honors given to him:

...ἐπειδὴ | Ἀμφικλῆς, μουσικὸς καὶ μελῶν | ποητῆς, ἀκροάσεις καὶ πλείους |  
ἐποίησατο καὶ προσόδιον γράψας | ἐμμελὲς εἰς τὴν πόλιν τοὺς τε | θεοὺς τοὺς  
τὴν νῆσον κατέχοντας | καὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων | ὕμνησεν, ἐδίδασκεν δὲ  
καὶ τοὺς τῶν | πολιτῶν παῖδας πρὸς λύραν τὸ | μέλος αἰδεῖν, ἀξίως τῆς τε  
τῶν θεῶν | τιμῆς καὶ τοῦ Ἀθηναίων δήμου, | ἐπαγγέλλεται δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ  
λοιπὸν | εὐχρηστον ἑαυτὸν παρασκευάζ[ειν] | καθότι ἂν ᾖ δυνατός...  
...  
δοκεῖ τεῖ βουλῇ ἐπαινέσαι | τε Ἀμφικλῆν Φιλοξένου Ῥηναέα ἐπὶ | τε τεῖ εἰς  
τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβεῖαι | καὶ τεῖ εἰς τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων | εὐνοίαι καὶ  
στεφανῶσαι αὐτὸν δάφνης | στεφάνω· ἀποστεῖλαι δ' αὐτῷ καὶ | ξένιον·  
καλέσαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ | πρυτανεῖον ἐπὶ τὴν κοινὴν ἐστίαν· (IDelos  
1497.5-18, 26-33)

Since Amphicles, a musician and melic poet, gave many performances; and, having written a processional hymn for our city, hymned both the gods that dwell on our island and the deme of the Athenians; and also taught the citizens' children to sing the hymn to the lyre, in a manner worthy both of the honor of the gods and the deme of the Athenians; and freely promises of himself even in the future to make himself of service in accordance to his ability...the assembly resolves to praise Amphicles son of Philoxenus of Rheneia both for his piety to the gods and his goodwill to the deme of the Athenians, and to crown him with a crown of laurel; and also to send to him a guest-present; and also to invite him into the *prytaneion* to the common hearth.

Amphicles is here deemed worthy of *sitesis* and other honors owing to his εὐσέβεια ('piety') to the gods and εὐνοία ('goodwill') to the Athenian deme on Delos. He did this by not only composing a pleasing *prosodion*, or processional hymn, that celebrated both, but also by teaching this hymn to the citizen's children who performed it with him, and in so doing he made it possible for the citizens to continue performing his hymn year after year, renewing the original

gift of the song to the gods he originally provided.<sup>140</sup> In celebrating the city and helping her preserve her good relationship with her divinities, Amphiicles showed himself to be a benefactor, and even a savior, of the Athenian deme. Admittedly, this inscription dates from the mid-second century, a century after the time of Callimachus; nevertheless, civic honors are by nature conservative, and so we may safely conclude that *poleis* were offering *sitesis* to foreign poets for their services already in the early Hellenistic period.<sup>141</sup>

Before returning to the Museum, there is another *polis* honor aside from *sitesis* that was on offer in the Hellenistic period to mention: honoring a benefactor with the gift of a portion of meat from a city's sacrifices. As Jan-Mathieu Carbon has shown in his examination of honorary decrees listing this honor, the apportionment of meat to benefactors was widespread across the *oikoumene*, although it was not as common as inviting the honorand to join in the city's sacrifices. Intriguingly, the honorand did not need in all cases to attend the designated sacrifices to receive the share of meat; many inscriptions attest to the practice of sending meat to the honorands even when separated by exceptional distance.<sup>142</sup> A most extraordinary case concerns the female poet Aristodama of Smyrna. In 218/17, the city Chaleion honored her recognition of her poetry praising the city and its sanctuary with an extraordinary gift of meat from the sacrifice to Apollo: I read the text as [...πέμπε]σθαι δὲ αὐτᾶι καὶ ἀπὸ τᾶς / [πόλιος ἀμῶν γέρ]ας παρὰ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος / ἐκ τᾶς θυσίας μερίδα [ἐπὶ τὰν ἐστίαν αὐτᾶς εἰς] / Ζμύρναν ('and

---

<sup>140</sup> I thank Ivana Petrovic for pointing me to this inscription.

<sup>141</sup> N.B. Philippides, discussed above in section two, was granted *sitesis* in 283/2, although his comedies are not listed as grounds for his achievement.

<sup>142</sup> Carbon (2018), 356-71.



that to her shall be [sent] also from [our city an honorable por]tion (*geras*) from Apollo, a portion (*meris*) from the sacrifice [to her hearth to] Smyrna’).<sup>143</sup> Reading the supplement πέμπεσθαι, the decree proposes not just a one-time gift of meat from the god Apollo himself (παρὰ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος), but a regular provision of meat from the sacrifice.<sup>144</sup> Whether a one-time or

---

<sup>143</sup> See the text and discussion of Carbon (2018), 368 n. 88, who discusses his differences with the text of Daux (1922), 445-9 no. 1. I agree with Carbon that the supplement of Wilhelm (1929), 166 ἐπὶ τὰν ἐστίαν αὐτᾶς is preferable to Daux’s and *FD*’s κρεῶν ἐπὶ τᾶν ἐστίαν on the grounds that κρεῶν is redundant, whereas the honorary decree for Sostratus specifies that the meat shall be sent to his hearth (εἰς τὴν Σωσ|τράτου ἐστίαν γέρας, *IG* XI 4.1038.26-7), thus providing a parallel for ἐπὶ τὰν ἐστίαν αὐτᾶς. I also agree with him that ἐν] Σμύρναν (Daux, *FD*) should be emended to εἰς] Σμύρναν, once again on the basis of a parallel with the decree for Sostratus (εἰς Κνίδον, *IG* XI 4.1038.27). For the supplement of πέμπεσθαι, see the next note.

<sup>144</sup> I disagree with Carbon that πέμπε]σθαι (Daux, *FD*) should be emended to πέμψα]σθαι. He argues that the aorist infinitives preceding this passage of the decree suggest that Aristodama is being rewarded in a one-time event, and that the regular provision of meat from sacrifices to Apollo at Chaleion, implied by the present infinitive, would be out of place; moreover, he believes the distance between Chaleion near Delphi and Smyrna on the coast of Asia Minor prohibitive to the regular provision of meat to Aristodama. But his proposal that we read the aorist middle infinitive πέμψασθαι is unpersuasive on several counts. (1) In the middle πέμπω means to send someone to do something for the sender’s benefit: so *Soph. OT* 556 and *Luc. Tox.* 14 both involve sending a person either to summon another or to get a response from him. Carbon’s πέμψασθαι would, exceptionally, have an object rather than a person as a direct object,

regular transportation of Apolline meat was Aristodama's honor, the gift was sent to her home in Smyrna, where she would presumably invite her own guests who would participate in her Chaleian feast of honor. And not only would she be honored in Chaleion and in Smyrna: the Chaleians also had a copy of the honorary decree inscribed and set up in Delphi, broadcasting to the entire Greek world the exceptional honors they bestowed on poets offering them exceptional—and politically useful—praise.<sup>145</sup>

---

and there seems to be no idea of summoning or getting something out of Aristodama. A passive infinitive is therefore needed, and because *πεμφθῆναι* cannot be read here, we should retain Daux's supplement *πέμπεσθαι*. Anyway, this form has the benefit of being attested in other decrees cited by Carbon, and so we should not look to introduce an innovative aorist middle infinitive. (2) Carbon himself shows that there are other cases where meat was regularly sent over long distances to other honorands and in general: see for example the honorary decree *IG* XI 4.1038 (Delos, ca. 280-70) that prescribes that Sostratus of Knidos (the designer of the Ptolemaic lighthouse at Pharos) and his descendants after him be given a *geras* from a sacrifice during each festival celebrated by the Nesiotai on Delos, a distance of over 100 km, and his examination of the Zenon papyri at 360-2, showing that Zenon received honorary shares of meat from as far away as Arsinoe/Crocodilopolis. Given that Zenon often worked in Memphis or Alexandria, this meat could have traveled a distance of roughly 100 km. So, if meat could and did travel this far on other occasions, it does not seem excessive to assume in Aristodama's case that honorary portions of meat could have been transported 350 km, even regularly.

<sup>145</sup> On the possible political uses of such local historical poetry in the Hellenistic period see Rutherford (2009), 244-9, whose discussion of Aristodama's (and Nicander's) patronage by the

Delphi, Delos, and other panhellenic sanctuaries thus played two key functions in the circulation of the symbolic capital of distinction: for cities they were sites for the competitive display of their benefactions and honors to poets and other cultural professionals; for poets and professionals, in turn, they were marketplaces where cities could advertise the honors they were willing and able to bestow on them. The game of distinction played by cities and poets alike can be demonstrated by a different honorary decree for the same poet Aristodama. In 218/17 the city Lamia passed a decree (*IG IX 9 2.62*) honoring her, among other privileges, with citizenship. As Ian Rutherford rightly points out,<sup>146</sup> as a woman, Aristodama almost certainly was not a citizen in her hometown of Smyrna, where she received the sacrificial meat sent to her by the Chaleians. How exactly Aristodama's Lamian citizenship would have worked we cannot say, but the city's motivation is obvious. In making this immense gift to Aristodama, the city not only encouraged Aristodama to remain an active poetic benefactor, but also broadcasted to future poets, in full view of competitor cities, the extraordinary value they put on their cultural capital to attract them to Lamia as well. Aristodama came away a winner from this international competition for her attentions: the recipient of Lamian citizenship, sacrificial meat from Chaleion, and many other honorary privileges besides, she accumulated immense symbolic capital, and international reputation of distinction which she could parlay into honors far beyond her status as a woman.

It is against the background of the honors of *sitesis* and sacrificial portions for poets that the point of the Ptolemies' maintenance of scholars at the Museum emerges. To achieve their

---

Aetolians, intended to create a pan-Aetolian identity, has important implications for the role of poets in the period.

<sup>146</sup> Rutherford (2009), 238.

aim of making Alexandria a new center of Greek culture surpassing Athens and the other *poleis*, they wished to attract the world's most talented poets and intellectuals. So, they needed to make poets an offer that could not be refused. Simple payments of money would not be enough: what poets strove for on the international scene were feasts and portions of honor. The Museum's meals, then, were instituted in order to adopt the existing form of symbolic capital distributed by *poleis*, that of *sitesis* and sacrificial portions. By offering such symbolic meals to their scholars, the Ptolemies broadcast a clear message to the poets and cities of the Greek world: the Ptolemies valued intellectuals' cultural capital very highly, as highly, in fact, as the accomplishments of benefactors and saviors, like successful commanders, athletes and the like. We might even say that in the Alexandrian court, poets took their place side by side these men as the benefactors and saviors of the Ptolemaic state. To a poet hungry for distinction, then, a Museum fellowship would have promised him not only the resources and leisure to produce state-of-the-art scholarship and literature, but also to compete for a distinguished position at court.

We should note, too, that accepting an offer from one of the Ptolemies to join the Museum did not exclude scholars from winning honors from *poleis*: far from it. We shall explore the international dimension of Callimachus' *Hymns* in the next chapter, but for now I will make three brief points on this perk of Museum membership. First, joining the Museum afforded scholars and poets access to a international network composed not only of other scholars, but also of courtiers more broadly. Through these personal connections, poets could secure invitations to *poleis* to write works for them, like Amphicles' *prosodion* for the Athenian deme of Delos. Indeed, as the honorary inscription for Philippides, the friend of Lysimachus showed, the king himself could use the poet as a cultural and political ambassador to *poleis* where he desired influence. Second, the resources of the Museum's Library, specifically its collections of

local history made it possible for poets to compose works for these distant *poleis* they had never been to themselves, as we saw in Callimachus' Sicilian cities fragment. Third and finally, we must presume that membership in the Museum made poets more attractive to *poleis* who wished to win or retain Ptolemaic favor. Much as the Athenians honored Lysimachus' *philos* Philippides, granting patronage to Ptolemaic patrons was another way that cities could ingratiate themselves to the Ptolemies and enjoin them to do a good turn to them. Taking meals at the Museum, then, paved poets' ways to other cities' hearths.

Having considered food's role as a symbolic capital for Hellenistic poets, we should also examine what symbolic profits the Ptolemies reaped from feeding all these distinguished scholars. Discussing the Syracusia affair we saw that Hellenistic kings competed amongst themselves in supplying grain to starving cities, and that in so doing, kings suggested their worthiness of divine honors: for example, the poet of the Athenian ithyphallic hymn to Demetrius Poliorcetes etymologizes Demetrius from Demeter at least in part to commemorate his gift of 100,000 *medimnoi* of grain to the starving Athenians the year prior.<sup>147</sup> The Ptolemies led the grain game, not only in such exceptional gifts<sup>148</sup> but even more through their regular and substantial provision of Egypt's surplus grain to Alexandria and to trading partners throughout

---

<sup>147</sup> Chaniotis (2011), 162. See his discussion of the divinity of Hellenistic rulers and Petrovic (2015).

<sup>148</sup> See for example Ptolemy III Euergetes' massive gifts of grain and other supplies to Rhodes after a catastrophic earthquake in 227 (Polyb. 5.89.1-5). On this and other Ptolemaic provisions of grain see Buraselis (2013), 104-5.

the Mediterranean.<sup>149</sup> The Ptolemies built their imperial brand around this fertility, featuring motifs of agricultural abundance prominently in poetry, art, coins, cult, and spectacles.<sup>150</sup> Philadelphus' grand *pompe*, for instance, displayed this productivity ostentatiously: the pavilion was strewn with innumerable types of flowers to make a spectacle of Egypt's miraculously temperate climate – the Procession took place in winter – which allowed flowers from all over the world to grow together;<sup>151</sup> a figure dressed as the Year processed with a cornucopia, suggesting perennial bounty unimpeded by seasonal variation;<sup>152</sup> pigeons, ringdoves, and turtledoves flew out of a cage with string tied around their feet so that spectators could catch and take them away, presumably to eat;<sup>153</sup> and all manner of spices and animals were led in tow,

---

<sup>149</sup> Fraser (1972), 1.164-6 discusses Rhodes' trade with Ptolemaic Alexandria (grain for amphorae). In general on the Ptolemaic grain supply and policy see Buraselis (2013).

<sup>150</sup> In poetry the *locus classicus* is Theocritus' praise of Egypt's fertility at *Id.* 17.77-81 (considered above); see Hunter (2003), 156 on 79-80 for a discussion of the connection of pharaonic ideology connecting the pharaoh to the Nile flood and the country's fertility and the Ptolemaic king's ideological display of wealth. On the pharaonic ideology see also Koenen (1993), 39. Ptolemaic queens, especially Berenice II, were associated in cult with Isis and Demeter, providers of grain. On the depiction of cornucopiae on Berenice's coins, see e.g. Clayman (2014a), 129.

<sup>151</sup> Athen. 5.196d.

<sup>152</sup> Athen. 5.198a.

<sup>153</sup> Athen. 5.200c.

some no doubt to be sacrificed and consumed that very day.<sup>154</sup> The Ptolemies put this abundance to use wherever they went: Strootman has recently drawn attention to Hellenistic kings' habit of offering sacrifices at the cults of the *poleis* they visited, converting their wealth into sacrificial victims whose enjoyment bound together local gods, king, court, and *polis*.<sup>155</sup>

The Ptolemies' provision of food from fertile Egypt was intimately connected to their own *tryphe*, the 'conspicuous consumption' discussed above as central to Ptolemaic ideology. For the Greeks the ideas of feeding and luxury were instinctively related: there are frequent instances of etymological play between the noun τρυφή and the verb τρέφω, which means 'to nourish,' and related words.<sup>156</sup> Not only paying the Museum scholars, but also feeding them made a further display of the Ptolemies' *tryphe*. Even more, feeding them affected a visceral conversion of the Ptolemies' economic capital into the symbolic capital of distinguished meals; through their consumption, the scholars themselves became an objectified cultural capital. Athenaeus' explanation of Timon's satire of the Museum scholars is well worth recalling here: he says that they are fed in a net 'just like the most expensive birds' (καθάπερ οἱ πολυτιμότατοι ὄρνιθες, 1.22d). Their Museum meals allowed the Ptolemies to convert their wealth into the symbolic capital of their own *tryphe* and the cultural capital of their distinguished scholars.

---

<sup>154</sup> These were part of several different portions of the procession described in Athen. 5.200e-201b.

<sup>155</sup> Strootman (2018), 280-2, 285-6.

<sup>156</sup> See for example Eur. fr. 54.2-3, 892.3-4; Pl. *Gorg.* 525a, *Leg.* 695b; Men. fr. 466.3-5.

In conclusion, this detailed examination of *sitesis* and other honorific food for poets in the Hellenistic period reveals in the international network of poetic patrons is clear why eating at the Museum became metonymic of institutional membership as a whole (οἱ ἐν τῷ Μουσείῳ σιτούμενοι): in providing the meal, the Ptolemies made another display of their endless luxury and their conversion of it into cultural capital; in enjoying *sitesis*, the poets enjoyed their own distinction recognized as benefactors of the city on the same level as other stripes of courtiers. The significance of this feasting to Museum patronage is suggested already by Timon's satire that debases the symbolic capital the scholars fight over, royal food, as an instrument of the scholar's domination and consumption. Further confirmation still of the symbolic value of the Ptolemies' food comes from a telling anecdote reported by Vitruvius about the grammarian Zoilius 'Homeromastix.' This Zoilius came to Alexandria, evidently in hopes of patronage, and recited his works criticizing the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in the presence of Philadelphus (*suaque scripta contra Iliadem et Odyssean comparata regi recitavit*, Vitr. 7.pr.8). The king, however, refused him a reply (*nullum ei dedit responsum*, 7.pr.8) on the grounds that he had attacked a poet no less than Homer when Homer could not defend himself. Not one to give up hope, Zoilius stayed on in Alexandria, expecting some day to impress the king. When in time he ran out of money, he asked the king for a grant of money (*ut aliquid sibi tribueretur*, 7.pr.8). Ptolemy rebuked him as follows:

rex vero respondisse dicitur Homerum, qui ante annos mille decessisset, aevo perpetuo multa milia hominum pascere, item debere, qui meliore ingenio se profiteretur, non modo unum sed etiam plures alere posse. Et ad summam mors eius ut parricidii damnati varie memoratur... (Vitr. 7.pr.9)

But the king is said to have replied that Homer, who had died a thousand years earlier, feeds many thousands of men in uninterrupted perpetuity; in like manner he, who claimed to be endowed with a superior mind [to Homer], ought not only to be able to feed one, but even more men [than Homer did]. And, in sum, the



death of Zoilius, as if he were a condemned parricide, is recorded in different ways...

Philadelphus' role as the arbiter of scholarship, here vividly realized as Homer's legal defense,<sup>157</sup> is of a piece with the representations of the Ptolemies we discussed in the previous part of this section. What is of chief interest here is how Ptolemy replies to Zoilius' rather forward request for money (*sibi aliquid tribueretur*) in the language of food and feasting. Homer still feeds (*pascere*) many thousands even after his death, so Zoilius, who claims to be greater than Homer, ought to be able to nourish (*alere*) even more men than he did; the fact that he is starving, i.e. has not been given Ptolemaic patronage, reveals the paucity of his cultural capital. Cultural capital, then, is expressed in the symbolic capital of food, not with a financial handout. With this equation, Philadelphus makes himself analogous to Homer: each feasts 'many thousands of men in uninterrupted perpetuity,' scholars included. Ptolemy hereby sets himself up as the arbiter of the exchange rate between cultural, symbolic, and economic capital, and Zoilius reveals his own ignorance of the Ptolemies' symbolic economy of patronage by thinking in terms of a one-time cash award rather than the long-term provision of food.

*iii. The royal symposium as site of consumption of cultural capital and production of symbolic capital*

Two major questions in scholarship on Hellenistic poetry have been who consumed the cultural capital produced at the Museum and where. In the Hellenistic period reading, writing, and their materials assumed a central role in poets' self-image and imagined relationships to their

---

<sup>157</sup> Vitruvius has already set the scene with legal language: *nullum dedit responsum* is a technical term (*OLD* s.v. *responsum* 1b).

predecessors, as Peter Bing has shown so well.<sup>158</sup> This fact has sometimes been taken as further evidence that the Hellenistic poets were writing for an audience of literary *cognoscenti* who enjoyed their works primarily as written texts. For instance, Marco Fantuzzi has argued that the loss of the performance contexts for which Archaic poets like Pindar, Hipponax, and Alcman composed created new poetic possibilities for poets like Callimachus, who were cataloguing and organizing these older poets' works; the intellectual sophistication and 'Kreuzung der Gattungen' ('crossing of genres')<sup>159</sup> so characteristic of their poetry comes from their freedom to combine features of genres previously kept separate through performance in the new medium of the book-roll.<sup>160</sup>

Yet in recent decades scholars have challenged the idea that Hellenistic poetry was reserved for a reading audience of literary *cognoscenti* by focusing attention on performance contexts that did exist in this period. Gregor Weber and Alan Cameron have shown that in Alexandria and throughout the *oikoumene* there was a proliferation of new festivals with poetic competitions, like those described in Theocritus' *Idyll* 17, at which poets performed before large audiences;<sup>161</sup> they also argue for the importance of the royal banquet or symposium as a site for

---

<sup>158</sup> Bing (1988), 10-48.

<sup>159</sup> The term 'Kreuzung der Gattungen' was introduced by Kroll (1924); he saw Hellenistic poets' constant generic play as a sign of their taste for 'being modern at all costs' (202-3).

<sup>160</sup> Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 17-26.

<sup>161</sup> Weber (1993), 165-79 lists all known festivals featuring poetic performance in Alexandria; Cameron (1995), 24-70 considers a broad range of evidence for festival culture in the Hellenistic period.

the poetic performance.<sup>162</sup> Cameron went too far, to be sure, in arguing that the book-roll played no role in the development of genres like literary epigram and that in the Hellenistic period works were primarily experienced in performance; nevertheless, scholarly consensus now holds that poetry was consumed as both ‘text and performance,’ in Bing’s words, and that the royal symposium was one of the most important performance contexts for poetry.<sup>163</sup>

There is, in fact, precious little evidence that explicitly attests to the performance of poetry at Hellenistic royal symposia. One anecdote from Athenaeus, however, merits particular attention, for it closely links sympotic performance to *philia*. The story concerns Hegesianax, one of the two Hellenistic poets I mentioned above who are expressly named *philo*i. When he was a guest at a royal symposium of Antiochus III, the king and his *philo*i began to dance the war-dance in armor. Antiochus then bid Hegesianax to dance with them; the poet, however, declined, on the grounds that he would do so badly. Instead, Hegesianax offered to read his own poems (ποιήματα, Athen. 4.155b) well. This was a resounding success: ‘Enjoined, then, to recite his works, Hegesianax so pleased the king that he both was judged worthy of an *eranos* and became one of his *philo*i’ (κελευσθεῖς οὖν λέγειν οὕτως ἤσε τὸν βασιλέα ὥστ’ ἐράνου τε ἀξιωθῆναι καὶ τῶν φίλων εἰς γενέσθαι, 4.155b). Acosta-Hughes and Stephens have already discussed how Hegesianax manipulates the competitive sympotic atmosphere to his benefit by

---

<sup>162</sup> Weber (1993), 180-2; Cameron (1995), 71-103.

<sup>163</sup> Bing (2000) = Bing (2009), 106-15. See the more recent studies of Murray (2008), 20-4 and Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012), 130-40, noting at 146 that the earlier position that Hellenistic poetry was meant primarily for private reading has become increasingly hard to maintain.

changing the rules of the game to favor his own sphere of excellence.<sup>164</sup> I would like here to draw attention to the rewards Hegesianax reaps for his recital. The king first judges him worthy to receive an *eranos*, a reward or favor of some kind (LSJ s.v. 2.2)<sup>165</sup> which suggests a relationship of reciprocity.<sup>166</sup> Second, Antiochus makes Hegesianax one of his *philoï*, formally welcoming him into the in-group that is court. The royal symposium, then, was a key venue for the poet to present himself as a worthy *philos* to the king and try to enjoin him to act as a *philos* in return.

Still, we have no way of knowing how much Hellenistic poetry was actually performed at the royal symposium. Some poems, like Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*, clearly assume the king's symposium as their setting,<sup>167</sup> but Gregor Weber has reminded us that any kind of poetry could

---

<sup>164</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012), 131.

<sup>165</sup> Berrey (2017), 115-16 interprets the passage differently, arguing that the king judged Hegesianax to have worthily contributed an *eranos* in the form of reading his poems. But this interpretation seems to bend the usage of ἀξιόω too far: ἀξιόω + gen. generally indicates that one is worthy of receiving something, not of having given it (LSJ s.v. 1.1). I thus follow the interpretation of Olson (2006), 241, although his suggestion that the *eranos* is a gift of gold seems overly definite given the range of sympotic gifts we have seen in this chapter.

<sup>166</sup> One of the meanings of *eranos* active here is 'potluck,' a meal to which all members made a contribution (LSJ s.v. 1); Hegesianax' poetic *eranos* is thus met with Antiochus' counter-*eranos* in some form or another.

<sup>167</sup> The *Hymn to Zeus* opens Ζηνὸς ἔοι τί κεν ἄλλο παρὰ σπονδῇσιν αἰεῖδεν / λῶιον ἢ θεὸν αὐτόν ('What else could be better to be singing at libations of Zeus than the god himself?', 1-2).

have afforded the court entertainment.<sup>168</sup> Cameron has collected an impressive range of anecdotes attesting to the prominence of learned conversation about literature at Hellenistic symposia, especially the kings'.<sup>169</sup> Although these anecdotes do not offer the proof he claims they do that Hellenistic poetry was all composed for sympotic recital, they do suggest an essential point. The royal symposium was the crucial informal occasion in which the king and the entire range of courtiers discussed poetry, new and old; and so, whether or not any particular poem was performed at the king's symposium, Museum poets wrote with the audience of court, gathered at the king's symposium where their work would be discussed, in mind.

Moreover, there is good indirect evidence that the Alexandrian scholars, even though they took honorary meals as a group in the Museum, also were invited to the Ptolemies' symposia. Timon of Phlius's parody of the Museum scholars, which we examined in the previous section, suggests a tight relationship between the Museum and king's banquet. His joke,

---

In light of Callimachus' comparison of Ptolemy II to the god, Clauss (1986) argues suggestively that it was performed at a royal symposium during the inaugural Alexandrian *Basileia*. We may imagine reperformance at other symposia as well, as it was customary to begin all symposia with libations to Zeus Soter.

<sup>168</sup> Weber (1993), 81-2, influenced by the observation of Hutchinson (1988), 6-7 that Hellenistic poetry was about more than 'the conduct of scholarly quizzes.' Strootman (2010), 33 has subsequently argued that the erudition of much of Hellenistic poetry suited the competitive atmosphere of court at symposia, as courtiers competed amongst themselves to explain poetic references.

<sup>169</sup> Cameron (1995), 71-103.

we recall, is that the Museum scholars are fighting like birds over food which will only make them plumper and more attractive for Ptolemy to serve for dinner.<sup>170</sup> As successful parody relies on the skillful distortion of reality, Timon's parody suggests that the Museum scholars' works actually were 'served' as entertainment at the royal symposium; it also suggests that Museum scholars were invited to the royal symposium to impress in their learned conversation the other guests at the symposium. Far from sequestered in the Museum, then, Timon offers invaluable evidence that the king's *philoi* and his guests were a crucial audience which Alexandrian poets maintained in the Museum had to serve to keep their own meals coming.

What, then, was the atmosphere at the royal symposium where the king's poets were offered up for supper? Literary and historical sources such as the *Letter of Aristeas*, Josephus, and authors quoted in Athenaeus, coupled with archaeological evidence, reveal that the royal symposium of the Hellenistic age differed significantly from the elite symposia of Archaic and Classical Greece. These were small and intimate gatherings predicated on equality: all seats were relatively equal with the *klinai* arranged along the square or rectangular walls,<sup>171</sup> and symposiasts chose a symposiarch separate from the host to help foster *parrhesia*, or frank speech, in his house.<sup>172</sup>

What we see in the Hellenistic period is a feast or symposium marked by inequality. While Hellenistic kings must have continued to host smaller symposia, our sources most often

---

<sup>170</sup> Cameron (1995), 31-2.

<sup>171</sup> Vössing (2004), 33 with bibliography on the disposition of the *klinai* and its ideological valence.

<sup>172</sup> See Wecowski (2014), 36-7 (on symposiarch v. host), 65-74 (the ideal of equality at Archaic and Classical symposia).

describe grand banquets reaching sizes in the hundreds; the most famous of these may be Ptolemy II's grand pavilion for the Ptolemaia.<sup>173</sup> The massive size of such banquets, influenced by Macedonian and Persian custom,<sup>174</sup> precluded guests from sharing the common conversation and experience typical of the Greek symposium; instead, diners self-segregated into smaller groups, united only by their attention on professional entertainments or ostentatious individuals.<sup>175</sup> Moreover, only the blessed few could sit next to the king, an especial mark of favor, and a highly visible one at that: the various seating arrangements attested in the sources reveal that the king and the *philoi* at his side formed the room's clear focal point.<sup>176</sup> Such

---

<sup>173</sup> The grand pavilion, which held 130 couches in circular arrangement, is described by Callixeinus of Rhodes (Athen. 5.196a-97d). Thus Strootman (2014), 189 and Vössing (2004), 178-81 distinguish between smaller symposia and 'state banquets' (Strootman's term). On the inflated size of royal symposia, see Murray (1996), 21; on the smaller sized banquets, see Cameron (1995), 73-4.

<sup>174</sup> See Murray (1996), 15-20 on the various traditions of commensality influencing the Hellenistic royal symposium.

<sup>175</sup> See Vössing (2004), 158-65 on the professional entertainments and their unifying function.

<sup>176</sup> Jos. *AJ* 12.210 provides the clearest statement of the honor of various seating positions based on their distance from the king. Vössing (2004), 123-9 describes the various seating arrangements; see also the remarks of Strootman (2014), 189 on favor. As evidence that this display of favor was common, expected, and accepted of kings, see the disapproval held by our sources of the behavior of Antiochus IV Epiphanes at a massive banquet in 166, when he escorted guests to their seats and circulated around the party (Polyb. 30.25-6 = Athen. 5.194-5; 10.439; Diod. 30.16).

conspicuous inequality must have structured the smaller symposia as well, for some *philoï* would always sit nearest to the king. Indeed, Konrad Vössing argues persuasively that such ‘egalitarian’ feasts were only an ideological fiction by which the king displayed his superlative, Greek hospitality.<sup>177</sup>

Preferred seating was far from the only favor on offer. The king could and did bestow guests with gifts before, during, and after the symposium. Typical gifts included luxurious clothing, fine sympotic furniture and vessels, and cuts of meat or live animals to take away for feasting and distribution later, a custom seemingly adopted from Persian court ceremonial.<sup>178</sup> Most examples of sympotic gift-giving seem to involve distribution to all guests equally, marking them as members of the distinguished in-group. Predictably, playing on the winning team was not enough for many, and the royal symposium was rife with competition for individual distinction. Courtiers did so in a variety of ways: offering laudatory toasts or libations to the king seems to have been common practice,<sup>179</sup> and witty or talented contributions to the

---

<sup>177</sup> Vössing (2004), 148, 180.

<sup>178</sup> For examples, see Vössing (2004), 174-8 and Strootman (2014), 189-91. Strootman, however, incorrectly identifies the anecdote about Antiochus IV’s unequal distribution of odd gifts (knucklebone dice, figs, coins) as taking place at a symposium.

<sup>179</sup> Athenaeus offers a variety of such anecdotes, denigrating them all as flattery: see 6.261b (Demetrius ignores people flattering him at symposia pouring drinks to him alone as king and the other Diadochs as military and civic leaders), 6.255a (Athenians on Lemnos poured a libation to Seleucus the Savior instead of Zeus the Savior); cf. 6.251c (a flatterer invokes Alexander as a god even while he is getting sick).



table-talk and the evening's entertainment were greeted with spontaneous gifts,<sup>180</sup> the king's smile or laughter,<sup>181</sup> and other displays of his favor.<sup>182</sup>

Josephus' narrative of a symposium hosted by Ptolemy V attended by Hyrcanus (*AJ* 12.210-14), whom we encountered in the first section, offers a glimpse of how such sympotic competition could go.<sup>183</sup> As an outsider, Hyrcanus was assigned to the lowest seat in the symposium, that is, the one farthest from the king (210). The *philoi*, bribed by Hyrcanus' brothers against him, then orchestrated a painful joke against him during dinner to further isolate him: they had their servants pile all the bones they had stripped from the meat they had eaten onto Hyrcanus' plate, and at their encouragement the court jester Tryphon asked Ptolemy if he saw the bones, quipping that just as Hyrcanus had stripped his meat bare, so his father Joseph had plundered Syria (212). Here the *philoi* band together, taking collective action to exclude Hyrcanus from the king's favor. Moreover, they mount their attack not with brute force but with

---

<sup>180</sup> For example, Marc Antony's son rewarded the doctor Philotas for his medical witticism that silenced an overly bold symposiast (also a doctor) with a table full of precious cups (Plut. *Ant.* 28.7-9, discussed by Berrey 2017, 110-11).

<sup>181</sup> Though not strictly occurring at a symposium, Livy's remark that Antiochus IV used to smile indiscriminately at people (41.20.3) suggests how highly valued and controlled such a gesture was and should have been.

<sup>182</sup> Vössing (2004), 134 aptly describes the king as a referee between courtiers.

<sup>183</sup> Josephus' sympotic scene, written as it is centuries after the fact, is valuable not as a description of an actual night's events, but rather for a general picture of the social dynamics at such occasions generally.

the court's elegant language of food and table-talk, which was foreshadowed earlier in the narrative when Hyrcanus' brothers refused to go to court, pleading that they were 'too country' (ἀγροίτερον, 12.197) for the refined atmosphere.

The attack of the *philoi* pleased Ptolemy V, who in laughing signaled his favor to them. Not to deny Hyrcanus a chance to defend himself, Ptolemy turned to him and asked him to explain what the bones were doing on his table (12.213). Here again we see the influence of cultured table-talk: Ptolemy has posed Hyrcanus a riddle of severe consequences should he fail to provide a satisfying solution. Yet he does: Hyrcanus cleverly replied that the *philoi* were dogs who had devoured their portions bones and all, while he had removed the bones from his meat. The king 'marveled' (θαυμάσας) at the clever quality (σοφίην) of his answer and ordered all the men to clap (214). Hyrcanus could have received no greater gift: with their applause, Ptolemy compelled his *philoi* to accept their own defeat and cede victory to Hyrcanus for the night.

Such was the atmosphere of the royal symposium in which Hellenistic poets competed for royal favor with the entire spectrum of courtiers. Bourdieu's theory, discussed above, of the struggle over the legitimate principle of domination between different capitals offers a useful framework for analyzing poets' strategies to distinguish themselves from the commanders, bureaucrats, scientists, and other members of the court society at the symposium. For nowhere was the poet's struggle more urgent and apparent: all of the king's guests were theoretically equal, but the economy of favor was vividly displayed and contested. We must, however, introduce an important caveat to Bourdieu's theory, developed for 1960s France, to make it fully applicable to Greece. As I have said, Bourdieu sharply divides the dominant class into two fractions, a dominated fraction, rich in cultural capital but poor in economic capital, and a dominant fraction, culturally poor but materially wealthy. This does not hold for Alexandrian

court society, especially the king's symposiasts. Unlike Bourdieu's business executives, the king's wealthiest *philoi* had also to be rich in cultural capital. The Macedonian ruling class had long needed to assert its ever-dubious Greek identity, and one of the major ways elites did this was through appropriating and mastering Greek cultural capital. At the royal symposium, the main game which all courtiers had to play was competitive table-talk, whose favorite subjects were cultural products like food, music, art, prose, and not least poetry. Every Ptolemaic courtier knew well his king's massive investments in and mastery of these diverse cultural capitals. Accordingly, all strove in the cups to display their own holdings in cultural capital by reciting verses and making learned contributions to the evening's cultured conversation.

In this light, we may understand the dense, sophisticated allusivity of so much Hellenistic poetry as a deliberate strategy by which poets asserted their own distinction from courtiers who were not professional poets, but yet sought to turn a profit on the poets' work by appropriating it for themselves. The Ptolemies clearly valued such allusive poetry for the conspicuous display it made of their scholars' learning and thus their own cultural riches housed in the Museum. Equally clearly, such learned poetry was difficult for any courtier to discuss meaningfully unless he could explain the recondite allusions that enrich it. Some courtiers surely succeeded in elucidating this poetry, motivated by the symbolic profits they could reap from the king during sympotic conversation. Those who did not succeed in this game, however, had nevertheless to applaud this dense poetry, for it was favored by the king, and there was no easy profit to be made by admitting not to understand or like it. Thus, the complex literary tastes of the Alexandrian

court can be understood as the result of a kind of cultural inflation driven by poets' and courtiers' struggle for distinction at the other's expense.<sup>184</sup>

Poets had additional strategies for vying with courtiers who like them possessed mostly cultural capital, but capital in different fields of culture. Here Berrey's study of Hellenistic science can throw light on poets' practice. Berrey makes the persuasive argument that the innovation, interdisciplinarity, and spectacularity of Hellenistic scientific production is owed to scientists' need to succeed in attracting, and thus entertaining courtiers for their works to be accepted.<sup>185</sup> Herophilus' theory of the pulse, for example, succeeded in part, Berrey suggests, through its marvelous appropriation of Aristoxenus' theory of musical beat to the human body, effectively turning the body into a sympotic instrument in performance.<sup>186</sup> In Bourdieusian terms, Herophilus distinguishes himself at court through the display he makes of the different cultural capitals he has appropriated. Poets sought to distinguish themselves in much the same way, by offering the king poetry bristling with the latest advances across different fields: when

---

<sup>184</sup> I thus disagree with Strootman (2017), 76-84, who claims that the allusivity of Hellenistic poetry should be understood in terms of court entertainment. Such poetry, he claims, flattered courtiers' learnedness and afforded them opportunities to display their erudition before the king as they explained allusions. In other words, poets succeeded by allowing others to distinguish themselves. But if, as Strootman himself argues, poets were *philoï* just like any others, then their own desire for distinction must be taken into account.

<sup>185</sup> Berrey (2017), 7.

<sup>186</sup> Berrey (2017), 191-209.

Callimachus alludes to scientific debate over the nature of epilepsy in Acontius and Cydippe<sup>187</sup> (3.763) and Apollonius incorporates the most recent advances of human anatomy into his depiction of Medea's suffering from love,<sup>188</sup> they are enriching their own cultural capital of with scientific capital, showing themselves to be able contenders with scientists at their own game.

#### IV. Callimachus and the Poetics of Cultural Capital and Exchange at Court

Now that we have examined the competitive dynamics of Hellenistic court society and how cultural and symbolic capital was produced and consumed in Ptolemaic Alexandria, we may turn our attention to Callimachus of Cyrene. As we shall see, what little we know about his life suggests that he was a powerful courtier with not only immense cultural capital, but also a great share of economic capital as well. As such, he had the clout to interrogate, if not also influence, the game of competing capitals at the Ptolemaic court. How, then, do his works reflect and interrogate this social context and its systems of valuing and evaluating forms of capital and their exchanges? This final section lays the final foundations to tackle these questions.

---

<sup>187</sup> *Aet.* fr. 75.12-14 Harder; on Callimachus' engagement with the Hippocratic treatise *On the Sacred Disease* see Lang (2009).

<sup>188</sup> AR 3.763, describing the fine nerves beneath the nape of her neck.

*i. Callimachus as a Poet of the Ptolemaic Court*

We cannot trace the circumstances and details of Callimachus' life with any certainty, but there is no doubt that he was a member of the Ptolemaic court.<sup>189</sup> The self-proclaimed grandson of the Cyrenean general Callimachus (*Ep.* 21 Pf.), he belonged to an old aristocratic family whose ancestor, Battus, was the founder of Cyrene, whom we mentioned in connection with the 'Sicilian cities' at the beginning of the chapter; his family also included several philosophers and philosophical connections.<sup>190</sup> Alan Cameron has persuasively rejected the *Suda* entry's claim that he was a schoolteacher (γραμματικός) in the Eleusis neighborhood of Alexandria as at odds with Tzetzes' claim that he was a youth of the court (νεανίσκος τῆς αὐλῆς), a distinct honor.<sup>191</sup> Even if he was not a royal page, which Cameron accepts, his favor with the Ptolemies and high

---

<sup>189</sup> For a current and balanced overview of sources for and questions about Callimachus' biography, see Stephens (2011), 9-14; Pfeiffer (1949), 2.xcv-xcviii collects the ancient testimonia (T 1-22). It used to be thought that his apparent trips from Alexandria to Cyrene disqualified him as a court poet (see for example Meillier 1979, 23); yet as we have seen, courtiership was a relationship of *philia* rather than a residential position, and courtiers regularly maintained contact with their home *poleis*. On Callimachus' poetry in the context of the Alexandrian court, see especially Weber (2011).

<sup>190</sup> Cameron (1995), 7-9.

<sup>191</sup> Cameron (1995), 3-6. The poet's own work on teachers and students (*Iambus* 5, *Ep.* 48 Pf.) may have influenced this tradition, although Cameron suggests that the source of the *Suda* entry has misunderstood the Hellenistic meaning of γραμματικός as scholar in its contemporary sense as schoolteacher.

social status at court is further suggested by Strabo, who writes that Callimachus and the Librarian Eratosthenes, another Cyrenean, were ‘honored by the Egyptians’ kings’ (τετιμημένοι παρὰ τοῖς Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεῦσιν, 17.3.22). Since Cameron has shown that Strabo’s formulation here can be paralleled as a technical term for Hellenistic courtiers,<sup>192</sup> if any Hellenistic poet not explicitly named a *philos* could claim to be a titled ‘friend,’ it is Callimachus.

These indications of Callimachus’ social status at court corroborate the close relationship he depicts himself as sharing with the Ptolemaic kings and queens. In particular, the fragmentary *Victoria Berenices* (fr. 54-60j Harder), *Coma Berenices* (fr. 110-110f Harder), and an epigram on Berenice II as the fourth Grace (*Ep.* 15 G-P = 51 Pf.) suggest he belonged to an inner circle of courtiers with access to the queen, who was like Callimachus from Cyrene; before Berenice, he wrote a poem describing the deification of Arsinoe, in which her deceased sister Philoteria is already presented as a goddess, suggesting that Callimachus played an active role in shaping and promoting Ptolemaic imperial cult.<sup>193</sup> Callimachus’ portrayal of the Ptolemaic kings is equally familiar: the speaker of the *Hymn to Apollo* closely aligns himself with Apollo and ‘my king’ (26-7), probably Philadelphus; and Callimachus’ blatant allusion in ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ of the *Aetia* (fr. 75.4-9 Harder) to Sotades’ invective against Philadelphus’ and Arsinoe’s

---

<sup>192</sup> See Cameron (1995), 5 with n. 11.

<sup>193</sup> For an overview of Callimachus’ relationship to the Hellenistic queens, see Prioux (2011); for Berenice II in particular, see Clayman (2014a).

incestuous marriage, for which tradition reports Sotades was executed, suggests he an the ability to test boundaries which only someone close to the king could pull off.<sup>194</sup>

Until recently, this was as much as could be said about Callimachus' life at court: he was a Museum scholar and highly placed courtier. Now, however, a recently re-published inscription from the Athenian agora (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 791 = Agora 16.213*) makes a tantalizing addition to what we know of Callimachus' role as a Ptolemaic courtier. The inscription, dated to 248/7, records a decree creating an emergency fund (*epidosis*) for Athens to preserve its grain supply, then lists names of contributors, all of whom gave up to 200 drachmae, a very considerable sum. None of the names are accompanied by a patronymic, but the vast majority are followed by an ethnic or demotic name. Two names stand out, however: above Λύκων φιλόσο(φος) (*Ag. 16.213 col. I line 71*), which must be Lycon, the head of the Peripatos and an internationally renowned philosopher, the name Καλλίμαχος (70) is inscribed, unaccompanied by an ethnic or demotic name. Graham Oliver, following a suggestion of David Lewis, has argued that this Callimachus should be identified with Callimachus the poet, who like the philosopher Lycon was too famous in Athens in the mid-third century to require further identification; further, Oliver suggests plausibly that Callimachus was staying with or otherwise associated with Lycon in 248/7 when the *epidosis* was established.<sup>195</sup>

To be sure, this is an argument from conjecture, but Callimachus' presumed motivations for visiting and aiding Athens are fully in keeping with what we have seen in this chapter of

---

<sup>194</sup> Murray (2008), 20 emphasizes the sympotic quality of Hellenistic poets' relationships to their kings.

<sup>195</sup> Oliver (2002).



Hellenistic kings' uses of their *philoi*, poets included. Oliver suggests that the prominence of Athens in Callimachus' verse would have made him familiar with Athens, and that he would have received great *kleos* from making such a generous donation to the Athenians;<sup>196</sup> but more can be said here about the motivations behind his donation. We considered in the second section how the Athenians honored the poet Philippides in an honorary inscription for interceding on their behalf to Lysimachus, from whom he must have earned gifts and honors at court. Callimachus' donation of his own money to the Athenian's emergency fund would have been similarly useful to Ptolemy II. As a famous poet whose works proclaim his close relationship to the Ptolemaic house, his own large donation to Athens' emergency fund would have redounded to the Ptolemies' credit; and we have seen that the Ptolemies sought to help cities in no way more than in supplying grain, which the emergency fund was meant to do. We need not assume that Ptolemy II sent Callimachus to Athens for this purpose; rather, Callimachus was a courtier who knew what was good for him. His donation to the Athenians earned him *kleos* in their city, allowing him to show off both his wealth and his good use of it as a benefactor; moreover, he also would have earned thanks and gifts from Ptolemy II, whose own name was inextricably connected to Callimachus'.

If, then, Callimachus lived, worked, competed, and succeeded at court, where is the court in his poetry? Some scholars, combing through his work for explicit descriptions of royal symposia or other court events, have come away with empty hands and concluded that

---

<sup>196</sup> Oliver (2002), 7-8.

Callimachus' poetry largely ignores court life and cannot tell us much about it.<sup>197</sup> This approach is too narrow, and more recent scholars, searching rather for traces of court ideology, protocol, and even etiquette, have harvested richly.<sup>198</sup> In this light, it is worth reconsidering the interpretation of Callimachus' famous epigram written for his own tomb:

Βαττιάδεω παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδας εὖ μὲν ἀοιδὴν  
εἰδότος, εὖ δ' οἴνῳ καίρια συγγελάσαι. (*Ep.* 35 Pf = 30 G-P)

You carry your feet past the tomb of Battiades, who knew song well, and who knew well how to join in laughter at the right time with wine.

This epigram is conventionally read as contrasting the poet's serious poetry (ἀοιδὴν) with his lighter pieces meant for sympotic recital (οἴνῳ καίρια συγγελάσαι) so that the poet casts his reader's eye over his entire corpus.<sup>199</sup> This metapoetic reference is certainly attractive when we consider how well it would function as the closural poem of the *Epigrammata*, and so perhaps

---

<sup>197</sup> Kerkhecker (1997); see also Weber (1993), 283-301, which counts as instances of 'court' in Ptolemaic poetry only poems explicitly mentioning members of the court society.

<sup>198</sup> Stephens (2003), now with excellent analyses throughout her (2015) commentary on the *Hymns* (see, for instance, her suggestion at 264 that the *Hymn to Demeter*'s Erysichthon narrative be read as a *Fürstenspiegel*); Petrovic (2017) discusses the reflection of court institutions and etiquette in Theocritus and Callimachus.

<sup>199</sup> This reading begins with Reitzenstein (1893), 87 who saw οἴνῳ καίρια συγγελάσαι as a reference to Callimachus' sympotic poetry: so also Gow-Page (1965), 188 ad loc; Cameron (1995), 86; Gutzwiller (1998), 213. See also Coco (1988), 133 who endorses the epigram as Callimachus' profession of *l'art pour l'art*.

also Callimachus' omnibus collection.<sup>200</sup> But for all its merits, this interpretation glosses over what Callimachus' supposed reference to his lighter, sympotic poetry actually says. The poem's central contrast revolves around his knowledge (εἰδότος, 2) of poetry, on the one hand (ᾠοδὴν, 1), and of well-timed laughter when drinking on the other (οἶνῳ καίρια συγγελάσαι, 2). The epigram is not contrasting two kinds of poetry, then, but knowledge of poetry, whether he is performing or evaluating it, and knowledge of polite sympotic behavior: indeed, an entire world of etiquette lies behind καίρια συγγελάσαι.<sup>201</sup> It is true that this comic timing is one of Callimachus' greatest talents as a poet, and so we may find once again a literary reference in οἶνῳ καίρια συγγελάσαι; but we should take seriously this literal interpretation of the epigram. Here, Callimachus celebrates his life as the greatest symposiast: not only does he know how to perform poetry and judge that of others, but he also knows the social etiquette needed to succeed. We saw that the royal symposium was the crucial context for the exchange of poetry between poet and king; it comes as no surprise, then, that Callimachus' epitaph celebrates his victory in this prime arena of court.

---

<sup>200</sup> So Gutzwiller (1998), 213 building off of Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1924), 1.175 and Gabathuler (1937), 55-6. On how this epigram and its partner epigram for Callimachus' father (21 Pf = 29 G-P) create a pair and orient the reader to their 'Sitz im Buch,' see among other discussions Bing (1995), 126-8 = (2009), 99-102.

<sup>201</sup> See the brief note of Meyer (2005), 171 n. 145

## *ii. Aims and Methodology*

In this dissertation, I will examine how Callimachus treats capital in its various forms and its exchanges and conversions in the context of *philia*/courtiership. We have seen that life at court revolves around exchange: who exchanged what with whom, and how, was public information that each courtier, Callimachus included, lived and died on as favor at court fluctuated; each, moreover, needed his own capital to reap profits of distinction for himself in order to stay ahead of others, especially those whose capital was different from his own. By considering his major works, we shall see that his oeuvre creates an entire universe of courtly exchange, full of positive and negative exempla; should Ptolemy accept his gift, he accepts and legitimizes the politics of exchange as Callimachus creates it, with Callimachus and his king at the center.

My analyses of exchange in Callimachus' poetry will make use of Bourdieu's forms of capital and how they are deployed as 'social weapons' in individuals' struggle for distinction, ideas I have already introduced in this chapter. Here I will say a few words about how I will analyze exchange for the purposes of this dissertation. I define exchange broadly as any traffic of things (material and symbolic), deeds, and services.<sup>202</sup> I further divide exchange into two modes, gift-exchange and commodity-exchange, which I will now describe.

---

<sup>202</sup> Some scholars use the term reciprocity in the broad sense with which I use exchange (for example van Berkel 2012, 40-4); I agree, however, with van Wees (1998), 15-20 that the term reciprocity is best reserved for '*exchange conceptualized as the performance and requital of gratuitous actions*' (20, italics his), whether those valued positively, such as gifts, or negatively, such as violence or insults.

We saw in the first section of this chapter that gift-exchange is at the heart of *philia*: but what constitutes gift-exchange? Modern scholarship on gift-exchange stems from the path-breaking work of anthropologists and sociologists of the early twentieth-century, most influentially Marcel Mauss' *Essai sur le don* (1925, translated into English in 1967). Rather than provide a detailed overview of his and subsequent scholars' work on gift-exchange, I here offer a brief synthesis of its most salient aspects.<sup>203</sup> Gift-exchange is 'embedded'<sup>204</sup> in prior relationships or seeks to create such a relationship: common relationships of this type are friendship (as we have seen), relationships between men and the gods, and between a groom and the bride and her parents. There is a crucial delay in the giving of gifts so that partners remain indebted to each other, thus creating the bond between them. Relationships marked by such delay in exchange tend to replicate long-term social or political systems, like a court society or the cosmos.<sup>205</sup> The objects exchanged in such relationships have, in addition to quantifiable value, a quantitative and inestimable value as well, derived from the identity of the giver and the relationship in which they are given; gifts as well as gift-exchange are embedded.

---

<sup>203</sup> Many of the issues presented here are discussed in van Wees (1998) and van Berkel (2012), 40-8, to both of whom my discussion here is indebted.

<sup>204</sup> The terminology of embeddedness belongs to Polanyi: see for example Polanyi (1968), 54.

<sup>205</sup> van Wees (1998), 25-9 discusses the integrative function of gifts and the obligations they incur. Parry and Bloch (1989), 24 introduce the idea of different 'transactional orders' to which exchanges belong; gift-exchange is correlated with the long-term religious, social, and political orders, whereas commodity-exchange is correlated with the short-term individual order.

Gift-exchange contrasts strongly with market- or commodity-exchange.<sup>206</sup> Whereas gift-exchange is embedded, commodity-exchange is disembedded: the parties stand in no prior relationship and do not seek to create a relationship through the exchange. Each party overtly seeks his own self-interest, and there is either no delay in the exchange of goods or a relatively defined period in which the exchange must take place; such relationships are thus associated with the short-term order of own's self-interest, as the completed exchange dissolves any obligation that one party would have to the other.<sup>207</sup> Unlike gifts, commodities are alienable from the giver and the exchange in which they took place, and their value can be objectively quantified to facilitate exchange for objects of equivalent worth.<sup>208</sup>

In societies which practice gift-exchange, every exchange may be assimilated to the model of gift-exchange: offering hospitality, or giving a court title, can be construed as the giving of a gift. Accordingly, Polanyi and Mauss argued that market- or commodity-exchange marked a later step in an evolutionary societal model and could not coexist with gift-exchange.<sup>209</sup>

---

<sup>206</sup> Gregory (1982) is fundamental for the distinction between gifts and commodities; see also van Berkel (2012), 46-8 on the distinction between gift- and commodity-exchange.

<sup>207</sup> Commodity exchange thus resembles 'balanced reciprocity' as defined by Sahlins (1972), 195: 'the parties confront each other as distinct economic and social interests. The material side of the transaction is at least as critical as the social: there is more or less precise reckoning, as the things given must be covered within some short term.' van Wees (1998), 23-4 makes the valid criticism that Sahlins' balanced reciprocity is best considered market exchange rather than reciprocity.

<sup>208</sup> The distinction between gifts and commodities is summarized by von Reden (1995), 18.

<sup>209</sup> On Polanyi, see von Reden (1995), 2-3

Economic anthropologists have subsequently challenged this view, especially criticizing the conspicuous teleology it seeks to impose.<sup>210</sup> In the fields of Ancient History and Classics, scholars have shown that Greeks determined the character of an exchange or the objects exchanged ideologically.<sup>211</sup> Sitta von Reden demonstrates that in the *Odyssey* people, treasure, and song are viewed as gifts when exchanged between *philoï* but as commodities when exchanged by strangers;<sup>212</sup> Leslie Kurke has famously argued that Pindar assimilates his exchange of victory odes with patrons to various models of aristocratic gift-exchange, objecting to criticism that they are commodities exchanged for a price.<sup>213</sup>

The reason that ideology can drive whether one considers a given exchange as of gifts or commodities is found in the ambiguity inherent in the objects of exchange themselves. Most gifts have ‘latent objective value,’ that is, potential use as economic capital: examples would be fine sympotic ware given by the king at a symposium, or sacrificial animals to the gods. Gifts’ latent value as economic capital permits their commodification, divorcing them from their symbolic value and valuing them only in terms of what they can fetch in exchange with another person outside a *philia* relationship. Commodification arises when parties in an exchange relationship

---

<sup>210</sup> So von Reden (1995), 3.

<sup>211</sup> The importance of ideology is discussed by van Berkel (2012), 47-8.

<sup>212</sup> von Reden (1995), 58-76

<sup>213</sup> Kurke (1991), 85-160.

look overtly to their own self-interest and try to profit from gift-exchange; in other words, they treat gift-exchange as if it were a commodity-exchange.<sup>214</sup>

We can recast these quantitative and qualitative dimensions in the Bourdieusian forms of capital as follows. An expensive ring passed down from generation to generation has value as different forms of capital depending on the context in which it is exchanged. When a mother gives it to her son who gives it to his bride-to-be, the ring functions as a symbolic capital that strengthens the bonds of reciprocity between mother, son, and daughter-in-law, thereby producing social capital. When the son and daughter-in-law receive the gift, they should receive it as an object of inestimable value, linked as it is to the identities of the women who possessed it before, and its rarity as an antique. When the woman wears it out, it has value as a cultural capital, distinguishing its bearer from those whose rings are newer, or smaller; the ring reaps profits of symbolic capital for the wearer and the givers who are able to give such an object. But when after years of marriage the bride divorces the son, keeps the ring, and she sells it to a jeweler for its appraised value to purchase a new piece of jewelry, the ring is commodified, valued only as a form of economic capital – a value it always had and that contributed to the symbolic profits that the ring reaped for her. Another man enters the store soon and purchases the ring, where it may acquire new value once more in the disguised forms of cultural, social, symbolic capital.

---

<sup>214</sup> It should be noted that serving one's self-interest is not antithetical to gift-exchange, as the relationships that gifts solidify are mutually beneficial. Yet friends exchanging gifts should ideally look toward the good of the other, not themselves: on this spirit of exchange, see Sahlins (1972), 193-4 discussing 'generalized reciprocity.'



The distinction between gift- and commodity-exchange, used to such profit by scholars of Archaic Greek poetry, is especially useful for analyzing how a courtier like Callimachus evaluates exchange between gods, kings, *philoï*, and those outside of court circles. Objects of immense value flowed in and out of the Ptolemaic court, and those who befriended the king were richly rewarded: for this reason courtiers were portrayed by those outside the court, like Timon of Phlius, as parasites, retainers of the king seeking only their own interest. Within the court, too, friends competing for the king's favor could accuse another of looking after his own profit rather than the interest of the king. It is this ambiguity of exchange, its potential to be valued differently according to the interest of the observer, that makes it a useful subject to explore Callimachus' interrogation of court culture.

Callimachus' epigram 54 Pf. = 24 G-P offers a neat demonstration not only of how gift-exchange can shade into commodity-exchange, but also of how focusing on Callimachus' portrayal of exchanges might help us to ask larger questions about court society. This epigram records the fulfilment of a vow a man named Aceson made to Asclepius: if the god healed his wife, he promised to make him a dedication. As a dedicatory inscription, such an epigram should seek to make the god feel *charis* in exchange for the worshipper's dedication; future readers of the inscription re-perform the original dedication, thereby perpetuating the relationship between god and worshipper.<sup>215</sup> Moreover, this epigram also belongs to the genre of *iamata*, inscriptions recording the miraculous healing efficacy of the god to inspire belief in the god among future

---

<sup>215</sup> On *charis* and re-performance in inscribed dedicatory epigram see Day (2010), 232-80.

readers.<sup>216</sup> This spirit of gift-exchange, however, is subverted by Callimachus' speaker Aceson, who records his dedication to Asclepius in the following way:

τὸ χρέος ὡς ἀπέχεις, Ἀσκληπιέ, τὸ πρὸ γυναικός  
Δημοδίκης Ἀκέσων ὥφελεν εὐξάμενος,  
γιγνώσκειν· ἦν δ' ἄρα λάθῃ καὶ μιν ἀπαιτῆις,  
φησὶ παρέξεσθαι μαρτυρίην ὁ πίναξ.

Recognize, Asclepius, that you receive the debt in full which Aceson son of Demodicus vowed and incurred on his wife's behalf; but if perhaps you forget and demand it of him a second time (accepting Stadtmüller's conjectured supplement δῖς), this tablet claims it will provide a witness.

Scholars have described the tone of Aceson's epigram as somewhat irreverent;<sup>217</sup> let us be clear on the reasons for this interpretation. There is nothing irreverent in Aceson's idea that, if he did not fulfil his vow, Asclepius would come after him to extract it. Aceson's irreverence lies rather in his motivation for making a dedicatory inscription in the first place. He assumes that Asclepius could, perhaps (ἄρα), forget that he had received Aceson's dedication, and thus commissions the epigram as proof to Asclepius that he fulfilled his vow: φησὶ παρέξεσθαι μαρτυρίην ὁ πίναξ ('the board claims it will provide a witness,' 4).

Let us compare his attitude toward the god and motivation for commissioning an inscription for his dedication to those of a dedicatory inscription recorded among the Epidaurian *iamata* made by a woman whose five-year pregnancy Asclepius finally brought to conclusion:

οὐ μέγε | [θο]ς πίνακος θαυμαστέον, ἀλλὰ τὸ θεῖον, | πένθ' ἔτη ὡς ἐκύησε ἐγ γαστρὶ | Κλεῶ

---

<sup>216</sup> For a brief overview of the *iamata* of Epidaurus see Graf (2015), 506-10. The Epidaurian *iamata* are *IG IV<sup>2</sup>* 1.121-4; the best edition remains Herzog (1931), and now Renburg (2017) offers a new study of incubation sanctuaries.

<sup>217</sup> Hutchinson (1988), 72; Gutzwiller (1998), 192; Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 316.

βάρος, ἔσται | ἐγκατεκοιμάθη καὶ μιν ἔθηκε ὑγιῇ ('The greatness of a tablet is not to be marveled at, but the divine, since for five years Kleo bore the weight of pregnancy in her stomach, until she slept in the temple and gave birth to the child, healthy,' *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1.121.7-9). As this dedicatory inscription was chosen for re-inscription in the prominently displayed *iamata* by the temple priests, we may regard it as a model for what such an inscription was supposed to accomplish. Cleo directs her message toward readers visiting the sanctuary for themselves, whether sick or accompanying the sick. She intends to increase their marvel at and belief in the god's power by having it inscribed on a *pinax*. She notes, moreover, that it is not the size of the *pinax* that should amaze the reader, but the god himself and what he has accomplished.

By contrast, Aceson provides no information about his wife's healing for his readers that might inspire wonder and belief. In fact, the only reader he has this *pinax* made for is Asclepius himself, so that the god will have proof that Aceson discharged his obligation to him if he forgets. Unlike Cleo, who looks to generate belief in the god and thus further dedications and *charis*, Aceson looks to conclude a one-time transaction and doubts the god's memory or honesty. In a phrase, Aceson treats Asclepius as if he were a common doctor who had to be paid for his services rather than a god, and considers his exchange with him as one of commodities rather than gifts. Such is Aceson's irreverence.

To describe Aceson as irreverent, however, is to decide the interpretation of this epigram prematurely; let us take Aceson's concerns seriously for a moment. He acts the way he does because he believes that Asclepius could possibly forget a dedication, or worse, pretend to forget it, as Gutzwiller suggests. In a world of forgetful or swindling gods, dedicatory epigram would obviously assume a different function, namely self-protection. Is there any reason for us to privilege Aceson's view of Asclepius, or to assume it might have resonated with Callimachus'

audience at court? It is perhaps worth noting that Asclepius was not always a god, but lived and died like a mortal man before he was divinized. In this respect, he was comparable to the Ptolemaic kings, who lived and died and yet were celebrated with divine honors; we might, then, read Aceson's view of Asclepius as analogous to his view of his earthly divine king. The poem may also strike a chord with the realia of Ptolemaic administration. Aceson's creation of a paper trail for his dedication suggests the plethora of Ptolemaic papyri that record the traffic of imports, exports, and taxation;<sup>218</sup> moreover, Gutzwiller's cynical reading of the epigram, that Aceson fears Asclepius might only pretend to forget his gift to extract another, recalls the ever-present problem of extortion by imperial agents in Ptolemaic bureaucracy.<sup>219</sup> Aceson, then, may very well have had reasons to suspect the efficacy of Asclepius, a god who yet had a mortal life.

---

<sup>218</sup> Austin (1981), 407-10 conveniently offers a translation with notes of one such papyrus listing goods and their values from the personal archive of Zenon, a Ptolemaic official (*P. Cairo Zen.* 59.012 lines 1-79).

<sup>219</sup> *P. Teb.* 703 (for translation with notes, see Austin 1981, 428-34), a letter from the king's *dioiketes* to a subordinate *oikonomos* (on these positions see Rostovtzeff 1941, 1.269) with instructions for how to perform his job, suggests the prevalence of abuse by Ptolemaic officials. At lines 223-34 the *dioiketes* explicitly tells the *oikonomos* not to commit any extortion, for the local people must believe that the Ptolemies have made their lives better; even more, the letter's conclusion at 272-8 explicitly states that if the *oikonomos* does not extort people or associate with wicked men he may be thought worthy of a promotion. That not doing badly suggests promotion suggests there was a fair amount of, or fear of, abuse. For actual charges of abuse, see for example Wilken (1922), 1.113, a mid-second century letter detailing charges of blackmail

Whose side would a court audience have taken? Would Aceson's critique have found a sympathetic ear among courtiers? Could Ptolemy laugh at his divine analogue's supposed forgetfulness? Or would all have scorned Aceson for his commodification of divine healing and laughed at his misunderstanding of the genre of dedicatory epigram and *iamata*? I would suggest that this epigram and others like it<sup>220</sup> succeed by offering a 'safety valve' of sorts: Aceson's fear of forgetful Asclepius allows the king and his court to explore the tensions of divine kingship, its laughable underbelly, as it were, while also safely voicing this critique through a character who is himself laughable for his poverty of belief.

So, by reading this epigram, which revolves around commodified gift-exchange, from the point of view of the court society gathered at the royal symposium opens up new questions about the function of poetry at court and, just as importantly, about how Callimachus interrogates the structure of the court society, built as it is upon the exchange and conversions of different forms of capital. In the chapters ahead, I will explore two works concerned with kinds of gift-exchange: the *Hymns* (Chapters Two, Three, and Four) and *Aetia* 3-4 (Chapter 5).

---

made against local tax-collectors and other officials with threats of future punishment; translation and notes in Austin (1981), 435-6.

<sup>220</sup> It is noteworthy that the similarly comic epigram 34 Pf = 22 G-P deals with Heracles, another divinized mortal and also the Ptolemies' ancestor. See discussion of Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 317, following the interpretation of Luck (1967), 392-3, that Heracles' brusque manner recalls that of a Ptolemaic official.

## Chapter Two

### Creating the Court: Court Society and Court Poetry in the Hymns to Zeus and Apollo

Of Callimachus' transmitted works, only the collection of *Hymns* remains nearly complete.<sup>1</sup> These six hymns praise a host of divinities across the Mediterranean: from Zeus in Alexandria, to Apollo in Cyrene, Artemis in Ephesus, the nymph and island of Delos, Athena in Argos, and finally Demeter in Alexandria, closing the collection in ring composition.<sup>2</sup> In this chapter I lay the groundwork for examining Callimachus' book of *Hymns* as a valuable cultural capital in the Ptolemaic court society. I argue that Callimachus depicts the Olympian gods he celebrates as the rulers and members of a court society analogous to the Ptolemies' own. In so doing, I argue that his *Hymns* offer a public presentation of his patrons' own court society by analogy to diverse audiences outside the court center. I attend especially to the ways in which Callimachus in the *Hymns* presents his role and position in the court and the exchange of his hymns as a cultural capital. In so doing, I argue that he positions himself as an invaluable image-maker for the Ptolemies worthy of a distinguished position in their company.

I first lay the groundwork for this argument by considering how the *Hymns* function as a textual collection whose aim is to orchestrate a textual performance of once-ephemeral religious celebrations. I then consider how Callimachus aligns and forges an analogy between the Olympian gods and his Ptolemaic kings by considering his *Hymns* in the context of contemporary religious practices by which the Ptolemies were granted divine honors as *synnaoi*

---

<sup>1</sup> On the manuscript tradition of the *Hymns* and their transmission on papyri see Stephens (2015), 38-46.

<sup>2</sup> I discuss evidence for the principles of arrangement of the collection in Section I below.

*theoi*, ‘co-templed divinities’ with existing gods. I then examine the first two hymns of the collection, to Zeus and Apollo. Both hymns celebrate divine kings as rulers of court societies which embrace all mortal occupations. Both courts, moreover, have a markedly Ptolemaic cast. I demonstrate that the court Zeus creates in the first hymn recalls in detail the court established by Ptolemy I Soter; I then show how in the hymn to Apollo, Callimachus construes the god’s epiphany in Cyrene as the coming of Ptolemaic patronage to the city. In both hymns I attend to how Callimachus carves out an exalted position for poets in the Olympian and Alexandrian courts. He does so by portraying his poetry as a gift that persuasively celebrates his kings’ courts, and as we shall see in the hymn to Apollo, he leverages his cultural capital to make it a gift they cannot refuse.

## I. The *Hymns*’ Value as Cultural Capital at Court

### *i. The Hymns as a Textual Collection and the Question of Performance*

The major scholarly question concerning the *Hymns* has been whether they were genuine hymns intended for religious performance or if they were conceived and received as literary texts divorced from religious practice and intent.<sup>3</sup> What, then, is a hymn? It is a distinct form of religious utterance performed by an individual or group that is directed toward a god or gods for the purpose of winning their goodwill.<sup>4</sup> Hymns tend toward a common structure, first invoking,

---

<sup>3</sup> For a brief overview of scholarship on the issue see Petrovic (2016), 164-8.

<sup>4</sup> The scholarship on hymns is vast: for an excellent overview of their structure, function, and performance see Furley and Bremer (2001), 1.1-64.

then praising, and finally offering prayers to the divinity concerned.<sup>5</sup> Poets from the Archaic period onward conceived of hymns as verbal ἀγάλματα, ‘precious gifts’ made of words that were comparable to sacrifices and tangible offerings.<sup>6</sup> By offering such gifts in performance, poets and communities hoped to inspire χάρις, the feeling of ‘reciprocal pleasure and goodwill’ that would motivate the god to answer the speaker’s prayers.<sup>7</sup>

In 1901 Philippe Legrand argued influentially that the so-called ‘mimetic’ hymns – the hymns to Apollo, Athena, and Demeter, whose speakers describe ritual actions unfolding in the

---

<sup>5</sup> For this tripartite division of hymns see Furley and Bremer (2001), 1.50-63 with bibliography.

<sup>6</sup> See especially Pind. fr. 86a Snell/Maehler θύσων διθύραμβον (‘making/about to make a sacrifice of a dithyramb’), an idea picked up by Callimachus fr. 494 Pf. On the comparison of hymns to sacrifice and *agalmata* see Pulleyn (1997), 49; Day (2000), 46-8; Depew (2000); Vamvouri Ruffy (2004), 23; Petrovic (2012), 155-7, 173-6.

<sup>7</sup> The translation of Race (1982), 8; his discussion of hymnic *charis* at 8-10 provides ample evidence for the idea in extant hymns. On *charis* as the reciprocal relationship of goodwill between men and gods see Parker (1998); Day (2010), 232-80 provides an extensive and relevant discussion of *charis* in viewers’ encounters with dedications and dedicatory epigram. For hymnic *charis* see also Bremer (1998), 134-8, discussing hymns as songs of thanksgiving; Furley and Bremer (2001), 1.3-4; Vamvouri Ruffy (2004), 71.



time of narration<sup>8</sup>—could not have been performed.<sup>9</sup> Although Legrand maintained that the remaining hymns to Zeus, Artemis, and Delos were more likely than not performed at festivals,<sup>10</sup> his article spurred subsequent scholarship arguing that the *Hymns* were book poetry written solely for the pleasure of the Alexandrian intelligentsia.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Harder (1992) argues that the standard designation of *Hymns* 2, 5, and 6 as mimetic and *Hymns* 1, 3, and 4 as non-mimetic is problematic, because the mimetic hymns contain diegetic narrative, while the non-mimetic hymns also have mimetic elements. Still, the terminology usefully captures the definition of a mimetic poem given by Albert (1988), 15, namely that such a poem's speaker describes an ongoing action, in our case the performance of a ritual, with which he is concerned; see further Petrovic (2007), 124-5.

<sup>9</sup> Legrand (1901), 291-308.

<sup>10</sup> Legrand (1901), 308-12, arguing that the *Hymn to Zeus* was likely written to be performed at a symposium during the libations for Zeus Soter (cf. *Hymn* 1.1 Ζηνὸς παρὰ σπονδῆϊσιν), the *Hymn to Delos* for a Delian festival, and the *Hymn to Artemis* for a festival at Ephesus.

<sup>11</sup> Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1924), 1.182 stated definitively that the *Hymn to Athena* and to *Demeter* were not performed, and the same for the *Hymn to Apollo* at 2.77; but at 1.181 he claims the *Hymn to Zeus* was recited at a symposium. For denial that some or all of the *Hymns* were performed see e.g. Bornmann (1968), xii-iii; Williams (1978), 2-3. Other scholars maintained that all Callimachus' *Hymns* were meant for reading and/or recital before the Alexandrian court: see for example Mineur (1984), 10-16; Bulloch (1985), 8; Hutchinson (1988), 63; Calame (1993), 54; Haslam (1993), 125; Pretagostini (1993), 254; Furley and Bremer (2001), 1.46. Depew (1993) argues that the *Hymns*' use of mimesis creates the fiction of performance

Yet the tide is changing. Strong arguments have now been made that Callimachus' mimetic hymns share features with contemporary cult hymns and reflect developments in Hellenistic religious festivals; and a new consensus has been reached that all of Callimachus' hymns have at least the potential to have been performed.<sup>12</sup> Scholarship on the *Hymns*, however, still tends to analyze them as 'sophisticated literary texts'<sup>13</sup> for a narrow elite rather than religious texts performed and consumed beyond the Alexandrian court. This literary focus is owed to the strong indications that the *Hymns* form an artistically arranged collection, and that

---

and so reveals their literariness; so too Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 364. Vamvouri Ruffy (2004), 217-20 argues that Callimachus' *Hymns* create a literary space for the hymnic genre.

<sup>12</sup> Petrovic (2007), 114-81 lays out the state of the question regarding the hymns' performance and offers persuasive arguments in favor of their performance at festivals. Fraser (1972), 1.652-66 is a notable exception to the then-prevailing orthodoxy of the *Hymns*' literariness; he maintains that the *Hymns* display genuine religious feeling and so were probably performed. Cameron (1995), 63-7 revives the suggestion of Cahen (1929), 281 and (1940), 34 that the *Hymns* were performed at festivals, but apart from the ritual itself, like Horace's *carmen saeculare*. For recent scholarship endorsing the possibility of the *Hymns*' performance, see Hunter and Fuhrer (2002), 144; Gutzwiller (2007), 70-3; Bulloch (2010), 168 (although at 173 he rejects that the mimetic *Hymns* could have been performed); Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012), 146; Acosta-Hughes and Cusset (2013), 128-31; Stephens (2015), 11-12; Petrovic (2016), 164-8.

<sup>13</sup> Gutzwiller (2007), 70.

Callimachus is likely responsible for their arrangement.<sup>14</sup> Internal references to datable events in the *Hymns* nevertheless point to a window of composition from the 280s to the 250s.<sup>15</sup> I follow Ivana Petrovic in concluding that Callimachus most likely composed the hymns individually for particular occasions, that these hymns then circulated as texts and were also reperformed at symposia and/or festivals, and that Callimachus subsequently collected the hymns as the *Hymns*.<sup>16</sup>

For a poet like Callimachus striving to maintain an honored position in the court society, writing hymns offered a strategic opportunity to accrue valuable signs of distinction. We saw in the previous chapter that poets in the Hellenistic period stood to win enviable marks of distinction from cities whose gods and festivals they adorned with hymns. It seems reasonable to

---

<sup>14</sup> For a useful overview of the arguments in favor of a consciously designed poetic book, see Stephens (2015), 12-14. Early proponents of the idea of a consciously-arranged collection were Haslam (1993), noting principles of arrangement at 115, and Knight (1993). Hunter and Fuhrer (2002), suggest that the poetry-book, in creating a ‘divine hierarchy,’ becomes ‘a kind of *Theogony*,’ and Fantuzzi (2011), 448-53 similarly suggests that the arrangement of the first four *Hymns* ‘exploits’ and ‘validates’ the ‘politics of Olympus’ (borrowing the term of Strauss Clay 1989) in its arrangement; Depew (2004) argues for gender as an organizational principle; Acosta-Hughes and Cusset (2013), 124-8, 131 suggest various editorial principles at work, including geography; Petrovic (2016) argues for the family as a unifying motif.

<sup>15</sup> See Stephens (2015), 16-22 for a clear exposition of the *Hymns*’ likely chronology and points of uncertainty.

<sup>16</sup> Petrovic (2016), 165.

assume that Callimachus would have been eager for this symbolic capital. His patrons certainly would have been hungry for it: the Ptolemies wanted to be known for their preeminence in giving patronage to the best poets, and civic honors, internationally publicized as they were, were a valuable weapon in their battle for cultural supremacy. Moreover, Hellenistic kings also competed amongst themselves in making splendid dedications and sacrifices in the *poleis* they visited in order to portray themselves as benefactors of civic religion.<sup>17</sup> Giving patronage to a prize-winning poet of hymns thus not only showed off their cultural capital, but also their *eusebeia*.

What, though, was the added value in the field of court for Callimachus to circulate these hymns as texts, and to arrange these texts into a poetic book? We may come to an answer, I believe, by considering how the *Hymns* position themselves between text and performance. Acosta-Hughes and Stephens, discussing Callimachus' poetry in general, argue that Callimachus embeds performances into his poetry in order to make his poetry *become* the performance: in their words, his poetry 'constructs itself to transcend a specific moment of performance.'<sup>18</sup> I would like to demonstrate how Callimachus' *Hymns* thematize their transcendence of performance, and thereby suggest the superior value of their textuality, by examining the opening of the hymn to Apollo. As I shall argue, Callimachus engages here with contemporary developments in engineering at court and constructs his hymn as a textual, hymnic automaton which orchestrates Apollo's epiphany. It is this ability of his poetry to transcend and even recreate religious rituals that gives his *Hymns* value as a cultural capital at court: as a literary

---

<sup>17</sup> See Hunter (2003), 179-80 on *Id.* 17.108-9 with further literature.

<sup>18</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012), 147; cf. Stephens (2015), 12.

collection fostered by Ptolemaic patronage, they can stage a textual, Ptolemaic festival for readers across the *oikoumene*.

The first words of the hymn to Apollo, whose speaker appears to be an officiant of the god,<sup>19</sup> describe a seismic commotion that announce Apollo's arrival at his temple:

οἶον ὁ τῷ πόλλωνος ἐσεῖσατο δάφνινος ὄρπηξ,  
οἷα δ' ὅλον τὸ μέλαθρον· ἐκάς ἐκάς ὅστις ἀλιτρός.  
καὶ δὴ πον τὰ θύρετρα καλῶι ποδὶ Φοῖβος ἀράσσει·  
οὐχ ὀράαις; ἐπένευσεν ὁ Δῆλιος ἡδύ τι φοῖνιξ  
ἐξαπίνης, ὃ δὲ κύκνος ἐν ἡέρι καλὸν αἰεῖδει.  
αὐτοὶ νῦν κατοχῆς ἀνακλίνασθε πυλάων,  
αὐταὶ δὲ κληῖδες· ὁ γὰρ θεὸς οὐκέτι μακράν·  
οἱ δὲ νέοι μολπήν τε καὶ ἐς χορὸν ἐντύνασθε. (*Hymn* 2.1-8)

How the laurel branch of Apollo shakes, and the entire temple! Away, away, whoever is wicked! Phoebus, I suppose, is making the doors shake with his fair foot. Don't you see? The Delian palm nods somewhat sweetly all of a sudden, and the swan in the sky is singing beautifully. Open yourselves now, you bolts of the doors; open yourselves, you latches – for the god is no longer far off! Young men, ready yourselves for both song and dance.

Legrand claimed that this description of the god's epiphany proved that the hymn could never have been performed.<sup>20</sup> His objection was that the actions described by the speaker could not have been coordinated in advance so as to coincide with the speaker's description of them: the bird, for example, might not sing at the right moment, and the whole performance would be off.

---

<sup>19</sup> Petrovic (2007), 134-9 discusses the various possibilities proposed for the speaker's role in scholarship; in Petrovic (2011), 282-5 she suggests that, owing to Callimachus' close family ties to the cult of Cyrenean Apollo, Callimachus himself might be the hymn's speaker in the role of Apollo's priest.

<sup>20</sup> Legrand (1901), who makes similar arguments about elements of *mise-en-scène* in the hymns to Athena and Demeter.

Petrovic has now persuasively refuted Legrand's thesis by reconsidering the mimetic hymns in light of Hellenistic religious practice.<sup>21</sup> Sacred regulations concerning festivals and ritual practices became far more exacting in this period about the timing and coordination of different elements of the celebration.<sup>22</sup> Advanced planning was evidently necessary for the complex rituals performed in this period, so there is no good reason to deny that Callimachus' hymns could have been coordinated ahead of time to make their performance a success.

But I would argue further that the mimetic hymns' staging of elaborate rituals adds to their efficacy in performance and value to the festivals' sponsors. When the speaker of the hymn to Apollo points out the marvelous signs of the god's arrival and responds to them in real time, he increases the audience's immersion and awe in the wondrous ritual. For the cities who planned the event, the textual hymn advertises their elaborate festivities for audiences far and wide. In the case of the mimetic hymn to Demeter in Alexandria, the Ptolemies themselves were the beneficiaries of Callimachus' services.

The role and value of Callimachus' performative texts can be explored further by considering one element of Apollo's epiphany in particular: the opening of the temple doors. Sensing Apollo's presence, the speaker commands the doors to unlock themselves: αὐτοὶ νῦν κατοχῆες ἀνακλίνασθε πυλάων, / αὐταὶ δὲ κληῖδες· ὁ γὰρ θεὸς οὐκέτι μακράν ('Open

---

<sup>21</sup> See Petrovic (2007), 114-81 on the relationship of *Hymns* to contemporary religion generally, especially 124-34 (objections to Legrand). More recently Petrovic (2011) examines features of the *Hymn to Apollo* owed to sacred regulations, especially the Cyrenean purity regulations, and shared with inscriptional hymns.

<sup>22</sup> Petrovic (2007), 139-41; see also Chaniotis (1997), 246.

yourselves now, you bolts of the doors; open yourselves, you latches – for the god is no longer far off!,’ 6-7). The conceit of doors opening at the gods’ arrival is an old one. Twice in the *Iliad* the gates of heaven open on their own (αὐτόματα) for Hera as she departs on chariot (*Il.* 5.749-52 = 8.393-6).<sup>23</sup> Moreover, a similar door opening features in the Samian *eiresione* (‘begging-song’), a cult hymn ascribed to Homer and likely pre-Hellenistic, whose speaker relates that ‘the doors are opening themselves’ (αὐταὶ ἀνακλίνεσθε θύραι, *Hom. Ep.* 15.3 Evelyn-White).<sup>24</sup> Despite the antiquity of automated doors, Callimachus’ audiences would have perceived them differently than an Archaic audience would have. In the Hellenistic courts and in Hellenistic religious festivals, automata and mechanical marvels were fully in vogue.<sup>25</sup> Kings gave patronage to engineers who designed such marvels: the Ptolemies, for instance, attracted both Ctesibius in the generation of Callimachus and Philo of Byzantium, Callimachus’ contemporary, to Alexandria. These engineers constructed automata which were enjoyed as entertainment at court and also displayed to the masses in religious festivals. The first known instance of such an automaton dates to 309/8, when Demetrius of Phalerum led the procession of the Athenian Greater Dionysia whose highlight was a giant snail which moved of its own accord while

---

<sup>23</sup> Hephaestus also fashions automata for the gods, most famously the self-moving tripods we hear about when Thetis visits him to ask for a shield for Achilles (*Il.* 18.373-89). For discussion of automated objects attributed to Hephaestus see Faraone (1987).

<sup>24</sup> For discussion of this *eiresione* with respect to Callimachus’ hymn and door magic more broadly see McKay (1967), who at 185-6 argues that it antedates Callimachus.

<sup>25</sup> von Hesberg (1987) offers an overview of developments in automation; see also the brief remarks of Fraser (1972), 1.425-6.

secreting slime into the street (Polyb. 12.13.9-11). Ptolemy II Philadelphus included in his grand *pompē* an automated statue of the nymph Nysa who stood up from her seat, poured a libation of wine, and sat back down (Ath. 5.198f).<sup>26</sup> Clara Bosak-Schroeder has argued that some Hellenistic viewers would have interpreted these automata as working by magic and the gods while others would have seen them as man-made marvels.<sup>27</sup> I would suggest a third mode of reception, one in which these man-made automata were understood as manifestations of the divinity of the king or queen who displayed them. In the *Iliad*, automata made Hephaestus outfitted the Olympian court; now Hellenistic royalty adorned their courts and festivals with them to lay claim to the same divine status.

Returning to Callimachus' hymn to Apollo, it is striking that among the most popular automata attested in the Hellenistic period and beyond were automatic doors. While full-sized, self-opening doors were evidently not developed in the third century BC, small-scale ones appear regularly in mechanical treatises. An automaton described by Callimachus' contemporary Philo of Byzantium has fish pop in and out of doors in a submerged basin.<sup>28</sup> Heron of Alexandria, writing in the first century CE, even describes a model temple whose doors open automatically

---

<sup>26</sup> See Rice (1983), 62-8, who situates the statue of Nysa in the broader context of automatism in the third century.

<sup>27</sup> Bosak-Schroeder (2016), 130-4 similarly articulates a multiplicity of receptions of religious automata that must have coexisted in the Hellenistic period, when had technology could create marvels previously only attributed to the gods' power.

<sup>28</sup> Discussion of this automaton at Drachmann (1948), 72; for Philon and the Arabic transmission of his work, see 41-4.



when a fire is lit on the altar.<sup>29</sup> Although we know little about Heron's sources, it is at least conceivable that a similar idea was developed in Callimachus' age, the heyday of religious automata.<sup>30</sup> I suggest that Callimachus's speaker's command that the doors unlock themselves and open (αὐτοὶ νῦν κατοχῆες ἀνακλίνασθε πυλάων, / αὐταὶ δὲ κληῖδες, 6-7) might have been understood by worshippers gathered at the temple and by other audiences as an indication that the temple doors were mechanically automated. Callimachus would in this way incorporate into his hymn a marvelous feat of religious engineering fully in keeping with contemporary taste.

What was the value for Callimachus in embracing the technological innovations in engineering in his hymn? We have seen that engineers profited in the courts of kings by offering them the cultural capital of automata. I propose that poets positioned themselves agonistically against these scientists by appropriating their cultural capital and highlighting their poetic unique contribution to their patrons' imperial enterprise. The epigrammatist Hedylus, for example, wrote a dedicatory epigram (4 G-P) for a fantastic *rhyton* which the engineer Ctesibius made in the shape of the Egyptian god Bes and dedicated to Arsinoe-Aphrodite in her shrine on Cape Zephyrion. The marvelous feature of the vessel was that it emitted a pleasing whistle (λίγυυ ῥῆχον, 3) when water was poured out of it. Ctesibius hoped to win the Ptolemies' favor by engineering this mechanical wonder for the divinized Arsinoe. What was in it for Hedylus? On the one hand, his epigram profits Ctesibius by celebrating his dedication and thereby earning his good graces; on the other, Hedylus subtly competes with Ctesibius for the Ptolemies' favor. For

---

<sup>29</sup> Heron, *Pneu.* 1.38-9 (text with figures and German translation in Schmidt 1899, 1.175-83).

See discussion of Drachmann (1948), 127-8.

<sup>30</sup> On the question of Heron's sources, see Drachmann (1948), 80-4.

like the engineer's *rhyton*, his epigram emits a 'sweet sound,' that of his verses.<sup>31</sup> Whose music was more valuable to the Ptolemies was a matter only his patrons could decide at court.

Just as Hedylus casts Ctesibius' *rhyton* as a foil to his own epigrammatic art, Callimachus frames the automatic doors of Apollo's temple as a foil for his mimetic hymn. Responding to the speaker's command, the doors open and Apollo's statue appears before the eyes of his pious worshippers. In the meantime, the speaker is preparing a chorus of boys to perform a hymn for the newly-arrived god. Before they begin to sing, the speaker declares, 'And the chorus will not sing of Phoebus for one day only, for the god is abundant in hymns; who would not readily sing of Phoebus?' (οὐδ' ὁ χορὸς τὸν Φοῖβον ἐφ' ἓν μόνον ἡμᾶρ ἀείσει, / ἔστι γὰρ εὐμνός: τίς ἂν οὐ ῥέα Φοῖβον ἀείδοι:, 30-1). On first reading, these words seem to suggest that the boys' song will be a long one, indeed. It comes as a surprise, then, when the hymn comes unexpectedly to a halt less than one hundred verses later! In the hymn's famous concluding passage, Phthonos, 'Envy,' appears and blames the singer for his short hymn; Apollo, however, kicks Phthonos away and states his preference for a hymn that is short and pure.<sup>32</sup> In retrospect it becomes clear that the speaker earlier on meant that the boys' chorus would sing Apollo 'not for one day only' because the hymn would be endlessly reperformed. As Acosta-Hughes and Stephens have explained, the hymn's efficacy as a performance depends, paradoxically, upon its textuality; the chorus' single performance is already embedded within its endless reperformance via the hymn's

---

<sup>31</sup> Sens (2015), in fact, has argued that Hedylus positions himself competitively vis-à-vis Callimachus by appropriating his aesthetics.

<sup>32</sup> I consider the hymn's *sphragis* in detail in the final section of the chapter.

textuality.<sup>33</sup> Building on their argument, I suggest that the automated temple doors function as an analogy for Callimachus' hymn *qua* text. The speaker commands the doors to open, they open and Apollo appears; so too, when the reader of Callimachus' hymn lends his voice to his words, the Cyrenean epiphany starts again: the laurel shakes, the swan sings, and the doors open. Callimachus' textual hymn is his own automaton offered to adorn Apollo's festival. In fact, his is arguably more valuable than the engineers', for his hymn has orchestrated the entire festival as a marvelous, automated performance.

So much for the value of one textual hymn. What was the added value for Callimachus in collecting these six *Hymns* into a single collection? In the rest of this chapter and the two to follow, I will argue that the *Hymns* orchestrate in a single textual performance an epiphany of the Olympian gods which, by analogy, present the splendor of the Ptolemies' court for the world to see.

*ii. Gods or Men? The Analogical Relationship of the Olympians and Ptolemies*

Alongside the question of the *Hymns*' performance, the relationship of the Olympian gods whom Callimachus celebrates to the Ptolemies has long been debated. Many scholars over the years have argued that the gods of the *Hymns* are allegorical figures behind whom lie specific

---

<sup>33</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012), 145-7; see also Stephens (2015), 10-12

Ptolemaic kings and queens.<sup>34</sup> Berenice II, for instance, has been held to be not only Artemis,<sup>35</sup> but also Athena and Demeter.<sup>36</sup> Such interpretations often rest on and reinforce an assumption that the hymns are not what they seem to be, hymns for the gods, but royal encomia in disguise. There is, however, no evidence for this assumption.<sup>37</sup> Some other scholars have clung to the opposite extreme and asserted that the gods bear no relation to the Ptolemies.<sup>38</sup> This position, however, is even more untenable, for as we shall see Callimachus explicitly aligns his kings with the gods at key points.

A middle path has been charted by scholars in the past two decades which might be embraced under the umbrella term ‘analogy’: in light of the Ptolemies’ deification over the course of the third century, scholars have interpreted Callimachus’ representation of the Olympian gods in his *Hymns* as reinforcing, commenting upon, or interrogating Ptolemaic royal

---

<sup>34</sup> Among many examples see the verdict of Couat (1931), 207: ‘For the most part, [the *Hymns*]’ object is to celebrate at a religious festival *and under the guise of a divinity* the greatness of the ruler and the glory of his reign’ (emphasis mine).

<sup>35</sup> e.g. Gercke (1887), 275 identifies Artemis in the *Hymn to Artemis* as Berenice II.

<sup>36</sup> See the recent discussion of Clayman (2014a), 79-89.

<sup>37</sup> The refutation of such allegorical interpretations by Kuiper (1898), 2.139-41 remains sensible and significant. Hand in hand with this allegorical interpretation is the idea that Callimachus himself was a skeptic of traditional religion: for an overview and refutation of this position see Petrovic (2007), 118-20.

<sup>38</sup> See especially the remarks of Williams (1978), 1.

ideology,<sup>39</sup> the gendered dynamics of power,<sup>40</sup> family dynastic politics,<sup>41</sup> and court ceremonial.<sup>42</sup>

A crucial issue in these discussions is the degree to which the Olympian-Ptolemaic analogy holds. Hunter and Fuhrer, for example, have proposed that the *Hymns* blur the line between analogy and equivalence; discussing the hymn to Zeus they claim that ‘Zeus and the good king are, at least potentially, fused together: we are *almost* dealing with one paradigm, rather than two related figures.’<sup>43</sup> In his new monograph Michael Brumbaugh argues that Callimachus uses the Olympians as deliberately open, flexible signifiers which can serve variously as models, equivalents, metaphors, and analogies.<sup>44</sup> Why, we should ask, are the limits of Callimachus’ analogy so hard to define? I believe that we may come to a better understanding of this question, and thus the validity of this approach, by examining how Callimachus aligns the Ptolemies with the gods in the *Hymns* and how the two were aligned in contemporary religion.

Callimachus explicitly aligns the Ptolemies with the gods at three points in the *Hymns*. In the collection’s first hymn to Zeus, Callimachus, after he has praised Zeus’s choice of kings to be his portion of mankind, says that Zeus has distributed wealth to all kings, but not equally. As he then explains,

ἔοικε δὲ τεκμήρασθαι                      85  
ἡμετέρῳι μεδέοντι· περιπρὸ γὰρ εὐρὺν βέβηκεν.  
ἑσπέριος κείνός γε τελεῖ τὰ κεν ἦρι νοήσῃ·

---

<sup>39</sup> Hunter and Fuhrer (2002) and now Brumbaugh (2019).

<sup>40</sup> Depew (2004).

<sup>41</sup> Fantuzzi (2011), Petrovic (2016).

<sup>42</sup> Petrovic (2017).

<sup>43</sup> Hunter and Fuhrer (2002), 169 (emphasis theirs).

<sup>44</sup> Brumbaugh (2019), 2-3.

ἐσπέριος τὰ μέγιστα, τὰ μείονα δ', εὔτε νοήσῃ.  
οἱ δὲ τὰ μὲν πλειῶνι, τὰ δ' οὐχ ἐνί, τῶν δ' ἀπὸ πάμπαν  
αὐτὸς ἄνῃν ἐκόλουσας, ἐνέκλασσας δὲ μενοινήν. (*Hymn* 1.85-90)

One can judge (sc. this) on the basis of our ruler, for he surpasses the rest far and wide. In the evening he finishes the things he thought of in the morning; in the evening he finishes the biggest things, while the smaller ones he finishes when he thinks of them. But other kings finish some things in a year, other things not in one, and of still other things you yourself have prohibited their accomplishment and thwarted their eager desire.

The wealth of 'our ruler' Ptolemy<sup>45</sup> wealth is here explained as the result of his ability to bring his plans to swift completion. Stephens has amply demonstrated that this notion reflects Egyptian kingship ideology,<sup>46</sup> and Callimachus specifically links the king's wealth to his prowess on the battlefield. He employs a Homeric *dis legomenon* περιπρό in line 86 when describing how his king 'surpasses the rest far and wide.' This adverb is used in the *Iliad* of Agamemnon and Patroclus when they are unbeatable in battle, περιπρὸ γὰρ ἔγχεϊ θῦεν ('for he rushed widely with his spear,' *Il.* 11.180, 16.699). By alluding to these passages Callimachus subtly reinforces the ideology of Egypt as Ptolemy I Soter's 'spear-won land' (δορίκτητος χώρα) and the Ptolemaic king as an invincible, spear-wielding warrior.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> Which Ptolemy is meant here, Ptolemy I Soter or his son Philadelphus, is an issue which I discuss in the section on the hymn to Zeus below.

<sup>46</sup> Stephens (2003), 112-13; (2015), 69 on 85-8. As she discusses, there is also a Greek parallel in the *Hom. Hymn Herm.* 17-18 of baby Hermes accomplishing great deeds on his first day of life.

<sup>47</sup> See Barbantani (2007) on the ideology of the king as a warrior. For the use of 'spear-won land' in connection with Ptolemy I's right to rule Egypt see D.S. 18.39.5, 18.43.1 with Thompson (2018), 9-10.

Callimachus does not call Ptolemy a god in this passage; he does, however, assimilate him to one in subtle ways. As McLennan notes, the participle μεδέων ('ruler') used to name 'our ruler' in line 86 is used only of Zeus in Homeric epic and is rarely used of persons.<sup>48</sup> It is an epithet of gods common in inscriptions, including a third- or second-century BC inscribed hexameter hymn from Tenos to Apollo, addressed [Δ]ήλου μεδέων (*IG* XII,5 893.1). Given the regular use of this epithet in the contemporary religious context, it would not have been lost on any in Callimachus' audiences, elite or not, that Ptolemy was being assimilated to a god. And he is a particularly Zeus-like divinity: Stephens has noted that Callimachus' description of 'our king' echoes Zeus' swift maturation at lines 56-9.<sup>49</sup> When in line 90 Callimachus says that 'you yourself' (αὐτός) thwarted other kings' plans, many have noted a poignant ambiguity: who is 'you' here, Ptolemy or Zeus?<sup>50</sup> Callimachus has not equated the two; he has brought them into full alignment.

Callimachus is more explicit about the alignment of 'my king' with the gods in the next hymn of the collection to Apollo. The speaker of the hymn here proclaims:

κακὸν μακάρεσσιν ἐρίζειν.  
 ὃς μάχεται μακάρεσσιν, ἐμῶι βασιλῆϊ μάχοιτο·  
 ὅστις ἐμῶι βασιλῆϊ, καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι μάχοιτο (*Hymn* 2.25-7)

It is a bad thing to challenge the blessed ones: he who fights with the blessed ones would fight with my king; whoever fights with my king would fight Apollo as well.

---

<sup>48</sup> McLennan (1977), 122 ad loc.

<sup>49</sup> Stephens (2003), 108-9.

<sup>50</sup> See discussions of e.g. McLennan (1977), 126 ad loc.; Stephens (2015), 70 ad loc.

The repeated use of the verb μάχομαι suggests that the gods, the king, and Apollo are united in a συμμαχία ('military alliance') such that anyone who would fight with one – in deed, word, or thought –<sup>51</sup> would have the other strike him down. Once again the king's divinity is not stated, but it is strongly suggested, in this case by a play on words that links 'the blessed ones' (μακάρεσσιν, 25, 26) to battle (μάχοιτο, 26, 27).<sup>52</sup> The fact that the speaker's king partakes in this divine warfare thus effectively enlists him in the μακάρες. This point is sharpened when we recall that Callimachus' king's name was Πτολεμαῖος, 'Warlike,' and that military victory was, as I have just mentioned, a central pillar of Hellenistic kingship.

The Ptolemies' divinity is made explicit in the fourth hymn of the collection, the hymn to Delos. From the womb of his belabored mother Leto, Apollo forbids her from giving birth to him on the island of Cos since it is owed to 'another god...the lofty offspring of the Savior Gods' (θεὸς ἄλλος / ...Σαωτήρων ὕπατον γένος, 165-6).<sup>53</sup> Apollo then proclaims that he and the

---

<sup>51</sup> On the relationship of the speaker's commands to ritual *programmata* and purity regulations attested for Cyrene, see Petrovic (2011), 265-74.

<sup>52</sup> This collocation of μάκαρ and μάχομαι is Homeric: see *Il.* 5.819 (Diomedes reports Athena's words not to fight with the blessed ones), 6.141 (Diomedes tells Glaucus he would not fight with the blessed ones). Word play is superabundant in this hymn: see the notes of Williams (1978) and Stephens (2015) throughout.

<sup>53</sup> It is unclear whether at this point Philadelphus had been deified in cult. Callimachus likely composed the hymn within a few years of 275 (see Stephens 2015, 18), while the cult of Philadelphus and Arsinoe II as the *Theoi Adelphoi* was established in the year 271: see *PHib* 199 lines 11-17 with Fraser (1972), 1.216; Pfeiffer (2008), 51-2.



god Ptolemy will be brought together as allies, for ‘a **common struggle** will come to us later’ (ξυνός τις ἐλεύσεται ἄμμιν ἄεθλος / ὕστερον, 171-2), namely war against Gallic mercenaries at Delphi in 279 and in Egypt in 275.<sup>54</sup> He describes this struggle in appropriately allusive language at lines 172-87, concluding the narrative with a description of the booty they will win. In the following lines, the god notes that the shields will be shared between them:

τέων αἱ μὲν ἐμοὶ γέρας, αἱ δ’ ἐπὶ Νείλῳ  
ἐν πυρὶ τοὺς φορέοντας ἀποπνεύσαντας ἰδοῦσαι  
κείσονται βασιλῆος ἀέθλια πολλὰ καμόντος. (*Hymn* 4.185-7)

Of these (sc. shields), some will be my prize of honor; others, after they have seen their bearers expire in flames, will be laid up on the banks of the Nile as the prizes of a king who has performed many labors.

Apollo telescopes the Gallic defeats in Delphi and Egypt so that the shields of the vanquished appear as spoils of one and the same conflict. While we do not know where in Egypt and how they were displayed,<sup>55</sup> the vast ideological potential of these shields is clear enough: they are to serve as a material and conceptual bond between Philadelphus and Apollo. Callimachus, through Apollo’s prophecy, makes each set of shields point to the other: the viewer of Philadelphus’ shields in Egypt is meant to think of Apollo’s in Delphi, and the visitor of Delphi is meant to think of Philadelphus, the ‘other god,’ whose shields are dedicated in Egypt. Callimachus thus uses the Gallic shields to forge an analogy between Apollo and Philadelphus in which each is like and united with the other.

---

<sup>54</sup> Stephens (2015), 208 ad loc. interprets ἄμμιν as more likely referring to Apollo and the Greeks mentioned in the following line, rather than Apollo and Philadelphus. I suggest the latter on the grounds that up to this point Apollo’s speech has been addressed to Philadelphus.

<sup>55</sup> For a survey of scholarly opinions see Mineur (1984), 178-9 ad loc.

The way that Callimachus aligns and analogizes the Ptolemies and Olympians is of a piece with the strategies of representing the Ptolemies' divinities in sanctuaries. In the Hellenistic period, rulers, their courtiers, and cities began to dedicate statues of kings and queens alongside and in visual dialogue with those of existing gods.<sup>56</sup> Callicrates of Samos, for example, the Ptolemaic admiral and priest of the newly-formed cult of his patrons Philadelphus and Arsinoe II as the *Theoi Adelphoi*, dedicated a spectacular statue group of the Sibling Gods to Zeus at Olympia. The massive monument, 20m long, is set up opposite the temples of Zeus and Hera. Atop an 8.93 m tall column on each end of the pedestal stood a statue of Ptolemy and Arsinoe. As Bing has noted in his excellent discussion,<sup>57</sup> the sheer height of the statues creates the impression that one is looking up to gods. The character of these Ptolemaic gods is then left for the viewer to infer from their visual and spatial analogy with Zeus and Hera. According to Hoepfner the Ptolemies' statues faced the Olympians' temples, and the columns upon which their statues stood line up with the end-columns of both Zeus's and Hera's temples.<sup>58</sup> Bing explains that in this way Callicrates' monument fashions Philadelphus and Arsinoe as another pair of Sibling Gods, like the Greek Zeus and Hera, in order 'to make intelligible and to legitimize through Greek precedent' these new gods and their incestuous union.<sup>59</sup>

But this is not all that Callicrates' monument does. At the same time as it suggests the similarity of Philadelphus and Arsinoe to the Olympians, it also makes it possible to read the

---

<sup>56</sup> Préaux (1978), 1.251-2.

<sup>57</sup> Bing (2002/3), 252-5.

<sup>58</sup> Hoepfner (1971), 45-9.

<sup>59</sup> Bing (2002/3), 254.

analogy in the other direction and to imagine Zeus and Hera as similar to the Ptolemaic Sibling Gods. Hoepfner has suggested that the double-column design of Callicrates' monument might purposefully evoke the paired obelisks dedicated by pharaohs. Bing notes that this move would be 'consistent with Kallikrates' attempts to mediate between the new world and the old.'<sup>60</sup> An important way that Callicrates' Egyptianizing monument mediates this cultural gap is by analogizing Zeus and Hera to a pharaonic, Ptolemaic couple. The anchoring process that Callicrates' monument achieves goes both ways.

This re-fashioning of old gods in the form of new is encapsulated in Callimachus' famous epigram on Berenice II, in which she, in the form of her statue, is added to the three Graces:

τέσσαρες αἱ Χάριτες· ποτὶ γὰρ μία ταῖς τρισι τήναις  
 ἄρτι ποτεπλάσθη κῆτι μύροισι νοτεῖ.  
 εὐαίων ἐν πᾶσιν ἀρίζαλος Βερενίκα  
 ὅς ἄτερ οὐδ' αὐταὶ αἱ Χάριτες Χάριτες. (*Ep.* 51 Pf.)

Four are the Graces: for in addition to those three, one was recently fashioned in addition and is still wet with perfumed oils. Happy among all, conspicuous Berenice, without whom not even the Graces themselves are Graces.

With the addition of Berenice, the Graces have been forever changed, and are no longer Graces without her. Callimachus dramatizes the process of addition in the epigram's clever play with numbers and the Graces' name, Χάριτες. The first three words, 'Four are the Graces,' express the paradox. In these three words, the third is 'Graces,' tying their identity to the idea of a triad; yet the epigram's first word is four, signaling the change that they will undergo. Berenice's name caps the third line, thus effecting her inclusion as the newest of the three. Then, in the fourth line, the Graces become four: Callimachus uses the word Χάριτες two more times in the last line so that he has used it three times in the four-line poem; they are three *within* four, tied now to

---

<sup>60</sup> Bing (2002/3), 254.

Berenice. Berenice should be happy, indeed, with this poem, for Callimachus has not so much assimilated her to the Graces, as the Graces to her.

So far we have considered only the placement of the Ptolemies' statues next to those of the gods. Yet one of the main avenues by which the Ptolemies and other Hellenistic kings were granted divine honors was by having their cult statue dedicated within the sanctuary of a god as a σύνναος θεός, 'a co-templed god' who received a share of the worship of the temple's main divinity.<sup>61</sup> In 271 Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II were made *synnaoi theoi* of the divine Alexander the Great.<sup>62</sup> Beginning with Arsinoe II in 271 the Ptolemies regularly had their statues set up in all the temples of Egypt.<sup>63</sup> Stefan Pfeiffer notes that the phenomenon of granting divine honors to the Ptolemies as *synnaoi*, although common practice in connection with Egyptian divinities, apparently played little or no role in honoring the Ptolemies in the temples of Olympian divinities.<sup>64</sup> It is important to note, however, that this was not an isolated Egyptian phenomenon. Greek cities offered other Hellenistic kings the honor of being *synnaos* with a local god: an inscription from Pergamon in the second century, for example, preserves a decree resolving that

---

<sup>61</sup> Nock (1930) remains the fundamental study of this phenomenon; for a focus on the Hellenistic period see Préaux (1978), 1.251-3; and for the Ptolemies in particular, see Pfeiffer (2008), 55-8.

<sup>62</sup> Hölbl (2001), 94-5.

<sup>63</sup> Hölbl (2001), 101 for Arsinoe II's status as *synnaos thea* in Egyptian temples; Nock (1930), 4-9 discusses the evidence for all of the Ptolemies.

<sup>64</sup> Pfeiffer (2008), 58. He does, however, discuss a major exception: the deceased Arsinoe II was co-templed with and shared a priest with Zeus Casios in Pelusion, an important coast city on the extreme western end of the Nile delta: see Pfeiffer (2008), 61.

the *demos* dedicate a statue of Attalus III standing atop a pile of booty in the temple of Asclepius at Elaia so that he might be σύνναος τῷ θεῷ (*I.Perg.* 246).<sup>65</sup> This brings to mind how Callimachus links Philadelphus and Apollo through the spoils of Gallic shields in the hymn to Delos.

The Ptolemies' poets responded to the religious innovation of *synnaoi* in their own poetry. In his *Encomium* of Ptolemy II Philadelphus Theocritus refashions the death of Berenice I, the wife of Ptolemy I Soter, as an act of divine translation:

σέθεν δ' ἔνεκεν Βερενίκα  
εὐειδῆς Ἀχέροντα πολύστονον οὐκ ἐπέρασεν,  
ἀλλὰ μιν ἀρπάξασα, πάροιθ' ἐπὶ νῆα κατελθεῖν  
κυανέαν καὶ στυγνὸν αἰὲ πορθμῆα καμόντων,  
ἐς ναὸν κατέθηκας, ἕως δ' ἀπεδάσσαο τιμᾶς. (*Id.* 17.46-50)

Because of you [Aphrodite] fair Berenice did not cross the Acheron of much wailing, but you snatched her before she descended upon the dark boat and the ferryman forever hateful of the outworn dead, and established her in a temple and gave her a share of your<sup>66</sup> honor.

Scholars have commonly understood this passage to reflect Berenice's status as Aphrodite's *synnaos*,<sup>67</sup> but more emphasis may be put on the crucial role Theocritus plays in the deification. A clever play on words crystallizes Berenice's freedom from death and deification as achieved

---

<sup>65</sup> See Chaniotis (2003), 436.

<sup>66</sup> For the use of ἐός as a second-person pronoun see Hunter (2003), 119-20 ad *Id.* 17.25 (citing Rengakos 1993, 117).

<sup>67</sup> So Hunter (2003), 136-7 ad loc. Gow (1950), 2.335 ad loc. thinks that the passage refers to Berenice either as *synnaos* of Aphrodite or actually identified with the goddess, but it is unclear how Theocritus' description of Aphrodite's partitioning of her *time* would make Berenice actually into Aphrodite.

by becoming Aphrodite's *synnaos*: she did not get on Charon's black boat (νηῶν κατελθεῖν../κυανέαν, 48-9), but Aphrodite set her up in her temple (ναόν κατέθηκας, 50) so that instead of death, she is granted eternal life as co-dweller with Aphrodite. In fact, Theocritus has already prepared us for Berenice's establishment as a cult statue in Aphrodite's temple in how he describes Aphrodite pressing her hand upon Berenice's breast, imbuing it with her divine fragrance: κόλπον ἐς εὐώδη ῥαδινὰς ἐσεμάξατο χεῖρας (*Id.* 17.37). Hunter suggests that the verb εἰσμάσσομαι here may mean that Aphrodite 'wiped' her hands upon Berenice's breast,<sup>68</sup> but the idea of shaping and kneading conveyed by the simplex verb μάσσω (LSJ s.v.) seems relevant when we recall that Berenice is to become a cult statue in Aphrodite's temple. We might also note a passage from *Idyll* 15 in the song of the singer at the Adonia festival hosted by Arsinoe II in the Alexandrian court: Aphrodite made (ἐποίησας, 107) Berenice I immortal by trickling ambrosia onto her breast (ἀμβροσίαν ἐς στῆθος ἀποστάξασα γυναίκας, 108). Cult statues were regularly anointed for festival days, and so Aphrodite's distillation of ambrosia onto Berenice's chest is the original act which worshippers re-perform in ritual. In both *Idyll* 15 and 17, then, Theocritus portrays Aphrodite as making Berenice into her *synnaos*, a statue housed in her shrine and receiving part of her worship.

With images and statues of the Ptolemies being set up next to and even worshipped in connection with the Olympians, these gods had become ready analogies for the Ptolemies in other media. I propose that Callimachus' audiences, familiar as they were with the association and alignment of the Olympians and Ptolemies in cult and public images would have read the Olympians in his *Hymns* similarly as analogies for the Ptolemies.

---

<sup>68</sup> Hunter (2003), 128 ad loc.

This brings us to the topic at hand: Callimachus' fashioning of an Olympian court society as an analogy for that of his patrons. While the topics of divine kingship, queenship, and dynastic politics in the *Hymns* have received ample attention,<sup>69</sup> only recently has the specifically courtly dimension of their power been brought to light. Petrovic has demonstrated that many recognizable features of Ptolemaic court ceremonial and etiquette, including the institutions of bodyguards and royal pages, the restriction of access to the ruler's person, and the politics of favor, are reflected in the *Hymns*. She argues that Callimachus uses the Olympian court to furnish Greek, divine exempla to add legitimacy to the Ptolemies' institution of court ceremonial and practices, many of which were owed to Persian court taken over by Alexander the Great.<sup>70</sup> I seek on the one hand to extend her analysis by examining the *Hymns* as a whole, and on the other to shed further light on how Callimachus positions himself in the courtly hierarchy his *Hymns* elaborate. By tracing how Callimachus represents the exchange of cultural capital within each hymn, I seek to show that he positions himself not as an isolated, bookish poet, but as a culturally powerful representative and image-maker for the Ptolemies who deserves a valued position in their court.

For the rest of the chapter I will examine the *Hymns*' first two hymns to Zeus and Apollo. These hymns open the collection by focusing on a divine king firmly in control of a court society of a markedly Ptolemaic cast. In the hymn to Zeus we see Zeus actually create this court *ab ovo*; then in the hymn to Apollo we see how Callimachus presents the epiphany of the divine court in Cyrene. In the process of delineating the Olympian court society, Callimachus makes a claim on

---

<sup>69</sup> See especially Hunter and Fuhrer (2002); Depew (2004); Stephens (2003), 74-121; Petrovic (2016); Brumbaugh (2019).

<sup>70</sup> Petrovic (2017), 145-6.

an important place for poets and poetry in it alongside commanders, estate holders, doctors, and ambassadors. By the end of the hymn to Apollo, we shall see that he has, in fact, endeavored to make himself unassailable in the social milieu of his king's court: his gift is one which his king must accept and offer royal favor for in return.

### I. *Hymn to Zeus*: Creating the Olympian Court

Callimachus begins his collection of *Hymns* with a song praising Zeus, the king of the gods, 'always great, always lord, router of the Pelagonians, distributor of justice to the children of Ouranos' (ἀεὶ μέγαν, αἰὲν ἄνακτα, / Πηλαγόνων ἐλατῆρα, δικασπόλον Οὐρανίδησι, *Hymn* 1.2-3). The hymn celebrates Zeus's birth, his swift maturation, and ascension to the throne of Mt. Olympus, from where he rules gods and men alike. But Zeus is not the only ruler Callimachus praises; he also describes how of all men Zeus chose kings as his special portion, and he extols the great fortune and power of 'our ruler' (ἡμετέρῳι μεδέοντι, 86). Callimachus does not explicitly state who this ruler is, but he does not need to. We learn from the hymn's first line that the performative setting is a symposium during libations for Zeus: Ζηνὸς ἔοι τί κεν ἄλλο παρὰ σπονδῆσιν αἰεῖδεν / λώϊον ἢ θεὸν αὐτόν...; ('What else could be better to sing of at libations for Zeus than the god himself...?', 1-2).<sup>71</sup> All symposia customarily began with

---

<sup>71</sup> Beginning with the scholia commentators have noted that the syntax of Ζηνός is ambiguous, but it seems best to take it with σπονδῆσιν, as I have translated above, rather than with λώϊον. See Stephens (2015), 57 on 1-7 for discussion of the issues.



libations to Zeus *Soter*;<sup>72</sup> James Clauss, however, has made a compelling argument that Callimachus originally composed this hymn for a royal symposium during the Alexandrian *Basileia* festival when Ptolemy II Philadelphus had ascended to the co-regency with his father, Ptolemy I Soter. The *Basileia* was a Macedonian festival celebrating Zeus *Basileus* ('the King'), and in 285/4 and 284/3 it coincided with the celebration of Philadelphus' accession and birthday.<sup>73</sup> Drawing on Clauss's argument for support scholars commonly identify the king celebrated at the end of the hymn as Philadelphus. It seems to me, however, that Callimachus draws our attention even more so in the hymn to his father Soter. At the time of the hymn's proposed first performance, Soter had ruled Alexandria for decades, where he had created *ab ovo* the court which his son now inherited. The hymn to Zeus begins in primeval Arcadia still devoid of water and agriculture<sup>74</sup> and tells the story of how Zeus ordered the entire cosmos. The obvious analogy for Zeus is thus Soter, and in what follows we shall see several allusions in the hymn point to him, not his son. This impression is all the stronger for the reader of the *Hymns*, for whom the first god suggests the first Ptolemy.

The hymn to Zeus has received a great amount of scholarship considering how Greek and Egyptian ideologies of kingship inflect Callimachus' portrayal of Zeus, and how Callimachus

---

<sup>72</sup> See Athen. 15.692f-93c (first libations to Zeus *Soter*); for a full discussion of the practice see Kidd (1998), 163.

<sup>73</sup> Clauss (1986), 157-60, building upon the suggestion of Richter (1871), 1-4 and the work of Koenen (1977) on the inscriptional evidence for the *Basileia*.

<sup>74</sup> See the detailed discussion of Stephens (2003), 95-102 on the hymn's Arcadian section.

uses Zeus in turn as a model for his Ptolemaic king.<sup>75</sup> In this section I shift the spotlight from Zeus the king to the court that he establishes as a physical and social space on Mt. Olympus. Michael Brumbaugh takes a step in this direction in his recent monograph on kingship in the *Hymns*. In the course of discussing how Zeus's political order is characterized by 'hierarchy and specialization' he suggests that this power structure 'may have felt familiar to those operating within the complex bureaucracy in place to manage the vast Ptolemaic empire.'<sup>76</sup> His invocation of Manning's recent work on the Ptolemaic bureaucracy directs our attention to the operations of power outside of the imperial center.<sup>77</sup> I wish to emphasize instead the specific resonances that

---

<sup>75</sup> For Callimachus' engagement with Hesiod and his construction of Zeus's kingship see Reinsch-Werner (1976), 24-73; Bing (1988), 76-83; Barbantani (2011), 182-9; Fantuzzi (2011), 445-8; Brumbaugh (2019), 53-89. For Callimachus' incorporation of Egyptian ideology of kingship, see Stephens (2003), 102-14 with her discussion of individual lines in (2015) *ad loc.* Cuypers (2004), approaching the hymn from the perspective of contemporary philosophical debates, argues differently that Zeus represents the Stoic principle. Predominantly literary and aesthetic approaches to the hymn are still taken: see recently Kirichenko (2012), who sees Callimachus' engagement with his literary predecessors, including Hesiod, and his rationalization of myth, as rewriting myth according to an 'urbane aesthetic ideal' (200).

<sup>76</sup> Brumbaugh (2019), 64-8; quote from 65.

<sup>77</sup> Manning (2010) takes a bottom-up approach to the Ptolemaic state and argues that the Ptolemaic bureaucracy was connected to but largely independent from the elites in the court center. See, for example, his remarks at 42 that 'we must consider bureaucratic *behavior* as something only loosely connected to actual royal *control*.'

Callimachus' portrayal of Zeus's court would have had for the high-ranking members of the Ptolemies' court who would have made up the audience of the hymn's hypothesized performance at court and an important segment of Callimachus' readership. I demonstrate that Callimachus inflects Zeus's court with Ptolemaic realia to furnish an Olympian 'charter myth' for the court that Soter had established. I then argue that Callimachus positions himself as a valuable member of his king's court society by virtue of his ability to fashion such politically expedient images of Ptolemaic, courtly power.

*i. Setting Up Court: Ptolemaic Olympus*

In the hymn's first movement Callimachus describes Zeus's birth in Arcadia and how from there he was transferred to Crete to be raised there. We enter the story at the point when Zeus takes possession of Mt. Olympus. Callimachus here takes pains to dispel an ancient myth about how Zeus gained Olympus by lot. We shall consider the political relevance of Callimachus' correction of the record below; for now what concern us are several details in these scene that are relevant to Callimachus' fashioning of Olympus as a Hellenistic, and Ptolemaic, court. Callimachus first points our direction to Zeus as an inhabitant of a court when he says that his brothers Hades and Poseidon 'did not begrudge him [Zeus] possessing heaven as his allotted home (οὐρανὸν οὐκ ἐμέγηραν ἔχειν ἐπιδαίσιον οἶκον, 59). In Archaic epic, the gods have Ὀλύμπια δώματ'α, but neither Olympus nor heaven (οὐρανός) are ever called an οἶκος. To my knowledge the idea of heaven as the gods' οἶκος is first attested in the fifth century, when Euripides describes Atlas as holding up heaven which he calls the 'ancient house of the gods' (θεῶν παλαιὸν οἶκον, *Ion* 2). By this time οἶκος had begun to be used metonymically in the case of kings to refer to a 'kingdom,' the royal house; this is especially common in descriptions

of the Persian Great King.<sup>78</sup> οἶκος continued to be used this way in the Hellenistic period, when the idea of the king's 'house' comprised not only the royal residence and property, but also his family, social network, and interests.<sup>79</sup> When in the *Iliad* Poseidon tells how he, Zeus, and Hades cast lots for the three realms of the universe – a story which Callimachus rejects – he refers to these zones as *timai* (*Il.* 15.189). By describing heaven as an *oikos* Callimachus effortlessly naturalizes a monarchical vision of Olympus which would be well received in the house of his patrons, the Ptolemaic kings.

Callimachus caps his refutation of the lottery myth by directing our attention to the heart of Zeus's *oikos*, his throne: οὐ σε θεῶν ἐσσηνα πάλοι θέσαν, ἔργα δὲ χειρῶν, / σὴ τε βίη τό τε κάρτος, ὃ καὶ πέλας εἶσαο δίφρου ('Lots did not make you king-bee of the gods, but the works of your hands, both your force and your might, wherefore you sat them down hard by your throne,' 66-7). What first strikes the reader of this passage is Callimachus' curious appellation of Zeus as ἐσσην, a word I have translated above as 'king' but which properly means 'king bee.'<sup>80</sup> Stephens has offered the satisfying explanation that Callimachus is here appropriating the pharaonic valence of the bee – it was the hieroglyph for the pharaoh as the king of Lower Egypt

---

<sup>78</sup> LSJ s.v. 3; for the connection with the Persian king see for example Thuc. 1.137.

<sup>79</sup> Strootman (2014), 38 discusses both 'palace' and 'kingdom' as translations for *oikos*, citing Polyb. 2.37.7, 2.48.2, and 2.50.9 for the latter.

<sup>80</sup> See McLennan (1977), 103 ad loc. for discussion. He suggests that the apiary valence picks up on the infant Zeus's feeding by bees at line 50.

– to frame Zeus as an Egyptian and specifically Ptolemaic king.<sup>81</sup> But Callimachus also plays on the word's etymology, which is significant for our understanding of the mode of Zeus's kingship. Brumbaugh points out that Callimachus seems to derive ἑσσήν from the verb ἕζομαι ('to sit'), since in the next line he describes Zeus making βίη and κάρτος sit (εἵσαο) by his throne.<sup>82</sup> This etymology anchors Zeus's kingship in his seat, which is fashioned into a symbol of his power; moreover, as ἑσσήν Zeus controls the seating around his throne. The way is paved for a politics of favor expressed through physical proximity to the king at court, as was practiced in the Hellenistic courts. There is still another aspect of the etymology of ἑσσήν relevant to the hymn. The *Etymologicum Magnum* derives the king bee's name 'from sitting within [sc. a hive] (ἀπὸ τοῦ ἕσω ἐνέζεσθαι). In other words, the ruling bee is called so because of the interiority of his rule, its location within an enclosed space. We saw in the first chapter that the Greeks themselves imagined kingship as closely tied up with the idea of walls: Deioces, the first king, established

---

<sup>81</sup> Stephens (2003), 107-8 and also Stephens (2015), 68 ad loc. Brumbaugh (2019), 70-1 is skeptical of the bee's Egyptian valence on the grounds that the bee hieroglyph does not particularly stand out in the inscriptions in which it is found. This is not a decisive criticism, nor does it outweigh the presence of many other Egyptian ideas and motifs in this and other *Hymns*. He argues instead at 71-3 that bee kings were prominent in Greek thinking about kingship and suggests that Callimachus might be refuting the view in particular espoused in Plato's *Statesman*, that a mortal king is outstanding in body and soul from everyone else like king in a bee hive (Plat. *Stat.* 301d4-e2). This is a possible interpretation of the passage, but one that may coexist with the Egyptian explanation.

<sup>82</sup> Brumbaugh (2019), 70.

his rule by building the walls of Ecbatana and staying inside where he could never be seen. Might Callimachus here suggest that Zeus ἐσσήν had already paved the way for these earlier kings? More pertinently, is Zeus ἐσσήν not an attractive model for the Ptolemaic king, ruling from within his *oikos*? If the etymology of ἐσσήν from ἔζομαι invests the king's seat with regal authority, then the etymology from ἔσω ἐνέζεσθαι inaugurates the court as the center of power.

Following the connection of ἐσσήν to seating we should turn our attention to the word Callimachus chooses for Zeus's chair, δίφρος. Scholars customarily translate δίφρος here as 'throne' in order to connect it to Zeus's kingship,<sup>83</sup> but it is worth emphasizing the particular meaning this kind of seat had for Callimachus' audience. A *diphros* is a portable chair with turned legs and lacking a back rest and arm rest. In all three respects it differs from a *thronos*, which has straight legs and back and arm rests.<sup>84</sup> Elsewhere in his poetry Callimachus specifies that the gods are seated on *thronoi*, making the choice of a *diphros* conspicuous here.<sup>85</sup> Moreover, in the passage of the *Theogony* which Callimachus alludes to here Hesiod mentions seats (ἔδραι), not *diphroi*:

τῶν οὐκ ἔστ' ἀπάνευθε Διὸς δόμος, οὐδέ τις ἔδρη,  
οὐδ' ὁδός, ὅππῃ μὴ κείνοις θεὸς ἡγεμονεύει,  
ἀλλ' αἰεὶ παρ Ζηνὶ βαρυκτύπῳ ἐδριόωνται. (*Th.* 386-8)

---

<sup>83</sup> See e.g. McLennan (1977), 104 ad loc. and the translation of Stephens (2015), 56.

<sup>84</sup> On the *diphros* see Richter (1966), 38-46.

<sup>85</sup> In the *Hymn to Delos*, Callimachus describes her throne both as a θρόνος (*h.Delos* 232) and an ἐδέθλιον (228), and in the fragmentary *Iambus* 6 Callimachus refers to the θρόνος (τῷ θρόν[ω] τὸ χρύ[σι]ον, *Ia.* 6.23) in Pheidias' statue of Olympian Zeus, whom he later calls ἐφεδρίδος (37).

Apart from Zeus, these gods [Kratos and Bia] have no home nor any seat nor journey where the god does not lead their way; but they always are seated at the side of loud-thundering Zeus.

Perhaps Hesiod's description of Zeus's itinerant court, with Kratos and Bia perpetually in attendance, inspired Callimachus to bestow the Olympian king with a portable *diphros*. Beyond this consideration, however, I see two compelling motives for Callimachus' choice of interior decoration for Zeus's court, both of them are relevant for the Ptolemies. First, δίφρος commonly designates a chariot-board and by synecdoche a chariot itself. Indeed, Callimachus uses the word two other times in the *Hymns*, in each case referring to a god's chariot: that of Artemis at *Hymn* 3.111 and of Athena at *Hymn* 5.65. A reference to Zeus's 'chariot-board' might evoke his victory in the Gigantomachy, for in artistic representations of the battle he is depicted on chariot.<sup>86</sup> But more importantly for Callimachus' Alexandrian audience would have been a reference to chariot racing, for in the 280s the Ptolemies had begun to assert themselves as the preeminent dynasty in chariot racing. Soter had won a Pythian victory in the race of two colts in 286 (Paus. 10.7.8), and two epigrams from the new Posidippus (AB 78, 88) report Olympic victories of Soter, Philadelphus, and Berenice I, perhaps all in 284.<sup>87</sup> The Ptolemies capitalized on victories in pan-

---

<sup>86</sup> Callimachus seems to allude to the Gigantomachy at the beginning of the hymn when he refers to Zeus as Πηλαγόνων ἐλατήρ ('driver of the Pelagonians,' 2), since the scholia gloss 'Pelagonians' as Giants. For the interpretation of this line see Stephens (2015), 57 on 3, who notes that Strab. 7 fr. 40 calls the Titans 'Pelagonians,' but that Titans and Giants are often confused.

<sup>87</sup> For the suggestion of the date see Bing (2002/3), 253 n. 23 and further discussion by Brumbaugh (2019), 36-7.

Hellenic games as confirmations of their royal status. Callimachus seats Zeus on a *diphros* so that the king of Olympus might prepare the track for his patrons.

Zeus's *diphros* seems also to point in the direction of the Ptolemies' predecessor Alexander the Great. Athenaeus offers a description of Alexander's royal tent (12.539d-f) which he says he owes to the third-century historian Phylarchus and the second-century historian Agatharcides.<sup>88</sup> Amidst a profusion of gold, couches, embroidered fabrics, and two thousand armed men and attendants, we finally catch sight of the king enthroned: κατὰ δὲ μέσῃν τὴν σκηνὴν χρυσοῦς ἐτίθετο δίφρος, ἐφ' οὗ καθήμενος ἐχρημάτιζεν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος τῶν σωματοφυλάκων πανταχόθεν ἐφεστηκότων ('And in the middle of the tent was placed a golden *diphros*, sitting upon which Alexander used to conduct business, his bodyguards stationed around him on all sides,' 12.539e). By sitting upon a *diphros* Alexander – or the Hellenistic historians writing about him – made a powerful statement, for the *diphros* was well-known to Greeks as an element of the Persian king's court ceremonial. The fourth-century historian Dinon describes the Great King's golden *diphros* which was always placed beneath his feet so that he never touched the ground (Ath. 12.514a = *FGrH* 690 F 26). Other mentions of Persian *diphroi* suggest its general connection to *tryphe*.<sup>89</sup> Alexander's use of a *diphros* elevated him above all other men, especially the Great King whom he had conquered and whose footstool he had stolen.

---

<sup>88</sup> On this passage see the discussion of Strootman (2014), 191-2.

<sup>89</sup> Ctesias, Greek physician at the court of Artaxerxes II and author of a *Persika*, mentions a golden *diphros* in the palace (*FGrH* 688 F 13); Demosthenes asserts that all Athenians know of the treasures of the barbarians dedicated on the Acropolis, including a silver-footed *diphros* and scimitar of Mardonius (Dem. 24.129).



Alexander's incorporation of Persian ceremonial was one of his most contentious decisions among his *hetairoi*, for it suggested that he meant to rule them as a Great King rather than as *primus inter pares*. What Callimachus does is to create an Olympian precedent for Ptolemaic court ceremonial which was and could be rejected as Persian. Zeus had a *diphros*, as did his son Alexander. Callimachus thus paves the way for the Ptolemies to retain elements of Persian court ceremonial in their own courts with divine, Greek precedent.

Other traditional trappings of the Olympian court, however, only needed to be emphasized to connect Zeus's court with the Ptolemies'. Such is the case with Zeus's strength and might seated by his δίφρος: σή τε βίη τό τε κάρτος, ὃ καὶ πέλας εἶσαο δίφρου, 67). Brumbaugh describes κάρτος and βία here as 'symbols flanking his throne,'<sup>90</sup> but Callimachus' audiences would have understood them far more vividly. Callimachus plainly alludes to Hesiod's description, considered above, of Kratos and Bia, the children of the goddess Styx, seated by Zeus's side at *Theogony* 388. Hesiod's description of these divinities was memorable enough for the poet of *Prometheus Bound* to bring Kratos and Bia to the stage as the henchman of the despot Zeus.<sup>91</sup> Callimachus' court audience would readily have understood Zeus's κάρτος and βίη as personifications, for their own kings, too, were flanked by bodyguards, the *somatophylakes*. *Somatophylax* is the oldest attested Macedonian court title. These seven men who guarded the king's chambers and, like Hesiod's Kratos and Bia, accompanied him at all times, wherever he

---

<sup>90</sup> Brumbaugh (2019), 61.

<sup>91</sup> In the play Oceanus calls Zeus a τραχὺς μόναρχος ('harsh monarch,' *PV* 324); for Zeus's portrayal as despot see e.g. Griffith (1983), 7.

went.<sup>92</sup> Crucially for the sympotic context of Callimachus' hymn, the *somatophylakes* even attended on the king at royal symposia; in fact they were the only men allowed to bear arms there.<sup>93</sup>

If anyone would have been interested in the station of Kratos and Bia, it would have been Soter himself. His own military and political career under Alexander took off in 330 when Alexander bestowed upon him the honor of being one of his *somatophylakes*, either on account of his bravery (Just. 13.4.10) or his loyalty to the king (Arr. *An.* 3.6.5-6).<sup>94</sup> This position allowed him complete access to Alexander's person and made his further promotion in rank possible; he would have been with good reason to maintain the office's prestige in his own court. In this light a detail from Callimachus' hymn takes on considerable significance. At the start of line 69, σή τε βίη τό τε κάρτος seem to be Zeus's personal, inherent qualities of violence and strength. After the line's main caesura, however, these characteristics appear to be external personifications of these qualities, Kratos and Bia, whom Zeus can physically sit by his throne (ὃ καὶ πέλας εἶσαο δίφρου, 67). This slippage is extremely suggestive when considered in the context of the analogy we have identified between Kratos and Bia and the *somatophylakes*. It is as if these Olympian and Ptolemaic bodyguards are in fact externalized extensions of the king's own body; put another way, the king's strength and coercive force reside not only in him, but also in the bodies of those who guard him.

---

<sup>92</sup> On the *somatophylakes* see Heckel (1986), 288-90; Strootman (2014), 115-17.

<sup>93</sup> Worthington (2016), 48.

<sup>94</sup> On Ptolemy's promotion to *somatophylax* see Worthington (2016), 43-5.

On a more general note, the episode offers an Olympian model for the Ptolemaic politics of favor. In the *Theogony*, Hesiod explains the station of Kratos and Bia at Zeus's side as a great honor (τιμήν, *Th.* 393). While only a select seven men could enjoy this exalted status, the institution clearly set up physical proximity as the quintessential display of favor. Callimachus' audience may also have reflected on how in Hesiod's poem Kratos and Bia won this position. The honor was secured for them by their mother Styx, who was the first to promise Zeus her own and her children's loyalty to him in the lead-up to the war against the Titans (389-403). Styx's pledge of loyalty and her children's rewards would have resonated strongly at the Ptolemaic court, which continued the Macedonian institution of royal pages, in which noble families gave their children to be raised at court as pledges of their loyalty. These parents' pledges could be met with great gifts for their sons: Alexander elevated three pages with whom he grew up—Hephaestion, Leonnatos, and Perdiccas—to the position of *somatophylakes*,<sup>95</sup> and nothing prevents us from assuming that Ptolemy I and II did the same. This aspect of Hesiod's narrative would thus have resonated strongly with Callimachus' audience, to say nothing of Callimachus himself, who may have been a page.

## *ii. The Social Field of Court*

With his *diphros*, bodyguard, and finally the Ptolemaic eagle which I discussed in the first chapter, Zeus has established the physical and symbolic layout of his Olympian οἶκος. He then chooses mortal kings as his special possession, leaving other kinds of men for 'lesser gods'

---

<sup>95</sup> Heckel (1986), 289.

(μακάρεσσιν ὀλίζουσιν, 72). Callimachus' explanation of his choice and its ramifications for the social hierarchy of both Olympus and the courts of mortal kings reward detailed attention:

εἴλεο δ' αἰζηῶν ὃ τι φέρτατον· οὐ σύ γε νηῶν 70  
ἐμπεράμους, οὐκ ἄνδρα σακέσπαλον, οὐ μὲν ἀοιδόν·  
ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν μακάρεσσιν ὀλίζουσιν αὖθι παρῆκας  
ἄλλα μέλειν ἑτέροισι, σὺ δ' ἐξέλεο πτολιάρχους  
αὐτούς, ὧν ὑπὸ χεῖρα γεωμόρος, ὧν ἴδρις αἰχμῆς,  
ὧν ἐρέτης, ὧν πάντα· τί δ' οὐ κρατέοντος ὑπ' ἰσχύν; 75  
αὐτίκα χαλκῆας μὲν ὑδείομεν Ἥφαίστοιο,  
τευχιστὰς δ' Ἄρηος, ἐπακτῆρας δὲ Χιτώνης  
Ἀρτέμιδος, Φοίβου δὲ λύρης εὖ εἰδότας οἴμους·  
ἔκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες, ἔπει Διὸς οὐδὲν ἀνάκτων 80  
θειότερον· τῶι καὶ σφε τεῆν ἐκρίναο λάξιν. (70-81)

Of men, you chose what is best. You indeed did not choose those experienced with ships, not the man who brandishes a shield, nor again the singer. But these other things you left to be the care of the other, lesser gods, and you selected rulers themselves, under whose hand are the worker of the land,<sup>96</sup> the man knowledgeable of the spear, the rower, everything. What is not under the strength of the powerful? For example, we proclaim that smiths are of Hephaestus, warriors of Ares, hunters of Artemis who wears the chiton, of Phoebus those who know well the ways of the lyre, but 'from Zeus are kings,' since nothing is more godlike than Zeus's lords. For this reason you judged them to be your allotted portion.

In this passage Callimachus invites us to consider two court societies side by side, the one Olympian, the other mortal. On Olympus Zeus is firmly in control of the other gods precisely because they are 'lesser' (ὀλίζουσιν, 72) than he in a very physical sense (cf. LSJ s.v. ολίγος). Zeus chose kings because they are what is 'best' (φέρτατον, 70), an adjective which again implies the physical excellence of a warrior (cf. LSJ s.v.). And indeed, just as Zeus rules as the stronger over the weaker, so too the foundation of the king's power is his physical, coercive strength: other mortals are under his hand (ὧν ὑπὸ χεῖρα, 74) in a very physical sense. When Callimachus asks the rhetorical question 'What is not beneath the strength of the powerful?' (τί

<sup>96</sup> Or 'landowner': on the two derivations of γεωμόρος see McLennan (1977), 111 ad loc.

δ' οὐ κρατέοντος ὑπ' ἰσχύν:, 75) he directly links the mortal king to Zeus on the basis of strength, for just as Zeus has set κάρτος by his throne, his king is κρατέων, 'powerful.'

Zeus's mortal kings are like him in strength and coercive power over their subjects; as a result, we may conclude that their court societies are set up similarly. Tracing the principles of 'hierarchy and specialization' in this passage, Brumbaugh has shown that Zeus and his kings occupy analogous positions in their social orders: just as Zeus controls all the lesser gods, each of whom have their own specialization, the kings control every occupational type of man, from farmer to soldier to smith to poet. Brumbaugh suggests that this highly hierarchical and specialized social structure would have felt familiar to audiences 'operating within the complex bureaucracy in place to manage the vast Ptolemaic empire.'<sup>97</sup> Where would this sense of familiarity have been stronger than at the court, where all of these men gathered together in one company? For at court the Ptolemies had 'under their hands' (cf. ὧν ὑπὸ χειρῶν, 74) estate managers and agriculturalists (cf. γεωμόρος, 75), army commanders (cf. ἄνδρα σακέσπαλον, 71, ἱδρις αἰχμῆς, 75, τευχιστῆρες, 78), navy admirals (cf. νηῶν ἐμπεράμους, 70-1, ἐρετής, 76), artisans (cf. χαλκῆες, 77), and of course singers (ᾠδοίς, 71, λύρης εὔειδοτες οἴμους, 79).

Not only, then, is the strong-god Zeus similar to the strong king he chose, but Zeus organizes a court society beneath him analogous to the court society of a Hellenistic king. In fact I believe that a clever play on words in line 73 fashions the lesser gods gathered in Zeus's house as Hellenistic courtiers. When Callimachus says that Zeus left everything but kings for the 'other' (ἐτέροις) lesser gods, his audience might well have heard the name of the Macedonian king's Companions (ἐταῖροι), as in the third century the /αι/ diphthong had begun to merge with

---

<sup>97</sup> Brumbaugh (2019), 65.

/ε/;<sup>98</sup> Callimachus plays with this sound change his famous epigram on the Cyclic poem and the Echo (*Ep.* 28 Pf.).<sup>99</sup> And who would have heard this word-play more easily than Ptolemy I Soter, who had been one of Alexander's *hetairoi*? Once again, we see Callimachus fashioning the Olympian court after his patron's own, bringing the gods down to earth.

It is in this passage, moreover, that Callimachus makes the first claim of the divinity of his king. As Brumbaugh has noted, kings in Zeus's political settlement are 'roughly parallel to the lesser gods' in status, for like the lesser gods they control (lesser) men.<sup>100</sup> I think we may go further and state that, in terms of patronage at least, the kings are higher than these lesser gods: *all* men come under their hand; lesser gods have only one slice of the pie. Callimachus caps this passage with the Hesiodic dictum 'Kings are from Zeus,' and then explains it: 'because nothing is more divine than Zeus's lords' ('ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες,' ἐπεὶ Διὸς οὐδὲν ἀνάκτων / θεϊότερον, 80-1). What would the Ptolemaic kings and their courtiers here in this line other than the poet's elevation of his kings to the highest echelon of Olympian rank?

But Callimachus also has something to say about the status and position of lesser gods on Olympus and lesser men in their divine kings' courts – or rather, it is his silence that speaks loudly. For Callimachus says nothing about the relative ranking of these lesser types at court. Rather than an oversight, I argue that this is to be expected when we consider the social dynamics of court from the last chapter. Only one thing was certain in this milieu: the king was

---

<sup>98</sup> Allen (1968), 75-6.

<sup>99</sup> *Ep.* 28 Pf. (= 2 G.-P.); νάχι and ἔχει must approximately rhyme: see Gow and Page (1965), 2.156-7 ad loc.

<sup>100</sup> Brumbaugh (2019), 68.

greater, and everyone else fought for his favor and thus relative status. Callimachus makes room for this politics of favor by leaving any relative status of lesser gods and lesser men unspecified.

At the same time, Callimachus was no impartial observer of the court, but a member with vested interests. Peter Bing has noted that, in the two lists of men under the control of other gods and kings, singers come last (70-1, 77-9); he suggests that Callimachus was implicitly arguing for his own superior status.<sup>101</sup> Bing, however, argued that poets had retreated from public life, so on this reading Callimachus' claim could only be wishful thinking. But when we return poets to their position within the court, Callimachus' ordered lists take on social significance. With them Callimachus stakes a claim to be the greatest of the lesser mortals in the eyes of king.

### *iii. Lying for Ptolemy: Callimachus' Value at Court*

Why should the Ptolemies take Callimachus' side? What gift did he offer that could compare to the agricultural profits of the γεωμόρος, or the victories of the τευχηστής? Brumbaugh considers the need that Hellenistic kings had for ambassadors and royal decrees to carry their voice beyond the court center and argues that Callimachus positions himself as an authoritative voice for the Ptolemies' ideology of kingship.<sup>102</sup> In light of the previous analyses I would add that Callimachus offers the Ptolemies an Olympian anchor for their Alexandrian court.

---

<sup>101</sup> Bing (1988), 77; see also the observation of Henrichs (1993), 146.

<sup>102</sup> Brumbaugh (2019), 85-6. He reaches this conclusion in the course of his significant discussion of Callimachus' manipulation of Hesiod's portrayal of the relationship of kings and poets: see Brumbaugh (2019), 79-89.

In this context we may now consider the most famous passage of Callimachus' hymn, his rejection of the ancient myth of Zeus's acquisition of Olympus by lot (57-67). In this passage, Callimachus lambasts the 'ancient poets,' Homer foremost among them,<sup>103</sup> for propagating the unbelievable story that the sons of Cronus cast lots for Olympus and the rest of the cosmos. Instead he argues, in Hesiodic vein, that Zeus's strength allowed him to take the heavens for his own. The passage is worth quoting in its entirety:

ἀλλ' ἔτι παιδνὸς ἐὼν ἐφράσσαο πάντα τέλεια·  
τῶι τοι καὶ γνωτοὶ προτερηγενέες περ ἐόντες  
οὐρανὸν οὐκ ἐμέγηραν ἔχειν ἐπιδάισιον οἶκον.  
δηναιοὶ δ' οὐ πάμπαν ἀληθέες ἦσαν ἀοιδοί· 60  
φάντο πάλον Κρονίδησι διάτριχα δώματα νεῖμαι·  
τίς δέ κ' ἐπ' Οὐλύμπωι τε καὶ Ἄϊδι κλῆρον ἐρύσσαι,  
ὅς μάλα μὴ νενίηλος; ἐπ' ἰσαίῃ γὰρ ἔοικε  
πήλασθαι· τὰ δὲ τόσσον ὅσον διὰ πλεῖστον ἔχουσι.  
ψευδοίμην, αἴοντος ἅ κεν πεπίθοιεν ἀκουήν. 65  
οὐ σε θεῶν ἐσσηνα πάλοι θέσαν, ἔργα δὲ χειρῶν,  
σὴ τε βίῃ τό τε κάρτος, ὃ καὶ πέλας εἴσαο δίφρου. (57-67)

But though you were still a boy you devised all things in completion; for which reason, I tell you, even your kin, though they were earlier-born, they did not grudge you possessing heaven as your allotted home. The ancient poets were not entirely truthful: they claim that a lot distributed homes in three divisions to the sons of Cronus. But who, who was not entirely a fool, would draw lots for Olympus and Hades? For it is reasonable to draw lots for equal shares, but these are as far apart as can be. If I should lie, I would tell lies that would persuade a listener's ear. No, lots did not make you king of the gods, but the works of your hands, both your violence and your strength, wherefore you set them by your seat.

Callimachus' claim that 'the ancient poets were not entirely truthful' (60) plainly alludes to Hesiod's encounter with the Muses in the proem of the *Theogony*, where the goddesses tell him

---

<sup>103</sup> *Il.* 15.187-92 tells of the division of the universe between Zeus, Poseidon, and Hades; see also *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 85-7. Differently Pind. *Ol.* 7.54-69 tells of the allotment of the world between all the gods while Helios was absent.



‘We know how to tell many lies similar to true things, but we know how to proclaim true things when we wish (ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα, / ἴδμεν δ’, εὔτ’ ἐθέλωμεν, ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι, Hes. *Th.* 27-8). Silvia Barbantani astutely observes that ‘The power of poetry to convey truth, but also lies that can disguise some elements of truth, is a particularly important issue for a court poet, because it bears on the veracity and value of his statements about the nature of monarchy.’<sup>104</sup> I would like to turn attention, however, to the specific tale with which Callimachus takes issue and its relevance to the court context. In brief, Callimachus rejects the δηναιοὶ ᾠοῖδοί because they have no handle on geopolitics, and further, the court politics of the years in the wake of Alexander’s death demand this old tradition to be rejected. Callimachus thus positions himself as a very valuable man at court indeed: a poet able to bring myth in line with his patrons’ interests.

Callimachus draws his audience’s attention to an apparent contradiction in the myth of the universe’s division by lot: to cast lots implies equality of the things to be allotted, and Olympus and Hades are as far different as can be (63-4). Here Callimachus is exploiting an inconsistency that is already present in the ‘ancient poets’ themselves. In the *Iliad*, Poseidon asserts (*Il.* 15.185-99) that his *time* is commensurate to Zeus’s since he possesses an equal share of the cosmos. Helios makes a similar claim about Hades’s equality to Zeus in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (85-6). As Brumbaugh has shown, however, even in the *Iliad* Zeus’s overweening strength is accepted by his rival Poseidon, so that the equality of brothers

---

<sup>104</sup> Barbantani (2011), 186.

betokened by their equal lots makes way for the strong man of heaven; Callimachus' rejection of the ancient poets is thus only a qualified acceptance, using Homer to chastise Homer.<sup>105</sup>

But this is not, in fact, how Callimachus goes about his argument. Let us consider the relevant passage more closely:

τίς δέ κ' ἐπ' Οὐλύμπῳ τε καὶ Ἄϊδι κλῆρον ἐρύσσει,  
ὃς μάλα μὴ νενίηλος; ἐπ' ἰσαίῃ γὰρ ἔοικε  
πῆλασθαι· τὰ δὲ τόσσον ὅσον διὰ πλεῖστον ἔχουσι. (62-4)

But who, who was not entirely a fool, would draw a lot for Olympus and Hades?  
For it is reasonable to draw lots for equal shares, but these are as far apart as can be.

Logically, Callimachus' case proceeds as follows. First, he rejects the premise that Olympus and Hades are equal; second, he infers from this that no one but utter fools have drawn lots for them, owing to their inequality. We should thus pay close attention to how Callimachus asserts the inequality of Olympus and Hades and to what effect.<sup>106</sup> What we find is a statement of

---

<sup>105</sup> Brumbaugh (2019), 55-60.

<sup>106</sup> Brumbaugh (2019), 61-2 argues differently that Callimachus is not so much concerned with the inequality of the lots but with those drawing them: 'what Kallimachos actually rejects is the conceit of ἰσαία (= ἰσότης) more generally' (78). While Callimachus certainly rejects the idea of Zeus's equality with his brothers, I disagree that this is his point he is making in the clause ἐπ' ἰσαίῃ γὰρ ἔοικε / πῆλασθαι. The most pressing objection is that this idea is directly followed upon by the great distance separating Olympus and Hades, thus suggesting that the 'equality' he is talking about is that of the portions up for allotment. Further, ἐπ' ἰσαίῃ, as McLennan (1977), 101 ad loc. notes, is an expanded version of ἐπ' ἴσῃ, where the adjective agrees with the understood noun μοῖρα (see LSJ s.v. ἴσος 2); thus Callimachus' audience would have by analogy

geopolitics, fashioned from the fabric of Archaic epic, in which physical location and distance are conflated with political power. Hades' 'inequality' is proven by its distance from Olympus: the verb διέχω, used in tmesis in the phrase τὰ δὲ τόσσον ὅσον διὰ πλεῖστον ἔχουσι, refers primarily to separation in space (LSJ s.v. 1, 2.2), from which it is metaphorically extended to difference in quality (LSJ s.v. 2.5). Olympus' superiority is taken for granted, but the reason why is clear from Callimachus' echoes of epic poetry. The correlative τὰ δὲ τόσσον ὅσον διὰ πλεῖστον ἔχουσι strongly recalls descriptions of the distance between Olympus, Hades, and Tartarus in both Homer (*Il.* 8.16) and Hesiod (*Th.* 717-26). In both texts, the vast separation of Olympus and the nether regions is emblematic of Zeus's domination as he is able to hurl his enemies from his superior position to the universe's lowest pits: in the *Theogony*, Hesiod stresses the relative distances separating heaven, the underworld, and Tartarus when recounting Zeus's imprisonment of the rebellious Titans (*Th.* 717-26); in the *Iliad*, Zeus himself recounts the distance to Tartarus (*Il.* 8.16) when he threatens to hurl any of the gods that would disobey him into the depths. Callimachus thus spins this epic connection of Olympus' height and political power into a logic of location, location, location: the farther one is from Hades, the farther one is from the physical and political pinnacle of the world.

---

understood ἐπ' ἰσαίαι [μοίραι], referring to the equality of shares allotted. It is worth mentioning also that the attested uses of ἰσαῖος, rare though they are, clearly refer to portions to be allotted: see *I.Milet* I.3.133 (the so-called 'Molpoi decree,' inscription ca. 200 BC, regulations first written down ca. 540 or 525 BC) line 10 τούτων προλαγχάνει τὰ ἰσῆα ὁ νέος (for the meaning 'equivalent share' here, see Herda 2006, 67); Philost. *Iun. Imagines* 3 (μοίρας...τῆς ἰσαίας, of a share of meat).

Callimachus makes this geopolitical argument with an *eikos* argument, a well-known technique of rhetoric which engages the judgement of the audience by bidding them to consider what they would expect to be the case in a given scenario.<sup>107</sup> For the Alexandrian court gathered at symposium in the presence of Soter and Philadelphus, one historical event would be foremost in men's minds as a comparandum for the gods' division of the universe. This was the division of Alexander's empire in the 'Babylonian Settlement' among his *hetairoi* after the king's death in which Ptolemy obtained possession of Egypt. Egypt was far and away the choicest slice of Alexander's spear-won lands. Easily defensible, accessible by sea, fabulously fertile, minerally rich, populous, possessing a highly developed infrastructure;<sup>108</sup> for all these reasons armies had fought for it throughout the fourth century.<sup>109</sup>

In hindsight, it seems inevitable that different accounts proliferated about how Ptolemy rose from one of seven *somatophylakes* ('bodyguards,' more on which below) to satrap of Egypt. This was a big win for Ptolemy: every account of the Settlement mentions Egypt's assignment first. According to Arrian, Diodorus, and Curtius Perdiccas, acclaimed as *chiliarch*, distributed the satrapies, though any details about the deliberations and bargaining that must have transpired are now lost.<sup>110</sup> Not all remembered the events in the same way, however. Pausanias reports that

---

<sup>107</sup> The bibliography on *eikos* arguments is immense: for a recent discussion emphasizing their social dimension, see Hoffman (2008).

<sup>108</sup> On Egypt's primacy among Alexander's conquered territories see Worthington (2016), 83-5.

<sup>109</sup> See the recent study of McKechnie (2018).

<sup>110</sup> Arr. *FGrH* 156 F 1.8; Diod. 18.3.1; Curt. 10.10.1.

Ptolemy played a leading role in carving up the empire;<sup>111</sup> more intriguingly, Justin reports that Perdiccas assigned the different satrapies by lot, with Ptolemy chancing to receive the first share (*prima Ptolemaeo Aegyptus et Africae Arabiaeque pars sorte uenit*, 13.4.10).

While we cannot be sure of the provenance or antiquity of these traditions, it is reasonable to suspect that competing versions of what transpired at Babylon developed in the competing courts of the Diadochs. Jean Carrière has argued, in fact, that Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus* took part in the war of fake news: the poet's extensive, emphatic denial of lots drawn for Olympus and Hades makes most sense as an indirect rebuttal of the narrative that Ptolemy received Egypt not by prowess, but by his strength.<sup>112</sup> In my opinion, further evidence strengthens Carrière's thesis. He suggests that Zeus's older brothers' ceding of Olympus to Zeus may reflect Ptolemy's gain of Egypt over the hands of 'old guard' Macedonians like Antipater or Perdiccas with more claim to the greatest portion.<sup>113</sup> Many prefer only to see here an allusion to Ptolemy II's ascension to the co-regency over his older siblings, the rivalry between Ptolemy and Perdiccas is well worth considering. In response to Ptolemy's blatant maneuvering for greater power and legitimacy in the year following Babylon—executing Cleomenes, Perdiccas' right-hand man in Egypt; intervening in Cyprus and Cyrene; stealing the corpse of Alexander<sup>114</sup>—Perdiccas launched an attack against Egypt. Ptolemy successfully rebuffed him, and Perdiccas met his end at the hands of his own disaffected soldiers. The next year, the new regent Antipater,

---

<sup>111</sup> Paus. 1.6.2.

<sup>112</sup> Carrière (1969), 88-90.

<sup>113</sup> Carrière (1969), 89.

<sup>114</sup> For an overview of these events see Worthington (2016), 90-5.

by far the oldest of the Macedonian leadership, arranged a new settlement at Triparadeisus.

Diodorus' account of Antipater's treatment of Ptolemy is revealing:

Πτολεμαίωι μὲν τὴν προϋπάρχουσαν προσώρισεν: ἀδύνατον γὰρ ἦν  
τοῦτον μεταθεῖναι διὰ τὸ δοκεῖν τὴν Αἴγυπτον διὰ τῆς ἰδίας ἀνδρείας ἔχειν  
οἶονεῖ δορίκτητον (Diod. 18.39.5)

To Ptolemy he designated the portion he had before; for it was impossible to transpose him on account of the fact that he seemed to possess Egypt by his own manliness as if it were spear-won land.

Perdiccas' bid for Egypt and Ptolemy's defeat of his army sowed the seeds for new narratives of Ptolemy's claim on Egypt. No longer was the land merely assigned to him: he had fought for and won it. As Callimachus would say of Zeus, 'No, lots did not make you king of the gods, but the deeds of your hands, both your violence and your strength' (οὐ σε θεῶν ἐσσηνα πάλαι θέσαν, ἔργα δὲ χειρῶν, / σὴ τε βίη τό τε κάρτος, 66-7). Ptolemy and Zeus, then, share more in common than not getting the best territory by lot: both laid claim to it by force, and both prevailed over those with a greater claim to it by virtue of seniority.

Given these many overlaps between Olympian and Ptolemaic history, it seems almost certain that Callimachus' audience of kings and court would have interpreted his militant revision of Olympian politics in light of Ptolemy's own contentious rise to power. After all, no one was more invested in the issue than Soter himself. Not only was he king, but he was also an historian, whose necessarily tendentious history of Alexander seems to have taken shots at Perdiccas where possible.<sup>115</sup> Callimachus, then, used the opportunity to hymn Zeus at Soter's and his son's symposium for the Basileia to spin a political profit, intervening by innuendo in the

---

<sup>115</sup> The strongest case for Ptolemy's bias against Perdiccas is made by Errington (1969); but see the more cautionary approach of Roisman (1984).

propaganda war over the origin of Ptolemy's dynasty. His refutation of the universe's allotment by chance as impossible for anyone but fools to believe years, it seems, to be read as criticism, so pleasing to Ptolemaic ears, of those historians, poets, and any other tellers of tales who would propagate or believe a story of Ptolemy's chance receipt of Egypt. Callimachus puts himself at the service of court ideology all but explicitly when he declares *ψευδοίμην, αἴοντος ἃ κεν πεπίθοιεν ἀκουήν* ('I would tell lies that should persuade the listener's ear,' 65). Not only does this claim indirectly denigrate Ptolemy's critics as liars, and bad ones, but it also suggests that, though he is not lying now, he would have no trouble telling persuasive lies were there need for them.<sup>116</sup> Like Hesiod's Muses, Callimachus offers the greatest gift of all, lies that sound like the truth.

By 'all but' intervening in recent history, Callimachus does something more. His revised and authoritative version of Zeus's, not Ptolemy's, ascent to power derives its authority from its accordance with the authorized version of Ptolemaic history. In other words, Callimachus writes Ptolemaic history into Olympian history so that the politics of Olympus can serve as fitting exempla and justifications for the Ptolemies. The force of analogy can always go both ways: Zeus's Olympus and Ptolemy's Alexandria are mutually reinforcing models of power. In this way Callimachus as a poet of hymns can do more than an historian can; by shaping gods and thus belief about gods, he can shape belief about Ptolemies.

---

<sup>116</sup> Fantuzzi (2011), 447 notes that Callimachus 'does not directly include ἀληθέα among his own tasks...'

### III. *Hymn to Apollo*: Royal Patronage of Cities and the Valuation of Cultural Capital

After creating the Olympian court in the hymn to Zeus and focusing on the Ptolemaic court in Alexandria, Callimachus moves to Cyrene, where his hymn to Apollo is performed outside of the god's temple during the annual festival of the Carneia. Out of all Callimachus' hymns, Apollo's has been the one most entrenched in the idea of *l'art pour l'art*, since the hymn ends with a famous *sphragis* in which Apollo valorizes the poetic principles which the hymn exemplifies, brevity and purity. While most scholars today would reject Williams' verdict that political and religious interpretations of the hymn are irrelevant,<sup>117</sup> nevertheless metapoetic approaches are still dominant; one still encounters the view, for example, that Apollo represents poet himself.<sup>118</sup>

In this section I examine the hymn to Apollo in terms of patronage and the exchange and valuation of cultural capital. I first demonstrate that the attributes of Apollo and the perks of his epiphany for Cyrene are overwhelmingly the same as those claimed by the Ptolemies themselves. By so aligning Apollo's patronage with that of the Ptolemies I argue that Callimachus makes his hymn promote increased Ptolemaic involvement in Cyrene in the 240s. Callimachus thus carries out the political role he sets out for himself in the hymn to Zeus of presenting the Ptolemies and their court to the world outside Alexandria. I then turn to the hymn's concluding *sphragis* in which Phthonos ('Envy') whispers criticism of the poet's hymn in Apollo's ear, only to be

---

<sup>117</sup> See Williams (1978), 3

<sup>118</sup> Henrichs (1993), 147; Hunter and Fuhrer (2002), 153; Depew (2004), 121; Barbantani (2011), 192-3.



kicked away by the god. I suggest that this scene of the poet's exchange of his hymn with the god presents an analogy for the exchange of Callimachus' verses at court in the presence of rival courtiers analogous to Phthonos. I argue that Callimachus leverages this scene of his hymn's exchange with Apollo to compel Ptolemy to follow his divine analogy's taste, exalting Callimachus and the value of his poetry and excluding envious courtiers from his company.

*i. Apollo's Ptolemaic Patronage*

The hymn is set at the Carneia festival in Cyrene, and we, the audience members, are outside Apollo's temple anxiously awaiting the epiphany of the god. The speaker who directs the ritual has banished the impure from our company (ἐκὰς ἐκὰς ὅστις ἀλιτρός, 2) and reminded us that those who see the god are great, while those who do not are poor (ὅς μιν ἴδῃ, μέγας οὔτος, ὅς οὐκ ἴδε, λιτὸς ἐκεῖνος, 10).<sup>119</sup> It soon becomes clear that an important aspect of our purity, and thus ability to see the god, is political purity: 'He who fights with the blessed ones would fight with my king; whoever fights with my king would fight also with Apollo' (ὅς μάχεται μακάρεσσιν, ἐμῶι βασιλῇι μάχοιτο· / ὅστις ἐμῶι βασιλῇι, καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι μάχοιτο, 25-7). Who, though, is this king? There three contenders: Ptolemy II Philadelphus, who would have been king of Cyrene until 275; Magas of Cyrene, who would have been king of Cyrene from 275 to his death ca. 250; and Ptolemy III Euergetes, king beginning in 246 upon his marriage to Berenice II, the daughter of Magas and princess of Cyrene. The scholia identify the king in line

---

<sup>119</sup> On these verses' relation to purity regulations, especially that of Cyrene, see Petrovic (2011), 265-73.

26 as Euergetes.<sup>120</sup> In support, Fraser has argued that the hymn's celebration of Apollo's marriage to the lion-wrestling nymph Cyrene at lines 90-5 alludes to his marriage to Berenice, and so dates the hymn to 246.<sup>121</sup> Fraser's argument is supported by the fact that in the *Victoria Berenices* Callimachus clearly fashions Berenice after Cyrene, as I will demonstrate in Chapter Five. Cameron, however, objects that if the hymn dates to 246, we should expect a focus on Berenice or the royal wedding. This is not, in my opinion, a cogent argument. Callimachus is not composing a hymn for Apollo and Cyrene, but for Apollo; a focus on the king makes sense. On the other hand, Cameron's argument – that the king is Magas and the hymn was composed in the 270s<sup>122</sup> – requires us to turn a blind eye to the emphasis in the hymn on Apollo's bride Cyrene. Stephens suggests as a compromise that the hymn might belong to the 250s when Magas was king, but Berenice had been betrothed to Euergetes; in this way, the hymn looks forward to their marriage and Cyrene's political return to Alexandria.

On the basis of the available evidence I accept a date of composition either in the 250s or from 246 on after the royal wedding. In each case, Apollo's marriage to Cyrene sets a divine precedent for Euergetes' marriage to Berenice and thus Ptolemaic control over Cyrene. In this

---

<sup>120</sup> The scholia, however, then describe Euergetes as a 'lover of literature' (φιλόλογον), an attribute which scholars have pointed out better suits Philadelphus. Cameron (1995), 408 suggests that the entire note is 'inference rather than information,' but if the scholiast inferred that the king was honored because he loved literature, why would he have inferred Euergetes rather than Philadelphus?

<sup>121</sup> Fraser (1972), 1.652, following Ehrlich (1894), 63-5.

<sup>122</sup> Cameron (1995), 407-9, following Laronde (1987), 362.

section, therefore, I will consider the ways in which Callimachus' celebration of Apollo creates a favorable reception of the Ptolemaic king in Cyrene.

After the speaker has declared that the chorus of boys will sing Apollo 'not for one day only' (30), the boys themselves seem to begin their song. Apollo's cult statue has by this time become visible to us,<sup>123</sup> and the first thing that the boys hymn is the god's wondrous appearance of dazzling gold:

χρύσεα τῶπόλλωνι τό τ' ἐνδυτὸν ἢ τ' ἐπιπορπίς  
ἢ τε λύρη τό τ' ἄεμμα τὸ Λύκτιον ἢ τε φαρέτρη,  
χρύσεα καὶ τὰ πέδιλα· πολύχρυσος γὰρ Ἀπόλλων  
καὶ πουλυκτέανος· Πυθῶνί κε τεκμήραιο. (32-5)

Golden are Apollo's robe and brooch and lyre and Lyctian bow and quiver, golden also are his sandals. For Apollo is rich in gold and rich in possessions: you would judge by Delphi.<sup>124</sup>

The brilliance of gold was a common feature of divine epiphanies since the *Iliad*, and the wealth of Delphi's treasuries was already famous in Homer.<sup>125</sup> In the Hellenistic period, however, gold had become highly politicized, and the Ptolemies rapaciously appropriated it as their special metal. One need only skim Callixenus of Rhodes' description of Philadelphus' *pompe* to

---

<sup>123</sup> On the role of statues in epiphany and Hellenistic religious practice, see Petrovic (2007), 170-7; Platt (2011); Hunter (2011), 251-60; Platt (2015).

<sup>124</sup> Stephens (2015), 74 points out that Apollo's attributes match those of a Roman copy of a Hellenistic statue of Apollo from his sanctuary in Cyrene; we thus have another argument in favor of the hymn's place in contemporary religion.

<sup>125</sup> On the gods' connection to gold see Williams (1978), 39 on 32, citing *Il.* 8.41-4 = *Il.* 13.22-5 in epiphanies of Zeus and Poseidon; for Delphi's wealth, see *Il.* 9.404-5 and Williams (1978), 41 on 35.

appreciate the massive resources that the Ptolemies poured into the display of gold. The deserts south of Egypt were famously rich in the metal. Recent excavations in the district of Samut reveal that expeditions for gold were taking place already in the early part of Ptolemy I's rule.<sup>126</sup> By 275 Ptolemy II had secured control of the gold mines in the Wadi Allaqi mountains.<sup>127</sup> Philadelphus made a political point of his extraction of gold from the desert in his grand procession: Ethiopian men carried as tribute 60 mixing bowls full of gold coins, silver coins, and gold dust (Ath. 5.201a), sending the message to the world that the earth now bore its treasures for Ptolemy. To judge from archaeological finds of fine golden ware in Egypt and the many wondrous objects attested by Callixeinus, Alexandria had a thriving metalwork industry to transform the unworked metal into marvelous finished products.<sup>128</sup>

Gold was the medium of divinity, and with gold the Ptolemies suggested their own divine status. Many statues of the gods in Philadelphus' *pompe*, for example, are adorned with golden objects for their attributes: for instance, a monumental statue of Dionysus wore a gold garland fashioned to look like ivy and grape, carried a thyrsus made of gold, and even wore shoes of gold (Ath. 5.200d); note that in Callimachus' hymn, too, Apollo wears golden sandals (χρύσεα καὶ τὰ πέδιλα, *Hymn* 2.34). As Philadelphus' procession draws to its end, the gods all of a sudden

---

<sup>126</sup> Redon (2018); Faucher (2018), 2.

<sup>127</sup> Agatharchides fr. 20; Diod. 1.37.5; 3.12. See discussion of Hölbl (2001), 55.

<sup>128</sup> Though old, the discussions of Alexandrian metalwork of Rostovtzeff (1941), 1.374-6 and Fraser (1972), 1.136-7 are still useful.

begin to appear accompanied by statues of Alexander and the Ptolemies, likewise in gold.<sup>129</sup> The gold makes its point eloquently: all so displayed are gods. And so, when the procession ends and Philadelphus was honored with two portrait statues of himself, it is not for nothing that they, too, are golden, carried on golden carts, and set up on monumental columns (203b). Philadelphus was not yet worshipped as a god, but the city made its wish to do their king worship more than clear.

The most distinctive use the Ptolemies made of gold was as precious coinage. Beginning with Soter the Ptolemies minted special coin series in gold which most often paired Ptolemaic portraits with the iconography of their court, like the eagle clutching the thunderbolt whose *aetion* Callimachus gave in the hymn to Zeus.<sup>130</sup> Gold coins circulated differently from others: while everyday transactions in Egypt were made with bronze currency, gold coins were used by the crown to make special monetary gifts. One such occasion for the gifting of gold coins was at religious festivals.<sup>131</sup> In Philadelphus' grand *pompe*, for example, a garland made out of 10,000 gold coins was set on the throne of Ptolemy I Soter (Ath. 5.202b). Gold thus had symbolic value over and above its monetary worth. Greeks throughout the Mediterranean would have felt the point of the Ptolemies' gold coinage clearly, for they were the only dynasty minting gold already by the fourth century's close.<sup>132</sup> Moreover, the financial policies of Soter had resulted in a

---

<sup>129</sup> For example, in sections 201c-d, statues of Dionysus, Priapus, Hera, Alexander, Ptolemy Soter, and Virtue all stood together united by each wearing a garland made of gold; and an all-golden statue of Alexander appears at 202a.

<sup>130</sup> Von Reden (2007), 48-57.

<sup>131</sup> Von Reden (2007), 48-9.

<sup>132</sup> Von Reden (2007), 42.

closed-currency ‘coin zone.’ Foreign currencies were forbidden from transactions, so anyone who wanted to do business had to embrace the world of Ptolemaic coinage and their metals.<sup>133</sup>

Coming to Egypt, one learned quickly that he had entered the world of gold and its gods.

In light of the Ptolemies’ appropriation of gold, I would argue that the boys’ praise of Apollo’s dazzling appearance performs a political as well as religious function. Flashing with the Ptolemaic metal *par excellence*, Apollo appears bringing with him the glamor of Alexandria. His golden epiphany thus suggests the Ptolemies’ epiphany and the return of Ptolemaic rule over Cyrene upon the marriage of Berenice II and Ptolemy III. Religious festivals, after all, were common occasions for the Ptolemies to distribute golden coins; perhaps we may even imagine the god’s epiphany accompanied with the gift of commemorative golden coins.

After Apollo’s gold comes his ageless beauty. His face, untouched by the first growth of hair, is adorned rather with locks that glisten not oil, but powerful unguents:

καὶ μὲν αἰὲ καλὸς καὶ αἰὲ νέος· οὔποτε Φοίβου  
θηλείαις οὐδ’ ὅσσον ἐπὶ χνόος ἦλθε παρειαῖς,  
αἱ δὲ κόμαι θυόεντα πέδῳ λείβουσιν ἔλαια·  
οὐ λίπος Ἀπόλλωνος ἀποστάζουσιν ἔθειραι,  
ἀλλ’ αὐτὴν πανάκειαν· ἐν ἅστει δ’ ὦι κεν ἐκεῖναι  
πρῶκες ἔραζε πέσωσιν, ἀκήρια πάντ’ ἐγένοντο. (36-41)

And he is ever fair and ever young: never as much as the first down comes upon Phoebe’s delicate cheeks, but his locks drip fragrant oil upon the ground:

---

<sup>133</sup> Von Reden (2007), 43-8. She persuasively argues against the *communis opinio* that the closed-currency system was a fully thought-out plan intended from the start to isolate the Egyptian economy (see e.g. Rostovtzeff 1941, 2.1242) and argues instead that the closed-currency system arose as the government’s response to the phenomenon known as Gresham’s law, which predicts that the reduced-standard Ptolemaic coins would have driven the full-standard, foreign coins out of circulation and into hoards.

Apollo's hair does not drip fat, but panacea itself, and in the city where those dewdrops fall to the ground everything becomes deathless.

Gods' statues were regularly anointed with oil for religious festivals,<sup>134</sup> and outpourings of liquids are attested at such occasions. At Philadelphus' *pompe*, for example, vast quantities of wine flowed out into the streets (Ath. 5.199a-b), and in the stadium where the procession took place wine was mixed in gigantic bowls such that 'everyone in the stadium enjoyed the sweet smell fittingly' (πάντες κοσμίως ἐγλυκάνθησαν οἱ ἐν τῷ σταδίῳ, 200b). Yet Apollo's unguents, like his gold, have political overtones which we should consider in light of the hymn's historical context, the return of Ptolemaic control of Cyrene.

In Ptolemaic Egypt, oil was a commodity whose production and sale was monopolized by the state. As attested by the so-called Revenue Laws of Ptolemy II (*PRev* cols. 38-56),<sup>135</sup> the state and its contractors kept an ever-watchful – and coercive – eye on all aspects of production and consumption. Tax-farmers and local officials, for example, 'shall compel the oil-workers to work [every] day and shall stay beside them' to make sure that they produce a minimum daily amount of oil; the officials then seal the means of production at day's end (co. 46). Some offenses went directly to the king for arbitration.<sup>136</sup> When the boys describe the fragrance of

---

<sup>134</sup> Petrovic and Petrovic (2003), 182-4.

<sup>135</sup> For the text edition of *PRev* see Grenfell and Mahaffy (1896) and Bingen (1952), with his interpretative essay Bingen (1978). A convenient English translation with notes may be found in Austin (1981), 400-7. For discussion see Rostovtzeff (1941), 1.302-5; Fraser (1972), 1.147-8.

<sup>136</sup> He judged, for example, cases of the illegal production of oil and of purchase on the black market; in addition to surrendering the oil and produce, the condemned owed 3,000 drachmas or, if they could not pay, their person (col. 49).

Apollo's glistening locks, we are invited to think of the Ptolemies' involvement in perfume manufacture especially. Evelyne Prioux has shown that perfumed oils in the Hellenistic world were especially associated with the royal courts;<sup>137</sup> as an example, Athenaeus preserves an anecdote about how king Antiochus liked to bathe in public baths using his usual unguents, whereupon one presumably miffed man exclaimed 'Blessed are you kings who enjoy these [perfumes] and smell sweet!' (μακάριοί ἐστε ὑμεῖς οἱ βασιλεῖς οἱ καὶ τούτοις χρώμενοι καὶ ὀδωδότες ἡδύ, Athen. 5.194b). But the Ptolemies made a concerted effort to stand out in the world of fragrance: the scholar Apollonius Mus, whose treatise *On Perfumes* (Περὶ μύρων) is cited by Athenaeus (15.688f-89a), attributes an acme of perfumery to Alexandria under the patronage of both Arsinoe II and Berenice II. Apollo's dripping, fragrant locks in Callimachus' hymn thus collapse divinity and Ptolemaic royalty, so that Apollo's epiphany evokes Ptolemy's as well.

Apollo's oil, though, is not only a perfume, but a πανάκεια whose drops fall to the ground and make everything in the city ἀκήρια, 'free from harm' (*Hymn* 2.40-1). Panacea was both a goddess and the name for a cure-all drug.<sup>138</sup> Panaceae make their appearance in literary texts in the third century. Along with Callimachus' hymn, an epigram of Posidippus' *Iamatika* (AB 59) celebrates a doctor, who had discovered a cure for the Libyan asp's poison, as the man 'to whom the father of the Asclepiads gave every panacea' (ὦι πανάκειαν / τὴν Ἀσκληπιαδῶν πᾶσαν ἔδωκε πατήρ, AB 95.5-6); the second-century poet Nicander caps his didactic poem *Theriaca* (*Matters Pertaining to Poisonous Beasts*) with a magisterial panacea of more than

---

<sup>137</sup> Prioux (2009).

<sup>138</sup> Williams (1978), 44 ad loc.; Stephens (2015), 89 ad loc.



twenty ingredients (934-56). These poetic panaceae appear at the same time as we hear of intense interest in innovations in pharmacology at the Hellenistic courts, especially Alexandria. The Ptolemaic physician Herophilus, who was contemporary with Callimachus, was distinguished for his use of drugs to treat an uncommonly broad range of ailments<sup>139</sup> and invented scores of new simple and compound drugs.<sup>140</sup> The latter are germane to the *Hymn to Apollo*, for ancient panaceae could contain dozens of ingredients. Moreover, Herophilus went so far as to claim that ‘drugs are very like the hands of the gods’ (οἷόν περ θεῶν χεῖρας εἶναι τὰ φάρμακα, Gal. 12.966); he believed that some herbs were so powerful that they only needed to be stepped upon to have effect (*quasdam [sc. herbas] fortassis etiam calcatas prodesse*, Plin. *NH* 2.15). Apollo’s panacea, likewise, need only fall to the ground from his head (ἔραζε πέσωσιν) to make everything in the city immune from death (ἀκήρια πάντ’ ἐγένοντο, *Hymn* 2.41).

In light of the Ptolemies’ monopoly on oil and their concentrated investments in perfumery and pharmacology, Apollo’s locks seem to drip with the fruits of Ptolemaic patronage and thus advertise the benefits of Ptolemaic rule for Cyrene. There is, however, a Cyrenean valence to Apollo’s epiphany still to be considered. Throughout antiquity Cyrene was famous for its production of silphion, a plant whose juice, called *laser* in Latin, was ingested or applied to heal countless ailments.<sup>141</sup> Laser was not an oil, so it seems unlikely that this is the liquid we are

---

<sup>139</sup> Cels. 5.1.1 claims that Herophilus and his students cured nothing without drugs; while clearly an exaggeration it is useful testimony nonetheless. See Fraser (1972), 1.353.

<sup>140</sup> See von Staden (1989), 400-1 with testimonia.

<sup>141</sup> For a description of the silphion plant see Theophr. *Hist. pl.* 6.3.1.; for medicinal uses of *laser* see especially Plin. *NH*. 22.100-6.

to imagine dripping from Apollo's locks (cf. ἔλαια, 38). Nevertheless it is possible that Callimachus intended some association between Apollo's panacea and Cyrene's medicinal crop. In this case, I would suggest that the point is one of cultural appropriation: with the marriage of Euergetes and Berenice, Ptolemaic Apollo now drips Cyrenean panacea.<sup>142</sup>

In the course of this discussion we have seen how Callimachus collapses Apollo's epiphany with the epiphany of the Ptolemaic king, whose court had appropriated and even monopolized the distinctive and distinguishing products with which the god is adorned. Yet Apollo's splendid appearance is not only a benefit to himself. The god is forever young, and the source of his beauty then flows into the city where he makes himself manifest. By analogy, the Ptolemaic king's rapacious appropriation of gold and oil, his investments in perfumery and medicine, and his annexation of Cyrene and its healing silphion are not only personal benefits, but the source of his public benefactions. His prosperity is the source of his people's prosperity.

This beneficence is also seen in the chorus's praise of Apollo *Nomios*, patron of shepherds. After describing Apollo's work tending livestock when he was in love with Admetus (48-50), the boys sing of the wondrous effects Apollo's gaze has on herds of every kind:<sup>143</sup>

ῥεῖά κε βουβόσιον τελέθαι πλέον, οὐδέ κεν αἴγες  
 δεύοιντο βρεφέων ἐπιμηλάδες, ἥισιν Ἀπόλλων  
 βοσκομένησ' ὀφθαλμὸν ἐπήγαγεν· οὐδ' ἀγάλακτες

---

<sup>142</sup> A similar point seems to have been made by two coins issued by Ptolemy I Soter in Cyrene between 321-311, both of which display the Cyrenean silphion plant in conjunction with the Ptolemaic eagle: Cyrene has come into the Ptolemaic fold. For the coins see Svoronos (1904), II nos. 59-60; for brief discussion see Bagnall (1976), 184.

<sup>143</sup> The idea of positive effects brought by a god's favorable glance is conventional: see parallels in Giangrande (1968), 713 and Harder (2012), 1.85 on *Aetia* fr. 1.37 ἴδον.

οἷες οὐδ' ἄκυτοι, πᾶσαι δέ κεν εἶεν ὕπαρνοι,  
ἢ δέ κε μουνότοκος διδυμητόκος αἶψα γένοιτο. (50-4)

A cattle-pasture would easily increase, and goats, pastured with sheep, would not lack young upon whom Apollo cast his eye while they were grazing; nor would sheep be without milk nor be unfruitful, but all would have lambs beneath them, and the sheep who had given birth once would suddenly bear twins.

Commenting on this passage Williams writes, 'The phrase [βοσκομένης] ὀφθαλμὸν ἐπήγαγεν] suggests that Apollo Nomios watches over his flocks like a mortal herdsman.'<sup>144</sup> This remark may at first seem banal, but in fact it points to another way in which Apollo serves as a double for the Ptolemaic king. In Ptolemaic Egypt and her territories, all livestock were taxed by the crown and subject to inspection; the tax is called ἐννόμιον. One of the most important sources for Ptolemaic administration is *P. Tebt. 703*, a set of instructions written by a *dioiketes* to a lower-ranking official, likely an *oikonomos*.<sup>145</sup> The *dioiketes* reminds his subordinate that the ἐννόμιον is among the most important taxes (οὔσης δὲ καὶ τῆς κατὰ τ[ὸ] ἐννόμιον προσόδου / ἐν ταῖς πρώταις, *P. Tebt. 703.165-6*), and suggests to increase the revenues by carrying out the registration as well as possible (166-7). He also specifies that both royal and private cattle must be registered (63-6) and bids him pay special attention to the shelter and feeding of calves (66-70, 183-91).

Although this work was done by royal officials, the king himself played an active role in the enforcement of his laws. According to an ordinance of Philadelphus for Syria and Phoenicia

---

<sup>144</sup> Williams (1978), 53 ad loc. His suggestion that Callimachus may be hinting at Apollo's role as the sun, however, is not persuasive.

<sup>145</sup> For translation with notes see Austin (1981), 429-33. On *P. Tebt. 703* and its relationship to the Revenue Laws see now Manning (2010), xxv.

(*C. Ord. Ptol.* 21), those who tried to cheat the system by registering their livestock under another name would be judged by the king and have their property confiscated (11-15); tax-farmers and *komarchai* ('mayors') had to submit an annual census of livestock and swear to its accuracy with an oath to the king (15-23). The king's registration, inspection, and taxation of all livestock through his officials may not have seemed to many of his subjects a kindly eye like Apollo's. In a most-revealing section of *P. Tebt.* 703, the *dioiketes* tells the *oikonomos* to prevent all crime possible,

σαφῶς γὰρ εἰδέναι δεῖ  
 ἕκαστον τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ κατοικούν-  
 τῶν καὶ πεπιστευκέναι διότι(\*) πᾶν τὸ  
 [το]ιοῦτον ἐ[ι]ς ἐπίστασιν ἦκται καὶ  
 [τ]ῆς πρότερον κ[α]κεξί[α]ς(\*) ἀπολελυ-  
 μένοι εἰσίν, οὐ[θενὸς] ἔχοντ[ο]ς ἐξουσίαν ὃ βούλε-  
 ται ποιεῖν, ἀλ[λὰ] πάντων οἰκονομουμένων  
 ἀπὸ τοῦ βελτίστου (*P. Tebt.* 703.225-32)

For it is necessary that each of those living in the country clearly knows and trusts that every such thing [sc. crime] has come to a stop and that they have been delivered from the earlier bad affairs, with no one having the ability to do what he pleases, but with everything being managed as best as possible.

It is hard not to see the beneficent Apollo *Nomios* in Callimachus' hymn as providing a positive analogy for Ptolemaic control of all the country's livestock. Under Ptolemy's eye as Apollo's, the flocks increase and prosperity abounds.

## ii. Apollo as Judge of Techne, Whose Taste Ptolemy (Must) Follow

The chorus's praise of Apollo *Nomios* elaborates a theme which they have already introduced: 'no one is so wide-ranging in skill as Apollo' (τέχνηι δ' ἀμφιλαφῆς οὔτις τόσον ὅσον Ἀπόλλων, 42). Apollo not only excels in raising herds, but in a wide variety of skills:

κεῖνος οἷστυετὴν ἔλαχ' ἀνέρα, κεῖνος ἀοιδόν  
 (Φοίβωι γὰρ καὶ τόξον ἐπιτρέπεται καὶ ἀοιδή),

κείνου δὲ θριαὶ καὶ μάντιες· ἐκ δὲ νῦ Φοίβου  
ἰητροὶ δεδάασιν ἀνάβλησιν θανάτοιο. (43-6)

That god obtained the archer as his lot, that god obtained the singer (for both the bow and song are entrusted to Phoebus), and his are the Thriae and prophets, and from Phoebus doctors learn the postponement of death.

The chorus further illustrates Apollo's *technē* by describing his expertise not only in tending livestock, but also in founding cities (55-64). No god, it seems, can compete with Apollo. And yet the wide range of occupations that belong to him – archers, poets, prophets, doctors, shepherds, city founders – echoes the same breadth of career types under the control of Zeus's kings as praised in the *Hymn to Zeus*! For the reader of Callimachus' poetry book, it is easy to intuit an analogy forged between Zeus's king Ptolemy and Apollo. Yet there is a major difference between the king's Zeus-like patronage in the first hymn and Apollo's patronage in the second: whereas in the Zeus hymn all men are 'under the kings' hand' (74), Apollo himself possesses and even teaches every kind of *technē* whose practitioners are his clients. I showed in the previous chapter that the Ptolemies asserted themselves as legitimate judges of the cultural capital of poetry and scholarship by practicing in those fields themselves. So too Apollo is not a patron ignorant of the vast array of fields that he practices: rather, he is a master of all of them. For example, Apollo is the very teacher of doctors: ἐκ δὲ νῦ Φοίβου / ἰητροὶ δεδάασιν ἀνάβλησιν θανάτοιο ('And from Apollo doctors learn the means of postponing death,' 45-6). As of course they should: we have just seen how Apollo's very hair drips panacea, the substance sought after and devised by the leading physicians under Ptolemaic patronage.

Apollo's mastery in these various *technai* positions him as a legitimate arbiter of excellence in each of his fields. His position offers a valuable analogy for the Ptolemies, who likewise staked out the position as the judges of accomplishment in the many fields they patronized. Callimachus makes Apollo's authority over the value of cultural capital in his *technai*

clear in his hymn's *sphragis* ('conclusion,' literally 'seal'). After the chorus leader claimed that the boys would sing for longer than a day, they bring their song unexpectedly to a halt after less than one hundred lines; then, out of nowhere, Phthonos, 'Envy,' appears next to Apollo, whispers a criticism of the poet to the god, whereupon the god rebukes him and issues his own criteria for judging poetry. The famous passage goes as follows:

ὁ Φθόνος Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπ' οὐατα λάθριος εἶπεν·  
 'οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα πόντος ἀείδει.'  
 τὸν Φθόνον ὠπόλλων ποδί τ' ἤλασεν ὥδέ τ' εἶπεν.  
 'Ἀσσυρίου ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλὰ  
 λύματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ἐφ' ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἔλκει.  
 Διοῖ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι,  
 ἀλλ' ἥτις καθαρὴ τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει  
 πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβὰς ἄκρον ἄωτον.'  
 χαῖρε, ἄναξ· ὁ δὲ Μῶμος, ἴν' ὁ Φθόνος, ἐνθα νέοιτο. (105-13)

Envy spoke secretly to Apollo's ear: I don't admire the poet who sings not even as many things as the sea sings.' Apollo drove Envy away with his foot and spoke in this way: 'The flow of the Assyrian river is great, but it carries many impurities of the earth and much filth on its water. But Bees do not carry water to Deo from every source, but whatever small spring flows up both pure and immaculate from a holy fountain.' Farewell, lord; and Blame, may you go where Envy went.

How these lines are to be understood, especially their singing sea, has been the subject of lively debate. It is now generally agreed that Phthonos criticizes Callimachus' hymn on the grounds that it is shorter even than what 'the sea' sings; and it has been persuasively suggested that 'the sea' refers to Homer. What is particularly attractive about this suggestion is that the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, which was ascribed to Homer already in the fifth century BC, is several hundred lines long; Phthonos would thus criticize Callimachus' hymn on the grounds that it was not even as long as that, i.e. it should have been longer still.<sup>146</sup> But Apollo wants something more than

<sup>146</sup> On the Hellenistic idea of Homer as the sea see Williams (1978), 88-9, 98-9 and Traill (1998), 216-18; on the sea's song as the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* see Traill (1998), 220-2.

length: he wants verses whose quality is pure.<sup>147</sup> He introduces the criterion of purity by contrasting the long but polluted Assyrian river to the pure droplets carried by Demeter's 'Bees,' which was a name for her priestesses, to their goddess. These small but clean offerings of water are thus an analogy for Callimachus' own hymn, short but pure, to Apollo.<sup>148</sup>

The *sphragis* of Callimachus' hymn to Apollo has long been read divorced from its religious context as the poet's own defense of his short yet refined verse as *l'art pour l'art*. In particular Callimachus' decision to cast Apollo in the role of a divine defender of his verse has been challenged as the playful invention of a modern poet. Ivana Petrovic, however, in several recent publications has demonstrated that inscribed hymns and oracular responses likewise present Apollo as a critic of hymns offered to him and as the authority who approves their inscription, performance, and reperformance.<sup>149</sup> Additionally, Phthonos' criticism of

---

<sup>147</sup> On Apollo's introduction of the idea of quality see Köhnken (1981), 413-15 and Cameron (1995), 406; *pace* Williams (1978), 87, who argues that 'οὐδ' ὅσα implies an unspoken οἶα.'

<sup>148</sup> Asper (1997), 109-25 surveys divergent interpretations of the water imagery; Petrovic (2011), 273-5 discusses the use of such water metaphors in sacred regulations. On the *melissai* as priestesses see Petrovic (2011), 275-6.

<sup>149</sup> Petrovic (2011), 276-82. There are also parallels to Apollo's banishment of blame in inscribed hymns: Macedonicus' paeon from the Asclepieion in Athens (Furley-Bremer 7.5, first century BC/AD) is referred to in the hymn as an ἄμε[μπ]τος ὕμνος (5); since the god was the one who commanded Macedonicus to make the hymn (Μακεδονικὸς Ἀμφιπολείτης ἐποίησεν τοῦ θεοῦ προστάξψαντ[ος], titulus), Apollo himself has certified its freedom from *momos*. Even closer to Callimachus' hymn is an example from a second- or third-century CE oracular response of

Callimachus' hymn offered to the god as a gift recalls a regulation on inner purity from Hesiod enjoining men not to criticize the sacrificial portion offered to the gods as regards its quantity (WD 755-6).<sup>150</sup> This *sphragis*, however surprising, literary, and modern it may seem to us, is no figment of the ivory tower poet's imagination but a traditional feature of Apolline hymns.

Who or what, though, is Phthonos, 'Envy'? Some scholars have argued that Phthonos is an externalized representation of Apollo's own sense of begrudging *phthonos* which dislikes the diminutive hymn Callimachus has given him.<sup>151</sup> In my view this interpretation unconvincingly ascribes to Apollo conflicted feelings of literary taste. Phthonos is here better understood as an independent divinity, as he appears also in Plato's dialogue *Phaedrus*. In his second speech Socrates tells Phaedrus that our souls, before they descended into our bodies, followed the gods, who were coursing across the heavens in chariots, wherever they liked: ἔπεται δὲ ὁ ἀεὶ ἐθέλων τε καὶ δυνάμενος: φθόνος γὰρ ἔξω θείου χοροῦ ἴσταται ('And the man who is always wishing and is able follows [them], for Envy stands outside of the divine chorus,' *Phaedr.* 247a). The 'divine chorus' is that of the gods circling the sky; Envy is here presented as a god who stands apart from the other gods' cosmic dance. Callimachus may allude to this passage when he has Apollo physically exclude Phthonos from his divine chorus: indeed, his kick is in step, as it were,

---

Apollo at Didyma (*SGO* 1/01/19/01) in which Apollo himself, after specifying his preference for very old hymns, proclaims 'gratitude for divine understanding will always be **blameless**' ([τῆς δὲ θεοφ]ροσύνης ἔσται χάρις αἰὲν ἀμεμφής, 11).

<sup>150</sup> Petrovic (2019), 292-6 with discussion of ancient and modern interpretations of the Hesiodic passage.

<sup>151</sup> Bundy (1972), 92; Chesire (2008), 372 n. 66.



with his chorus's dance.<sup>152</sup> Phthonos, then, is an independent god whose goal is to inspire *phthonos* in Apollo which would cause him begrudge Callimachus' gift as too small for his dignity and to reject it.<sup>153</sup>

As I discussed in the previous chapter, gift-exchange was central to Hellenistic court society, for king and courtiers were bound to each other by gifts, and the value of the gift one gave to the king was intimately tied to the favor one should receive from him. Both giving and receiving gifts were highly visible affairs often conducted in full view of others, as for example at royal symposia. As we would expect, the king's judgment of gifts was subject to debate, and courtiers looking after their own interests might try to denigrate a gift offered by a rival. Plutarch, for instance, in *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* preserves an illustrative anecdote from Alexander's court, where a certain courtier Agis criticized the king's gifts given to a jester in order, humorously, to praise him even more:

Ἦτι δὲ τούτων ἕτεροι πανουργότεροι καὶ πρὸς ἡδονὴν χρῶνται τῷ παρρησιάζεσθαι καὶ ψέγειν. καθάπερ Ἄγισ ὁ Ἀργεῖος, Ἀλεξάνδρου γελωτοποιῶντι τινὶ μεγάλας δωρεὰς διδόντος, ὑπὸ φθόνου καὶ λύπης ἐξέκραγεν ὥς τῆς πολλῆς ἀτοπίας, ἐπιστρέψαντος δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως πρὸς αὐτὸν ὀργῇ καὶ 'τί δὴ σὺ λέγεις;' εἰπόντος ὁμολογῶ, φησὶν, ἄχθεσθαι καὶ

---

<sup>152</sup> See Chesire (2008), 371, who even suggests that Apollo may with his kick join the dance himself.

<sup>153</sup> Köhnken (1981), 421 points out that Phthonos' criticism of the hymn as offering too little praise is an inversion of Pindar's notion of *phthonos* in break-off formulas, where he cuts short his praise of mortal victors lest he arouse *phthonos* for offering too much; Petrovic (2019), 294-6 argues that the 'inverted' Callimachean logic of Phthonos is owed to Hesiod. The salient difference between Pindar's epinicia and Callimachus' hymn lies in the their *laudandi*: a poet can easily give a mortal too much praise, whereas a god can easily be praised too little.

ἀγανακτεῖν, ὁρῶν ὑμᾶς τοὺς ἐκ Διὸς γεγονότας ἅπαντας ὁμοίως κόλαξιν ἀνθρώποις καὶ καταγελάστοις χαίροντας· καὶ γὰρ Ἡρακλῆς Κέρκωψί τισι, καὶ Σειληνοῖς ὁ Διόνυσος ἐτέρπετο, καὶ παρὰ σοὶ τοιούτους ἰδεῖν ἔστιν εὐδοκιμοῦντας.’ (Plut. *Mor.* 60b-c)

And still others are more unscrupulous than these and use frank speech and censure even to inspire pleasure. Just so, when Alexander was bestowing great gifts to a jester, Agis the Argive feeling envy and grief cried aloud ‘O the great absurdity!’ And when the king turned toward him in a rage and said ‘What are you saying?’, he said, ‘I confess to be grieved and indignant, seeing all you descendants of Zeus delighting similarly in flatterers and jokesters; for Heracles took pleasure in some Cercopes, and Dionysus in Silenoi, and in your company it is possible to see that men such as these are held in high repute.’

Agis’s *kolakeia* is advanced: rather than praise he openly criticizes Alexander for keeping company with clowns, yet into his criticism he weaves flattery, acknowledging Alexander as a son of Zeus along with Heracles and Dionysus, who offer him exempla of divinities who enjoyed their jesters’ jokes. More intriguing in our context is what rouses Agis to action: he sees the king granting sizeable presents to someone else, cries out ‘under the influence of envy (*phthonos*) and grief’ and gets to flattering. Several scholars have discussed Phthonos’ whispered words as flattery intended to puff up the god’s self-opinion as deserving of a truly immense hymn, thereby ingratiating Phthonos to him.<sup>154</sup> The consistent association of flatterers with envy, secrecy, and wheedling words lends support to this interpretation. Plutarch in the same treatise baldly states that ‘the speech of the flatterer...provokes envy’ (ὁ τοῦ κόλακος λόγος...διερεθίζων φθόνον, *Mor.* 60f). In a more vivid passage, he focuses on how they cozy up to their victims’ ears by relating some proverbial wisdom:

τοῖς μὲν οὖν ταύροις τὸν οἶστρον ἐνδύεσθαι παρὰ τὸ οὖς λέγουσι, καὶ τοῖς κυσὶ τὸν κρότωνα· τῶν δὲ φιλοτίμων ὁ κόλαξ τὰ ὦτα κατέχων τοῖς ἐπαίνοις καὶ προσπεφυκῶς δυσσπότρητος ἔστιν. (*Mor.* 55e)

---

<sup>154</sup> Traill (1998), 221-2.

So on the one hand, people say that in the case of bulls, the gadfly presses upon their ear, and in the case of dogs, the tick; on the other hand, the flatterer, in taking hold of the ears of the ambitious with praises and growing attached to them, is hard to turn away.

Callimachus' Phthonos plays this same part, whispering words into Apollo's ear intended to praise and please him, in order to earn favor for himself at the expense of the poet.

Given the analogies that Callimachus constructs in this hymn between Apollo and his king and Phthonos and an envious courtier, I suggest that we might read this *sphragis* as Callimachus' analogy for the exchange of cultural capital at court. On this reading we see that the valuation of cultural capital was an occasion for competition between courtiers. Phthonos appears at the end of the hymn, the very moment of its reception and divine approbation. He whispers to Apollo his judgement on the hymn's value as a gift ('too short') and as a result his attitude toward the poet ('I don't admire him', οὐκ ἄγαμαι). Yet Phthonos' attempt to blackball Callimachus backfires: instead of turning away the poet, Apollo kicks Phthonos away from the privileged position at his side and extols the value of the poet's gift.

This scene, I think, would have felt familiar to Callimachus' audience at the Ptolemaic court, where at banquets, symposia, and festivals poets could win the attention and favor of their kings by offering their poetic gifts in the presence of all the king's closest companions. Callimachus' *sphragis* suggests that any attempts by members of the court to devalue his hymn will be met by Ptolemy's swift kick, like Apollo's to Phthonos. In fact, Callimachus has so constructed the relationship between Ptolemy and Apollo so as to obligate Ptolemy to defend the value of his hymn. Let us recall the speaker's precept from the hymn's opening section: 'He who fights with the blessed ones would fight with my king; whoever would fight with my king would fight with Apollo as well' (*Hymn* 2.26-7). By kicking Phthonos away, Apollo has revealed that criticizing his poet's offering merits swift punishment. Who more than Ptolemy, Apollo's

σύμμαχος, must uphold the god's taste? Ptolemy has no choice but to exalt Callimachus' hymn. And why should he not? We have seen in this section that Callimachus' hymn construes Apollo's patronage as a compelling analogy for the patronage of the Ptolemaic king, an analogy which would have been most welcome in the period when Cyrene was returning to the Ptolemaic fold. With Phthonos' rejection from Apollo's side, Callimachus lays claim to a distinguished position within his own king's court.

#### IV. Conclusion

I began this chapter by arguing that Callimachus' *Hymns* are a textual collection which reperforms hymns composed individually and orchestrates these performances into a new, unified whole. I would like to close by considering the overarching significance of the collection's first 'act' – Zeus followed by Apollo – and the light it sheds on the how Callimachus staked out a position for himself as a poet in the court society. The hymns to Zeus and Apollo were almost certainly composed decades apart. The hymn to Zeus evokes Ptolemy I Soter's establishment of the Ptolemaic court and its transfer to Philadelphia, while the hymn to Apollo seems to celebrate the coming of Ptolemaic rule to Cyrene after a long period of estrangement. By sewing these hymns together Callimachus makes the events of Ptolemaic history they allude to contemporaneous in the time of reperformance. This elision makes possible a seamless temporal movement from the court's beginning to its present, and the result is a powerful picture of stable Ptolemaic rule in a period that was anything but stable.

In step, Callimachus asserts a vision of his own continuously favored state at the Ptolemaic court. He was there in the beginning when he offered Soter more believable fictions,

he is there now to celebrate Apollo's Ptolemaic epiphany in Cyrene; and he will never cease celebrating Zeus, Apollo, and their Ptolemaic kings, for he has published his *Hymns* as texts. Apollo, in contrast to Phthonos, likes small and pure drops of water, just like Demeter's priestesses carry to her. Demeter's priestesses do not carry water for Demeter once only; rather, they do so every year. So too Callimachus has offered Apollo and his Ptolemaic patrons the gift of *Hymns* that will be offered forever in the act of re-reading.

### Chapter Three

#### New Gods at Court: Deification and the Poet's Gift in the Hymns to Artemis and Delos

In the previous chapter I examined how Callimachus creates an Olympian court society, analogous to the Ptolemies' own, in which he carves out an honored position at his ruler's side. The next two hymns, to Artemis and Delos, mark a new step in the *Hymns*' structured examination of the divine court. Both center around the phenomenon of divinization and introducing new gods to the pre-existing hierarchy. It is no coincidence that these two central hymns in the collection tackle this most pressing religious and political issue for Callimachus' patrons, the Ptolemies, whose divinity was forged step by experimental step in the third century. On my reading, these two hymns are Callimachus' demonstration of the invaluable role that he plays as a poet in making room for his patrons on Olympus and securing their worship in the Greek world.

I will begin with the hymn to Artemis, focusing on the steps that the young goddess takes to acquire the various marks of power that allow her to enter the Olympian court. I demonstrate that the ways in which she gains and manifests her power would have been familiar to members of the Ptolemaic court, and I suggest that Callimachus makes her Olympian ascent analogous to that a Ptolemy might take to become a divine ruler. I also draw attention to Callimachus' portrayal of Heracles, the Ptolemies' mythical ancestor, at Olympus, and argue that his gluttony makes room for the Ptolemies' conspicuous consumption, *tryphe*, on Olympus. I conclude this section by examining how Callimachus portrays his song as the gift which makes Artemis a prominent Olympian goddess and argue that he angles for a preferential relationship with her over all her other friends.

In the next section I turn to the hymn to Delos, in which Callimachus celebrates the eponymous nymph and island who was the nurse of the newborn god Apollo and ‘first to praise him as a god’ (ὡς θεὸν ἤνεσε πρώτη, *Hymn* 4.6). Through a detailed examination of the proem I demonstrate that Callimachus positions himself as an intermediary between Apollo and Delos, bestowing his song upon her in order to reciprocate her praise of Apollo’s divinity. Moreover, Callimachus fashions Delos’ praise of Apollo as analogous to the League of Islanders’ early vote to award divine honors to Ptolemy I Soter. By analogy, then, Callimachus positions himself as offering the island of Delos prized Ptolemaic cultural capital in exchange for her awesome gift to the Ptolemies; his gift, moreover, merits him resplendent praise from Ptolemy. I then demonstrate how Callimachus weaves Delos’ mythical past into the Ptolemaic present through the unborn god Apollo’s prophecy of the birth of ‘another god’ (165), Ptolemy II Philadelphus. By incorporating Delos into a larger song of Ptolemaic praise, he produces a hymn valuable as political capital both to Delos and to his Ptolemaic patrons.

#### I. Bringing a New Goddess and God to Olympus: The Poet’s Gift of Deification in the Hymn to Artemis

Given the importance of deification in the Hellenistic age, it may come as a surprise that the hymn to Artemis, dedicated as it is to the rise of this new goddess to power, has only recently received favorable scholarly attention. What stood in the way of the hymn’s political and

religious significance was largely the question of its formal unity.<sup>1</sup> While the first part of the hymn narrates Artemis' journeys around the world gaining distinction until she ascends to Olympus, in the second Callimachus returns to earth and celebrates various aspects of her worship across the world. For most of the twentieth century this second part was considered a disorganized scholarly addendum: as Wilamowitz writes, 'the scholar still had too much material and, in Callimachus' case, was too often superior to the poet.'<sup>2</sup> Some attempted to find meaning in this perceived disunity. Haslam, for example, argued that Callimachus' addendum gives the goddess who has little to sing about a long hymn so as to produce a paradox,<sup>3</sup> while Vestrheim argued that the hymn expresses Artemis' own lack of a unified identity.<sup>4</sup>

In a seminal article Bing and Uhrmeister have more persuasively argued that there is, indeed, a unity to this hymn, one which lies in Artemis' development from young girl to powerful goddess.<sup>5</sup> The hymn's second part, they argue, is indeed integral to the structure of the whole because its description of Artemis' worship on earth marks the full expression and confirmation of her divinity. In their wake scholars have turned to the ways that Callimachus fashions Artemis into a new goddess: Miriam Platinga has emphasized the importance of

---

<sup>1</sup> For overviews of the twentieth century scholarship see Bing and Uhrmeister (1994), 19-20; Petrovic (2007), 184-9.

<sup>2</sup> Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1924), 2.58 (the original is in German).

<sup>3</sup> Haslam (1993), 114-17.

<sup>4</sup> Vestrheim (2000).

<sup>5</sup> Bing and Uhrmeister (1994).



Artemis' rivalry with her brother Apollo,<sup>6</sup> and Annemarie Ambühl has shown how Callimachus alludes to an array of male and female poetic models for Artemis to make her power a new poetic creation. Petrovic, on the other hand, considers the hymn in light of Artemis' cult in the Hellenistic period, by which point she had become a significant city goddess, and argues that Callimachus' aim is to bestow her with a hymn worthy of her contemporary religious significance.<sup>7</sup>

Following these demonstrations of the hymn's formal merits and contemporary significance, I aim here to show that the rise of both Artemis and Heracles to Olympus brings the Ptolemies, by analogy, to heaven as well. For this to happen, however, Callimachus must bring Olympus down to earth, as it were; the steps that Artemis takes to Olympus are modeled after those that a king, queen, or even powerful courtier would take to rise to power in the Ptolemaic court. I will demonstrate Callimachus' mode of divinization, therefore, by tracing Artemis' road to Olympus step by step, before turning attention to the Olympian court, Heracles, and the gifts that Callimachus expects in return from the queen whom he has created with his hymn.

### *i. Getting Favors from the King*

Artemis was a powerful goddess: so powerful, in fact, that Callimachus, after having uttered her name in the hymn's first word, explains that it is a serious matter for a singer to forget her! It is thus with some humor that Callimachus begins his hymn by celebrating how when she was still a very young girl (παῖς ἔτι κουρίζουσα, *Hymn* 3.5) she sat upon her father Zeus's lap

---

<sup>6</sup> Plantinga (2004).

<sup>7</sup> Petrovic (2007), 182-247.

and made an incessant list of demands starting with ‘gimme!’ (line-initial δός μοι/δός ‘gimme’ in *Hymn* 3.6, 8, 13, 15, 18).<sup>8</sup> Zeus, pleased by her performance, grants her all these things and more, including cities upon cities. As many scholars have noted, the quotidian feeling of this exchange assimilates the Olympian family to a mortal one.<sup>9</sup> But this is a specifically royal family: many of imperious Artemis’ requests are for regal privileges, and her father’s ability to grant them could be matched only by a Hellenistic king.

Here are Artemis’ requests:

- 6: eternal virginity
- 7: many names (so Phoebus will not be my rival)
- 8-10: bow and arrows [retracted: the Cyclopes will make them]
- 11: to be a torch-bearer
- 11-12: to hitch up her fringed skirt (to hunt beasts)
- 13-14: 60 nine-year old daughters of Ocean (to be a chorus)
- 15-17: 20 Amnisian nymphs (to be attendants for hunting gear and dogs)
- 18: all the mountains
- 19-25: whatever city you want (Fates ordained that I take care of women in labor)

This is not a complete list of Artemis’ conventional attributes;<sup>10</sup> as we shall see, it will be up to Zeus to bestow some essential gifts upon Artemis himself. Rather, as Bing and Uhrmeister point out, these are Artemis’ desires, capped by her acquiescing request for any city her father wants to give her; she has to play a role in mortal women’s lives, but it seems she would rather not.<sup>11</sup> Even more, little Artemis seems to be thinking critically about her requests and how she frames

---

<sup>8</sup> Stephens (2015), 123 on 6-25 further suggests some aspects of Artemis’ diction that may sound particularly childish.

<sup>9</sup> e.g. Petrovic (2016), 173-4.

<sup>10</sup> So Haslam (1993), 112.

<sup>11</sup> Bing and Uhrmeister (1994), 20-21.

them. She ends with a political concession to what she knows she must accept; she also takes back her early request for a bow and arrow. Callimachus' presentation of this shrewdly imperious goddess both permits and encourages us to ask why, then, Artemis wants what she wants and why she asks for it as she does.

Her first request, to preserve her perpetual virginity (δός μοι παρθενίην αἰώνιον, ἄππα, φυλάσσειν, 6) has attracted little attention because of its obviousness. Ancient etymology related her name Ἄρτεμις, after all, to παρθενία (Plat. *Crat.* 406b), so that virginity is her *sine qua non*. Yet Callimachus makes us witness Artemis before this feature of her life was vouchsafed by her father. Why, then, did she ask for it? Since she acts like a human child, we might as well ask why a young princess would ask to stay a virgin. Life as a Hellenistic royal bride, wife, and mother was not only uncertain but dangerous as well. Marriage meant moving out of one's father's court and into another with its own hierarchy and factions, bearing children for that king, and preserving the favor of one's own children over those of other women. Callimachus' audience at court, women and men alike, would have understood Artemis' desire to remain unmarried in her father's house. Callimachus' audience would also have understood that this virginity was a big request: royal daughters were expedient means of exchange in the world of personal alliances between the Hellenistic courts. The urgency, perhaps, and the magnitude of the request explain why she asks for it first.

Artemis next asks her father to give her πολωνυμία (7), the quality of being celebrated by many names,<sup>12</sup> 'so that Phoebus will not vie with me' (ἵνα μή μοι Φοῖβος ἐρίζηι, 7). As Bornmann notes, Artemis' request alludes to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, when Delos has Leto

---

<sup>12</sup> Stephens (2015), 123 ad loc. aptly translates 'many-named-ness.'

swear that her son will first build a temple and oracle on Delos, then over the rest of the world, ‘since he will surely be of many names’ (ἐπεὶ ἡ πολuwνυμος ἔσται, *h. h. Ap.* 82).<sup>13</sup> Artemis’ desire to outdo her brother is humorous,<sup>14</sup> but the laughter Callimachus inspires in his audiences is that of recognition. An analogous competition, as it were, for cult titles had unfolded between Arsinoe II Philadelphus and her brother, and like Artemis Arsinoe was by far victorious.<sup>15</sup> *Philoi*, too, vied amongst themselves for titles granted by the king. By including Zeus-given πολuwνυμία as one of Artemis’ chief desires, Callimachus provides a divine pedigree for the competition for court titles as symbolic capital.

Next Artemis asks for a bow and arrows, but stops herself and revokes her request as soon as it has fled her lips:

δὸς δ’ ἰοὺς καὶ τόξα—ἔα πάτερ, οὐ σε φαρέτρην  
οὐδ’ αἰτέω μέγα τόξον· ἐμοὶ Κύκλωπες οἴστους  
αὐτίκα τεχνήσονται, ἐμοὶ δ’ εὐκαμπὲς ἄεμμα. (8-10)

And give arrows and bows. Oh Father, I don’t ask you for a quiver or a great bow;  
the Cyclopes will fashion me arrows presently, and for me a well-bent bow.

What has made Artemis say ἔα πάτερ and back-peddle? Perhaps Zeus began to protest and signal his displeasure; perhaps Artemis has merely had second thoughts. Either way, a bow and arrows seem to have been too big a thing to ask from Zeus, presumably because he would have to relinquish his weapons to her, depriving himself of them at her expense. Little Artemis has learned an important lesson: some of the kings’ possessions are off-limits and some requests

---

<sup>13</sup> Bornmann (1968), 9 ad loc.

<sup>14</sup> Stephens (2015), 123 ad loc. attractively suggests that the abstract noun πολuwνυμία contributes to the humor of Artemis’ bequest.

<sup>15</sup> For discussion of Arsinoe II’s titles in cult see Fraser (1972), 1.237-46.

too great. Hellenistic courtiers, too, had to learn this lesson: as we saw in the last chapter, Theocritus' rustic Thyonicus instructs his friend not always to ask Ptolemy for gifts.

After avowing that the Cyclopes will make her a bow and arrows, Artemis reveals that she wants to use them for a life spent outdoors:

ἀλλὰ φαεσφορίην τε καὶ ἐς γόνυ μέχρι χιτῶνα  
ζώννυσθαι λεγνῶτόν, ἵν' ἄγρια θηρία καίνω.  
δὸς δέ μοι ἐξήκοντα χορίτιδας ὤκεανίνας,  
πάσας εἰνέτεας, πάσας ἔτι παῖδας ἀμίτρον.  
δὸς δέ μοι ἀμφιπόλους Ἀμνισίδας εἴκοσι νύμφας,  
αἳ τε μοι ἐνδρομίδας τε καὶ ὀππότε μηκέτι λύγκας  
μήτ' ἐλάφους βάλλοιμι θοοὺς κύνας εὖ κομέοιεν.  
δὸς δέ μοι οὔρεα πάντα (11-18)

But [give me] both the carrying of the torch and to hitch my fringed chiton up to my knee that I might be slaying wild beasts. And give me sixty Oceanids to be my dancers, all nine years old, all still girls who do not wear headbands. And give me twenty Amnisian nymphs to be my attendants who might tend to my hunting boots and swift dogs whenever I am not shooting at wild cats and deer. And give me all the mountains.

This idyllic vision of a life spent out in wild nature hunting and dancing would have strongly appealed to Callimachus' court audience, for whom the royal hunt was one of the most important court activities. An invitation to join the king's hunt was a special honor for a *philos*, and already in the third century the title *archikynegos* ('leader of the hunt') is attested for the Alexandrian court.<sup>16</sup> Callimachus writes the honor and pleasure of hunting into the Olympian court society as an analogy for his own. Several details add a particularly Macedonian color to Artemis' imagined hunt. First, Artemis' outfit of high boots and a chiton, surrounded with a patterned border and hitched up to the knee, has much in common with the dress of Macedonian kings and courtiers. The hunters on the Pella mosaics, for example, wear *chlamydes* with a deep red border

---

<sup>16</sup> For an overview with bibliography see Strootman (2014), 199-202.

like Artemis's;<sup>17</sup> moreover, the ceremonial Macedonian dress of *hetairoi* and *philoι* consisted of a short *chlamys* that stopped at the knee and high riding boots.<sup>18</sup> Even Artemis' insatiable appetite for the hunt, asking for every mountain to be hers, recalls the great lust for game of Hellenistic kings, the Ptolemies not least among them. There were hunting grounds and exotic beasts displayed within the palace district, and Philadelphus' zeal for marvelous creatures was so great that a band of *philoι* even brought him back alive a monstrously large snake which he kept tamed inside the palace as an attraction for guests and visitors (DS 3.36.3-37.8).

Artemis knows, however, that despite her wishes she cannot spend all her time hunting. She asks Zeus for a city, but displays not a wink of interest in it: 'But grant me any city, any one you want, for it will be rare when Artemis enters a town' (πόλιν δέ μοι ἦντινα νεῖμον / ἦντινα λῆις· σπαρνὸν γὰρ ὅτ' Ἄρτεμις ἄστυ κάτεισιν, 18-19).<sup>19</sup> Delighted by his daughter's impetuousness, Zeus nevertheless has a different plan for her:

‘...φέρειν, τέκος, ὅσσ’ ἐθελημός  
αἰτίζεις, καὶ δ’ ἄλλα πατήρ ἐτι μείζονα δώσει.  
τρὶς δέκα τοι πτολίεθρα καὶ οὐχ ἓνα πύργον ὀπάσσω,  
τρὶς δέκα τοι πτολίεθρα, τὰ μὴ θεὸν ἄλλον ἀέξειν  
εἴσεται, ἀλλὰ μόνην σὲ καὶ Ἀρτέμιδος καλέεσθαι·  
πολλὰς δὲ ξυνῇ πόλιας διαμετρήσασθαι  
μεσσογέων νήσους τε· καὶ ἐν πάσησιν ἔσονται  
Ἀρτέμιδος βωμοὶ τε καὶ ἄλσεα. καὶ μὲν ἀγυιαῖς  
ἔσση καὶ λιμένεσσιν ἐπίσκοπος.’ (31-9)

‘...Take, child, all the things you ask for eagerly, and I will give you even others greater still. I grant you thirty cities and more than a single tower, thirty cities which shall not know how to cherish any other god but you alone and to be called Artemis's. And I grant you many cities on the land and islands to [receive a share

---

<sup>17</sup> Petsas (1978), 95-7; see also Strootman (2014), 208.

<sup>18</sup> Strootman (2014), 202-9 on Macedonian royal dress with bibliography.

<sup>19</sup> On Artemis' lack of interest in cities see the discussion of Bing and Uhrmeister (1994), 20.

in] in common; and in all cities there will be both altars and groves of Artemis.  
And truly you will be an overseer of both streets and harbors.

This passage offers an *aetion* for how Artemis came to be worshipped as a city goddess throughout the *oikoumene*, especially in Asia Minor.<sup>20</sup> Why Zeus gave Artemis all these cities, however, is a question that has not received much attention. Bing and Uhrmeister have argued that Callimachus makes Zeus responsible for Artemis' urban role in order to explain the uneasy coexistence of her roles as a goddess of both wild nature and cities.<sup>21</sup> While they address the narrative problem facing Callimachus, their solution does not explain why Zeus as a character makes this tremendous gift. Petrovic suggests that Zeus's gift teaches Artemis the lesson of *noblesse oblige*: she can enjoy the perks of royalty like hunting only if she fulfils the royal duties of caring for cities.<sup>22</sup> While these cities might have seemed an unwanted obligation to Artemis, Zeus regards them clearly as gifts, calling them 'still greater' than those she asked for (καὶ δ' ἄλλα πατὴρ ἔτι μείζονα δώσει, 32). What parallels are there for Zeus's extraordinary gifts in the Hellenistic courts?

First, Zeus's grant of everything Artemis asks and more conforms to the social obligation of Hellenistic kings always to grant more in keeping with their unsurpassable status. Two anecdotes mentioned in the last chapter are relevant to this point: first, Alexander's gift of ten talents to a courtier who only asked for five because five were too little for him to give; second, a courtier's request of a talent from Ptolemy at a symposium in retaliation for a trick the king had played against him. If Hellenistic kings were so obliged, so too must be Zeus; Callimachus thus

---

<sup>20</sup> On Artemis' role in cult as a city goddess see Petrovic (2007), 194-235.

<sup>21</sup> Bing and Uhrmeister (1994), 20-1.

<sup>22</sup> Petrovic (2017), 152.

writes Hellenistic court etiquette into the Olympian court.<sup>23</sup> Here we may glimpse the poet's self-interest at play, for setting a divine precedent for royal generosity worked in his favor as a court-maintained poet and member of the court society.

If the quantity of Zeus's gifts conforms with the practice of Hellenistic kings, so too does their kind. Kings regarded as theirs all the territory they conquered, and one of the prime ways they made loyal friends was by making them gifts of cities, less developed estates, and uncultivated land. The technical term for such land was *dorea* ('free gift'), and *philo*i so rewarded earned this land's taxes and other revenues as personal gains.<sup>24</sup> Nor was land the only such gift kings could make. Revenues from harbors could be given to *philo*i,<sup>25</sup> and here we might recall that Zeus also made Artemis λιμένεσσιν ἐπίσκοπος (39). It would have come easily, I think, to Callimachus' court audience to regard the thirty cities Zeus promised to give (δώσει, 32) his daughter as analogous to the *doreai* they hoped to receive from their own king. So too Zeus's claim that these cities will not know how to 'cherish' (ἀέξειν, 34) any god but Artemis could also admit a pecuniary interpretation. αὔξω can be used to describe financial gains (see for example A. Ch. 825 κέρδος αὔξεται), and Callimachus later insists upon the superlative riches of Artemis' sanctuary at Ephesus, '[a sanctuary] than which no dawn will see anything more divine or wealthy; easily it would surpass Pytho' (τοῦ δ' οὔτι θεώτερον ὄψεται ἡώς / οὐδ' ἀφνειότερον: ῥέα κεν Πυθῶνα παρέλθοι, 249-50). Zeus's cities similarly make Artemis not only rich in worship, but also in costly dedications.

---

<sup>23</sup> On the king's inability to refuse a gift in public see Strootman (2014), 158.

<sup>24</sup> Herman (1987), 106-15; Strootman (2014), 153.

<sup>25</sup> See for example Plut. *Alex.* 15.2 and Strootman (2014), 153.



Giving tracts of land away as *doreai* had political advantages for the king: such superlative gifts could make the most loyal of friends, who would thereby earn substantial maintenance, enabling them to better serve him in the future. Yet *doreai* were also risky gifts to give, for if they came with full rights of ownership, landed *philo*i could consolidate their power and eventually oppose the king.<sup>26</sup> Why, then, might Zeus have thought it a wise idea to give so many cities to his little girl, who would become a powerful hunter? I think that Artemis' first and most urgent request, perpetual virginity, is crucial to Zeus's decision. By granting his daughter's desire never to marry, Zeus was assured that any cities he gave to her would remain within his house. Her virginity, somewhat paradoxically, was far from an obstacle to the creation of a dynasty, but rather a boon.

Zeus's approbation of his virgin daughter would have been familiar to his court audience in Alexandria, who had also seen an unwed princess exalted to the skies. Philotera, the full sister of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II, remained unwed and yet was deified and had Ptolemaic cities named after her.<sup>27</sup> No other Hellenistic dynasties so honored their unmarried daughters, and scholars have argued that the Ptolemies exceptionally exploited Philotera's potential as a virgin

---

<sup>26</sup> See Strootman (2014), 154. As regards the ownership of *doreai*, Herman (1987), 113-14 argues that full ownership was normally granted to recipients of crown land in the Achaemenid empire and pre-Hellenistic Macedon, but that in the Hellenistic period non-heritable possession coexisted along with heritable ownership.

<sup>27</sup> Mueller (2006), 210-11 conveniently assembles the information about the five cities known to have been named after Philotera (settlements 82-6 in her numeration).

to symbolize her paternal house.<sup>28</sup> Ptolemaic subjects caught on to the trend and ran with it; most intriguing to our analysis of Callimachus' hymn, a statue base from Didyma bears an inscription (*OGIS* 35) recording that the people of Miletus there dedicated a statue of Philotera to Artemis. Callimachus' scene of Zeus granting cities to Artemis may similarly have evoked images of Philotera in his audience.

Yet the gifts of cities also connect Artemis to Arsinoe II. In her first marriage, her husband Lysimachus re-founded Ephesus and named the city after her, thus linking her tightly to Artemis.<sup>29</sup> Also like the goddess, Arsinoe had scores of cities named after her by both Lysimachus and later her brother-husband Philadelphus.<sup>30</sup> Finally, Arsinoe also had many streets in Alexandria named after her, just as Zeus made Artemis the ἀγυιᾶς...ἐπίσκοπος (38-9).<sup>31</sup> The crucial difference between Arsinoe and Artemis is that Arsinoe was not a virgin. Still, Arsinoe and Philotera, like Artemis, remain rooted in their fathers' courts. Callimachus, in my opinion, emphasizes the many cities and surpassing favor virginal Artemis received from Zeus in order to provide a model for these Ptolemaic women, daughters of Soter who each in her own way propagated the success and identity of the dynasty he created.

---

<sup>28</sup> Wikander (2002), 188-9; Carney (2013), 98.

<sup>29</sup> For Arsinoe's connections to Ephesus see Stephens (2015), 19-20.

<sup>30</sup> Hölbl (2001), 367 provides a complete list of cities named after Arsinoe.

<sup>31</sup> For these streets named after Arsinoe II see Fraser (1972), 1.35-6, 237-9; on Artemis as goddess of streets see Petrovic (2007), 6, 226.

*ii. The Princess's Grand Tour*

Little Artemis leaves her father's lap on Olympus at line 40 as a παῖς to fetch her retinue of nymphs. When Callimachus describes her royal return to Olympus at 141 and her taking her seat in the divine court at 169, she is a goddess, both θεή (112) and ἄνασσα (137). One of Bing and Uhrmeister's major accomplishments was to chart, step by step, Artemis' development in the terms Callimachus uses to address her. She becomes a δαίμων after she receives her bow and arrows from the Cyclopes, θεή after she receives her dogs from Pan and makes her first hunt, and ἄνασσα after she makes the Hesiodic city of the just flourish and the city of the unjust wither. In this section I wish to extend their analyses by considering the ways in which Artemis' grand tour around the *oikoumene* acquiring her attributes of power and taking her place at court reflect practices familiar from the Hellenistic courts, using Ptolemaic evidence whenever possible. Petrovic (2017) has begun this work already by bringing to light the importance of some elements of court ceremonial and etiquette in the hymn. It is my intention to cast a still wider net and consider how Artemis' development incorporates Macedonian and perhaps even Egyptian inauguration rituals and royal ideology.

At the outset, it is worth emphasizing something so obvious as to be missed about Artemis' journey from girl to goddess: that it is, in fact, a journey. Although Artemis asks her father for all of her desires but the bow and arrows, she does not stay at court to receive any of them. Rather she becomes a goddess by embarking on a grand tour of the *oikoumene*, traveling from Crete to Sicily to Arcadia to Thrace and finally at long last to her Olympian home. She receives a different welcome everywhere she goes, and every stop on the road creates a new political alliance through an exchange of gifts and services. In this the fledgling goddess behaves precisely like a new Hellenistic monarch. After a Hellenistic ruler was newly acclaimed, it was

customary to embark on a royal tour of the *oikoumene*.<sup>32</sup> At each city the new king visited, he was welcomed joyfully by throngs of citizens, escorted into the city in a procession, and finally he made sacrifices to the local gods.<sup>33</sup> These religious festivities provided crucial opportunities for doing politics: kings distributed gifts and favors and citizens lost no opportunity to celebrate and obligate the ruler they welcomed into their midst.<sup>34</sup> Hermocles' infamous ithyphallic hymn to Demetrius Poliorcetes, performed by the Athenians upon their royal welcome to the king in 291 or 290, both celebrates Demetrius as a god and entreats him to act as a god in turn by praying that he take military action against the Aetolians, who had been making raids against the Athenians.<sup>35</sup> Demetrius became not only a king but a god during his visit to the Athenians; Artemis' visits to Oceanus, the Cyclopes, Pan, and the city of the unjust similarly play a role in her development as both queen and goddess.

#### a. *Royal Youths*

Artemis' first destination is Crete (40-1) where she 'selected many nymphs, all nine years old, all still girls ungirdled (πολέας δ' ἐπελέξατο νύμφας, / πάσας εἰνέτεας, πάσας ἔτι παῖδας ἀμίτρους, 42-3). Petrovic has aptly compared these nymphs to the *basilikoi paides* at the

---

<sup>32</sup> Clarysse (2000), 35.

<sup>33</sup> On royal rituals of entry see Strootman (2014), 233-41.

<sup>34</sup> For examples from Ptolemaic visits to the Egyptian *chora* see Clarysse (2000), 39-40.

<sup>35</sup> For the hymn see Ath. 6.253d-f; on the hymn's role in political negotiations between Athens and Demetrius see Chaniotis (2011), 158.

Macedonian courts, the Ptolemies included.<sup>36</sup> To this point, I would emphasize that Artemis' personal involvement in her retinue's selection dovetails with the active role consistently attributed to Alexander in both the choice and supervision of *paides* in Asia. For example, after the mutiny at Opis Arrian reports him saying that 'he himself would take care' of the 10,000 departing soldiers' boys by Asian mothers 'that they be educated in the Macedonian way' (αὐτὸς δὲ ἐπιμελήσεσθαι ὥς ἐκτρέφοντο Μακεδονικῶς, Arr. 7.12.2); Plutarch's description of Alexander's selection of 30,000 Parthian boys even echoes Callimachus' language (τρισμυρίου παῖδας ἐπιλεξάμενος, Plut. *Alex.* 47.6).<sup>37</sup> Artemis, it appears, is following in the son of Zeus's footsteps.

Bing and Uhrmeister call attention to the fact that Artemis, though she asked her father for this retinue of girls last, went to collect them first.<sup>38</sup> Why she should focus so much on them is suggested by their analogy to the *basilikoi paides*. As Petrovic puts it, 'Size of entourage is a timeless indicator of power and influence, equally at home in Ancient Alexandria and in modern-day Hollywood.'<sup>39</sup> Hellenistic royalty made a point of public appearances surrounded by their courtiers to impress upon the crowds their immense status. The following lines from the Athenian ithyphallic hymn to Demetrius are illuminating:

σεμνὸν τι φαίνεθ', οἱ φίλοι πάντες κύκλῳ,  
ἐν μέσοισι δ' αὐτός,  
ὅμοιον ὥσπερ οἱ φίλοι μὲν ἀστέρες,

---

<sup>36</sup> Petrovic (2017), 152-3.

<sup>37</sup> See Hammond (1990), 275-80 for discussion of Alexander's selection, training, and use of pages.

<sup>38</sup> Bing and Uhrmeister (1994), 22.

<sup>39</sup> Petrovic (2017), 152-3.

ἥλιος δ' ἐκεῖνος. (Ath. 6.253d-e)

This is an august sight: his [Demetrius'] *philoι* are all in a circle, but he is in the middle of them, just as if his *philoι* are stars, but that man is the sun.

Artemis' decision to select her girls first, then, is just the natural political decision made by a girl raised at court: when asking the Cyclopes for a favor, she wanted to appear to them as a sun among so many stars.

And stars *philoι* were. The Athenian hymn helps also to contextualize the overweening joy that these girls' parents feel upon sending their daughters away with Artemis: χαῖρε δὲ Καίρατος ποταμὸς μέγα, χαῖρε δὲ Τηθύς, / οὔνεκα θυγατέρας Λητωίδι πέμπον ἄμορβους ('The river Kairatos was greatly rejoicing, and rejoicing was Tethys, since they were sending their daughters to be attendants to the child of Leto,' 44-5). Petrovic aptly locates their joy in the honor they see their daughters being granted, and she further suggests that Callimachus emphasizes their joy in order to market the analogous Ptolemaic institution of *basilikoi paides* and personal service to the royal family eminently desirable.<sup>40</sup> In addition to joy, I would emphasize the parents' *charis* entails gratitude to the young goddess, and that this *charis* is integral to Artemis' politics. By showing favor to Kairatos' and Tethys' children, Artemis creates long-term bond of reciprocity between these parents who live in far-away Crete and Artemis who travels the world and holds court on Olympus. This is the first of many reciprocal relationships Artemis will form on her way back to her father's home, which play a key role in her maturation into a powerful divinity.

---

<sup>40</sup> Petrovic (2017), 153.

### b. Benefactress of the Cyclopes

If Artemis' gracious welcome on Crete emblemizes a Hellenistic politics of *charis*, her visit to the Cyclopes showcase the young princess' ability to play hardball. In this long scene (46-86), Artemis and her posse travel to the Lipari islands off Sicily, where the Cyclopes are at work in Hephaestus' forge. To summarize the narrative: Artemis' companions are terrified at these fearsome smiths' sight and dissonant sounds, and justifiably so, for even divine mothers threaten their children with a visit from a Cyclops; Artemis, however, was not afraid of the Cyclopes when she was little, nor is she now, and with a persuasive speech she gets them to make her a bow and arrows and they leave for Arcadia. In general scholars have regarded this scene as an amusing vignette which emphasizes Artemis' brave precocity,<sup>41</sup> and a great deal of attention has gone into exploring Callimachus' incorporation of a wide range of earlier poetry.<sup>42</sup> The analysis of Bing and Uhrmeister, however, reveals that Artemis' acquisition of her weapons marks a crucial step in her development as a goddess, for at the conclusion of the entire section, the poet switches to *Du-Stil* and first calls Artemis a *daimon* (ἄφαρ δ' ὠπλίσσαο, δαῖμον, 'and immediately you donned your arms, goddess,' 86).<sup>43</sup> Far more than weapons make a goddess,

---

<sup>41</sup> See for example Bornmann (1968), xxix-xxx and Stephens (2015), 128 on 46-86.

<sup>42</sup> The most famous model for this scene is Thetis' visit to Hephaestus' workshop in *Iliad* 18: see Herter ([1929] 1975), 394-9; Bornmann (1968), xviii-xix; Stephens (2015), 218 on 46-86.

Ambühl (2005) uncovers a broader range of models: at 269-73 she discusses parallels for the girls' behavior in Sappho and Erinna, and at 265-6 in Nausicaa's encounter with Odysseus; at 293-5 she discusses the comic role played by Hermes as owed to the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*.

<sup>43</sup> Bing and Uhrmeister (1994), 22.

however; in what follows I focus on Artemis' political strategies and suggest an important Egyptian dimension of this scene in the Cyclopes' workshop.

We should keep in mind that in the opening scene Artemis takes it upon herself to get the Cyclopes to make her a bow and arrows rather than asking her father for them as a gift. I proposed above one reason Artemis might have changed her mind, to avoid making an impolitic request of her father. Here I would suggest another motive. Securing the services of the Cyclopes allows Artemis to assert herself as a useful patron to powerful clients, thereby creating a valuable political and military base. Ambühl, following Herter, has noted that Callimachus makes a significant change to his Homeric model for this episode: while Thetis in *Iliad* 18 deals with Hephaestus, Artemis goes straight to his manual laborers, the Cyclopes.<sup>44</sup> In earlier literature, the Cyclopes make weapons exclusively for Zeus;<sup>45</sup> McCarter accordingly argues that Callimachus makes Artemis deal with the Cyclopes to underscore Artemis' τιμή as a goddess.<sup>46</sup> In Callimachus' hymn, however, the Cyclopes manufacture weapons and fine works for far more gods than Zeus. When the maidens arrive, the Cyclopes are in the process of making a μέγα ἔργον ('great work,' 49), which is a trough for Poseidon's horses (ἵππείην τεύκοντο Ποσειδάωνι ποτίστρην, 50);<sup>47</sup> and Artemis soon reminds the Cyclopes of the bow and arrows

---

<sup>44</sup> Ambühl (2005), 294, citing Herter ([1929] 1975), 395.

<sup>45</sup> Rautenbach (1984), 51.

<sup>46</sup> McCarter (2012), 372.

<sup>47</sup> Bornmann (1968), 29 discussing lines 49 and 50 detects a humorous deflation of this 'great work,' as the μέγα ἔργον announced in line 49 turns out in line 50 to be a ποτίστρη ('trough'), a word whose prosaic tenor is discussed more recently by Parsons (2011), 152. Many scholars



they had earlier fashioned for her brother (83). Artemis goes to the Cyclopes because they, it appears, control the means of production of divine weapons and status symbols. If she wants to compete with Apollo, and Poseidon, too, then needs to strike a deal with the workers, not their supervisor. In so dealing with the laborers, I would suggest that she sets a paradigm for the direct supervision the Ptolemies themselves kept over their laborers and the means of production, albeit through officials, by means of the royal monopolies and extensive tax codes I discussed earlier in connection with the *Hymn to Apollo*.

Just as much as donning arms signifies Artemis' transition from παῖς to δαίμων, so too does her change in how she treats the Cyclopes. It turns out that Artemis was so sure at the beginning of the hymn that the Cyclopes would make weapons for her (8-10) because they have a history: when she was three years old and brought by her mother to Hephaestus' workshop to

---

now read Poseidon's trough as a cipher for anti-Callimachean epic. This position is most strongly espoused by Casali (2006), 199-200, who reductively concludes that 'The whole Hymn to Artemis is an exemplary statement of Callimachus's attitude towards epos'; see also McCarter (2012), 364-5, for whom the epic seriousness of the Cyclopes' work is reduced by Callimachus to comedy. I am more hesitant to think, however, that Artemis herself would have looked down upon Poseidon's commission. Prosaic though ποτίστρη is, horses' troughs could be elaborately wrought: see examples discussed by Moore (2004), 48-50 in her survey of representations of horse troughs on vases before 400 BC. Artemis, moreover, shares Poseidon's penchant for equestrian equipment; the deer who pull her chariot drink from 'golden basins' (χρυσείας ὑποληνίδας, 166) when they rest on Olympus. Poseidon's trough, I think, is likewise a status symbol in the world of court society, and one with which Artemis herself might like to vie.

receive gifts from him, the Cyclops Brontes sat her down on his knees, she yanked off a handful of his chest hair, and it has never grown back (72-9). The key word in this scene is βίηφι (77), the adverb used to describe the might with which Artemis plucked out Brontes' hair. As Stephens notes, the word commonly describes male strength.<sup>48</sup> Its specific effect here is to link Artemis closely to her father, who in the first hymn *bia* and *kartos* next to his throne as *somatophylakes* (Hymn 1.67). In the hymn to Zeus, however, we never see this force in action, and its political value seems to lie more in the implied threat than in the application. Being a toddler, however, Artemis has not learned the appropriate restraint and so causes her mother an embarrassing *faux pas*. Hephaestus has invited mother and child over to give the little goddess customary presents (ὀπτήρια, 74), but she responds ungraciously by manhandling his attendant.<sup>49</sup>

Such unmotivated abuse does not a good goddess make, nor a good Ptolemaic ruler. Undeserved violence cuts against the ideology of kings as *soteres*, and the unrestrained use of *bia* is condemned in Alexander historiography: Arrian, for example, reports a speech of

---

<sup>48</sup> Stephens (2015), 132 ad loc.

<sup>49</sup> I wonder whether something about the gifts themselves might have set off Artemis' outburst. ὀπτήρια, as Stephens (2015), 132 on 74 notes, are gifts given upon first seeing someone, and common occasions are gifts to young children and to brides upon their wedding. Bornmann (1968), 38 ad loc. denies that the gifts given to Artemis were nuptial gifts, but is it possible that Artemis, soon to desire to remain a virgin, spurned such gifts out of an association with marriage? At the very least we might allow Callimachus to play with this inappropriate connotation of ὀπτήρια in the case of Artemis.

Callisthenes in which he claimed that Argead kings always used to rule ‘not by force but by custom’ (οὐδὲ βίαι, ἀλλὰ νόμῳ, Arr. 4.11.6).<sup>50</sup> It is significant, then, that Artemis, now growing up, has learned to use the carrot, not the stick. The following is the persuasive speech she addresses to the Cyclopes:

‘Κύκλωπες, κῆμοί τι Κυδώνιον εἰ δ’ ἄγε τόξον  
ἦδ’ ἰοὺς κοίλῃν τε κατακληῖδα βελέμνων  
τεύξατε· καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Λητωϊᾶς ὥσπερ Ἀπόλλων.  
αἱ δέ κ’ ἐγὼ τόξοις μονιὸν δάκος ἢ τι πέλωρον  
θηρίον ἀγρεύσω, τὸ δέ κεν Κύκλωπες ἔδοιεν.’  
ἔννεπες· οἱ δ’ ἐτέλεσσαν· ἄφαρ δ’ ὠπλίσσαο, δαῖμον. (81-6)

Cyclopes, come now, for me too fashion a Cydonian bow and arrows and hollow quiver for arrows; for I too am a child of Leto like Apollo. And if I take with my bow in the hunt a lone, ravenous animal or monstrous beast, the Cyclopes would eat it.’ You spoke; they completed the job; and you donned your arms, goddess.

Artemis could have ended her demand at line 83, when she reminds the Cyclopes that she is a daughter of Leto like Apollo, for whom they already made weapons; poor Brontes’ hairless chest was even then an ever-present reminder for what Artemis could do lest they disobey her. But instead of relying on her lineage and threat of force, she promises to be their benefactor, giving them a share of the meat she catches. Once again, we are reminded of the politics of Hellenistic kings, who made food distributions significant political weapons in their alliances with cities. We might even detect in Artemis’ promise a slight against her brother Apollo. Apollo’s most famous kill with his new bow was, of course, the Python, whose slaying was narrated at the end of the hymn to Apollo (*Hymn* 2.97-104). The Python made for famously bad meat: her very name means ‘rotting.’ Artemis, however, promises that she, unlike her brother, will bring good

---

<sup>50</sup> Billows (2000), 292-3 discusses the attribution of *bia* to Alexander in Polybius 16.22a.5.

meat. Artemis, then, appears to be playing the very same political game of food provision that Hellenistic kings competed in with each other in their wars for influence.

Callimachus devotes considerable attention to the terrors of Artemis' visit to the workshop of Hephaestus, and before leaving it behind I would like to suggest a possible interpretation of this scene in light of Egyptian kingship ideology. Callimachus, we have seen, first addresses Artemis as δαίμων when she puts on her bow and arrow made for her by Hephaestus' workers. This link of Hephaestian arms to Artemis' divinity seems to me to echo the coronation of the new pharaoh in Memphis, a renowned center of metalwork,<sup>51</sup> by the high priests of Ptah, whom Greeks since Herodotus (2.2.5) identified with Hephaestus.<sup>52</sup> The earliest Ptolemy who is attested to have been crowned by Ptah's priests is Ptolemy V Epiphanes in 196. The *Alexander Romance*, however, reports a tradition that Alexander himself was enthroned 'in the holy throne room of Hephaestus' (ἐνεθρόνιζον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ τοῦ Ἥφαίστου ἱερὸν θρονιστήριον, 1.34); while scholars have vigorously debated whether Alexander actually participated in this ceremony, those arguing in favor of the coronation are picking up steam.<sup>53</sup> Even if the early Ptolemies were not crowned as pharaohs in Memphis, they certainly knew of Ptah and this important role of his: Soter's first capital was in Memphis and he maintained

---

<sup>51</sup> On the metalwork industry in Memphis see Thompson (1988), 65-7, who intriguingly notes the manufacture of 'expensive ornamental arms' (66), recalling Artemis' bow and arrows.

<sup>52</sup> For the role of the priests of Ptah and their role in the pharaoh's coronation see Thompson (1988), 138-46.

<sup>53</sup> For an overview of the debates for and against coronation see Nawotka (2017), 112-14 with bibliography.

relationships with Ptah's priests. Even more tantalizing, however, both Arsinoe II and Philotera were worshipped as *synnaoi* of Ptah in Memphis, and Ptah's high priest was also the priest of their cult.<sup>54</sup> In light of this connection between Ptolemaic kings, queens, and Ptah, I would speculate that Artemis' divine investiture at the hands of Hephaestus' laborers may intentionally evoke that of the pharaoh at the hands of Ptah's priests. On this reading, Callimachus would inflect Artemis' development as an Olympian goddess with Egyptian ideology to create a particularly Ptolemaic divine cosmos. Artemis' promise to give food to the Cyclopes could even be read as a comment on Ptolemaic patronage of Ptah's priests. Ptolemaic patronage of the priests of Memphis was, after all, a central tenet of their policy to present themselves as legitimate rulers of Egypt: they, like Artemis, knew whom they needed to feed to become gods.

### c. The Hunt Makes the Goddess

Now both accompanied and armed, Artemis heads to Arcadia to visit Pan in search of a pack of hunting dogs (87-97). Artemis' new status as δαίμων can be gauged by the difference in her reception: unlike the Cyclopes whom she had to promise meat to get her gear, Pan without ado simply gives (ἔδωκε, 94) six outstanding dogs and seven bitches. His motives are not stated, but by now they do not need to be. Like Kairatos and Tethys, Pan should rejoice to send his dogs to be Artemis' hunters, and like the Cyclopes, Pan too needs to feed his pack (89), and he might well expect Artemis to bring him a cut of the meat when she is in town. Pan's spontaneous gift serves as a paradigm for how visiting divinities, including royal ones, ought to be treated.

---

<sup>54</sup> Thompson (1988), 127.

This short scene, dominated as it is by the catalogue of Artemis' new dogs (90-7), has seemed to many readers more ornamental than important, and current scholarship seeks its significance in its intertextual relationship to the *Homeric Hymn to Pan*.<sup>55</sup> While the literary pedigree of Artemis' visit to Pan is important, to dismiss the dogs is to forget the interest of Callimachus' most significant audience, the court. Hunting, we have seen, was one of the most important activities of Hellenistic kings and their *philoi*, and so it is significant that dogs were essential to the Macedonian hunt. The number of dogs in one's pack corresponded to one's social status: in the light of nine Molossian hounds shown in the lion hunt frieze of Vergina, Artemis' pack of 13 seems truly fit for royalty.<sup>56</sup> Breed and origin were likewise important. Not only Molossian and Laconian hounds are attested in Macedonian royal hunts, but also Indian hounds starting with Alexander's campaigns east. Alexander named a city not only after his horse Bucephalus, but also his Indian hound Peritas, whom Theopompus claimed (*FGrHist* 115 F 340) killed a lion by himself in the hunt.<sup>57</sup> Dogs were also prized as gifts: the satrap Sopeithes gave Alexander 150 dogs whose skill in lion hunting he memorably demonstrated at his court (Strab. 15.1.31). Ptolemy II Philadelphus showed off his own court's prodigious skill and appetite for hunting by displaying 2,400 dogs in his grand *pompe* (Ath. 5.201b).

---

<sup>55</sup> Thomas (2011), 158 n. 21 notes a specific allusion to the *Homeric Hymn to Pan*; Faulkner (2013) looks at both texts more broadly and argues that Pan's inclusion emphasizes Artemis' liminal position between wild nature and city.

<sup>56</sup> On dogs used in Macedonian royal hunts see Tripodi (1998), 48; Carney (2002), 62.

<sup>57</sup> For anecdotes about Alexander's hunting see passages cited in Carney (2002), 62-3.

Seen in this light, Pan's 'highly unorthodox role of a dog breeder'<sup>58</sup> appears rather a Ptolemaic update to the god's traditional portrayal, the magnificent master of canines whose gift fashions Artemis as a goddess in the taste of Callimachus' audience. Callimachus' description of the six male hounds who were skilled at dragging lions back alive by their neck to their den (91-3) is not a random detail, but drawn from the most memorable hunts shared by his audience. I wonder whether Callimachus' choice detail that the dogs drag the lion, still alive, back to the αὔλιον ('grotto,' 93; cf. αὔλιν...Πανός, 87-8)<sup>59</sup> might remind this audience of their own kings' practice of bringing live game to court, the αὐλή.<sup>60</sup> The same Philadelphus put to display magnificent train of wild beasts in his grand *pompe* (Athen. 5.200d-201c). Some have suggested that these animals were kept in a zoo at court; Ptolemy VIII, at any rate, refers to an animal enclosure within the palace in his *Memoirs* (FGrH 234 F 2).<sup>61</sup> In displaying and even keeping wildlife within the court, the Ptolemies appropriated the conquered Persian court's *paradeisoi*, enclosed parks for the pleasure of the king and his companions which struck such amazement in

---

<sup>58</sup> Henrichs (1991), 136; see also Faulkner (2013), 225 who sees Pan's canine interests as emblematic of his and Artemis' liminality.

<sup>59</sup> On the interpretation of αὔλις and αὔλιον see Stephens (2015), 133 on 87.

<sup>60</sup> Philadelphus displayed tame lions and other beasts in his grand *pompe* (Ath. 5.201f); recall also the anecdote discussed above about the live snake brought to court (Diod. 3.36.4-37.8).

<sup>61</sup> Fraser (1972), 1.15 and 2.466 n. 39; Rice (1983), 87 is more cautious and notes that the two animals named in Ptolemy VIII's *Memoirs* are pheasants and guinea fowl, which may suggest he is referring to a 'breeding ground for the palace kitchens.'

Greek audiences, to witness from the historian Xenophon's accounts of them.<sup>62</sup> Far from tedious, then, this catalogue of Artemis' elite pack of hunting dogs might have entertained his audience much in the same way as modern fans revel to hear the names of their team's players called out as they enter the stadium.

Fully equipped, Artemis proves her mettle as a goddess in the hunt, and it is as a victorious hunter that she finally ascends to Olympus. Her first catch is four deer 'larger than bulls, and gold gleamed from their horns' (μάσσονες ἢ ταῦροι, κεράων δ' ἀπελάμπετο χρυσός, 102). The animals astound her (ἔταφες, 103) and she claims that 'this would be a first prey worthy of Artemis' (τοῦτό κεν Ἀρτέμιδος πρωτάγριον ἄξιον εἶη, 104). Both the worthiness of the deer and the focus on their horns recalls the deer hunt mosaic from Pella, in which two nude men, whom some have argued are Alexander and Hephaestion, are ready to slaughter a deer with their weapons as the man on the right holds the hind by the antler.<sup>63</sup> Amazingly, she does not use the marvelous dogs she just received but catches them herself (105-6). Surely, there is the practical consideration of catching the deer unharmed to pull her chariot,<sup>64</sup> but Artemis' decision to hunt these massive deer unaided mirrors the dangerous feats of strength undertaken by Macedonian and Hellenistic kings on the hunt: Alexander, for example, rebuked or punished those who tried to assist him on hunts, and Seleucus became famous under Alexander for breaking a runaway bull with his own two hands, thereafter being honored by

---

<sup>62</sup> See for example Xen. *Anab.* 1.2.7; *Cyr.* 1.3.14. For a description of the *paradeisoi* and their ideological significance see Llewellyn-Jones (2013), 92-5.

<sup>63</sup> For the image of the deer hunt mosaic, see Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulou (1981), fig. 82.

<sup>64</sup> So Bornmann (1968), 52 on 106.



being given horns on his statues (App. *Syr.* 57).<sup>65</sup> Once Artemis takes down her golden-horned prey single-handedly, Callimachus addresses her as abounding in golden armament for the hunt:

Ἄρτεμι Παρθενίη Τιτυοκτόνε, χρύσεα μὲν τοι  
ἔντεα καὶ ζώνη, χρύσεον δ' ἐζεύξαιο δίφρον,  
ἐν δ' ἐβάλεν χρύσεια, θεή, κεμάδεσσι χαλινά. (110-12)

Virginal Artemis, slayer of Tityus, golden are your weapons and belt, and you yoked a golden chariot, and you spurred on your deer, goddess, with golden reins.

It seems that Artemis' successful first hunt has itself adorned her with gold. Indeed, the transformational effects of the first successful hunt were known to Callimachus' court audience and held in high importance. A Macedonian could only recline at symposium once he had killed a boar without using nets, and this custom kept Cassander, one of the Diadochs, sitting up while eating well into his thirties (Ath. 1.18a), a damning story which Pierre Briant has argued circulated during the years of war between the Diadochs.<sup>66</sup> So too for Artemis the capture of her marvelous stags changes her outward form to match her new status as θεή.

Artemis now uses her chariot to visit Thrace and collect her final implement, a pine torch kindled by her father's thunderbolts, before beginning to shoot her bow at trees, then a beast, and finally a city of unjust men (113-28). All of these actions flow out of her identity as a hunter. Even the torch, which fulfills her request for φαεσφορία (11), should be read in connection to hunting. Some vase paintings depict Artemis using the torch as a weapon, as for example against

---

<sup>65</sup> On Alexander's and his successors' dangerous hunting feats see anecdotes and discussion in Carney (2002), 63-5.

<sup>66</sup> Briant (1991), 225. For further discussion of the importance of the first hunt see also Carney (2002), 71 n. 45 with bibliography.

deer in a red figure *pelike* (ca. 370).<sup>67</sup> Scholars have recognized how Artemis' use of Zeus's thunder to light her torch (117-18) closely connects her to him and prepares the way for her role as a city goddess who punishes transgressions of justice.<sup>68</sup> The fact that her torch can also be used as a weapon only strengthens this connection between Artemis' hunting and her father's concern with justice, and eases into her climactic final shot of the arrow, no longer at a fir or pine or beast but at a city of unjust men (122).<sup>69</sup> Bing and Uhrmeister saw clearly that it is the bow that unites Artemis' roles as goddess of the hunt and of cities.<sup>70</sup> Shifting their emphasis slightly, it is her identity as a hunter that unites her treatment of beasts and men, whether as avenger or protector.

### *iii. Olympian Etiquette and Heracles' Tryphe*

Finally Artemis arrives on her chariot<sup>71</sup> to her father's house, where we are treated to a detailed description of the gods' life on Olympus (142-69). As has long been recognized, Callimachus models Artemis' arrival on Apollo's arrival on Olympus at the beginning of the

---

<sup>67</sup> See Aguirre (2010), 140 n. 33 for discussion.

<sup>68</sup> Bing and Uhrmeister (1994), 25; Stephens (2015), 138 on 118.

<sup>69</sup> On the relationship between Artemis' punishment of the city of the unjust and Hesiod's *Works and Days* see Reinsch-Werner (1976), 74-86; see also Bornmann (1968), 64-5 on 129-35.

<sup>70</sup> Bing and Uhrmeister (1994), 24-5.

<sup>71</sup> I examine the metapoetic aspects of Artemis' chariot to Olympus below.

*Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (1-13).<sup>72</sup> yet the differences are many. In this section I aim to demonstrate the differentiation and regulation of physical space and social roles at court and the importance of etiquette to the court; from there I will suggest how Callimachus' audience might have perceived the Olympian court.

When Apollo enters his father's house at the beginning of the *Homeric Hymn*, he walks right into the dining room of the gods, who all stand up in fear until his mother disarms him and she makes him take a seat next to her (2-9). In Callimachus' hymn, security on Olympus has vastly increased: Hermes, Apollo, and lately Heracles all stand at the entrance to the court, waiting to greet the goddess and do her the honor of removing her arms and that day's catch. This is no idle detail but a necessary update to the Olympian court in light of Hellenistic court culture: only *somatophylakes* were allowed to bear arms in palaces, so Artemis must disarm at the entrance.<sup>73</sup> Olympus, it seems, has been civilized by court etiquette. Nor does it appear that all are welcome within the court past the divine guards. Artemis' Amnisian nymphs, favored as they are to her, are not invited into the palace but remain outside taking care of the horse. As in Hellenistic courts, access to Zeus's symposium is strictly limited to the highest court circle, here the gods themselves.

Petrovic has suggested that Hermes, Apollo, and Heracles play the role of *somatophylakes* in order to make the highly honorable court positions of serving the king 'more dignified' and therefore palatable to the court audience. Her argument can be strengthened, in my

---

<sup>72</sup> Bornmann (1968), 80 on 168-9; Bing and Uhrmeister (1994), 29; Stephens (2015), 143 on 168.

<sup>73</sup> See the above discussion of *somatophylakes* in the *Hymn to Zeus*.

view, by taking a closer look at the language of the passage. Callimachus tells us that Apollo waits to receive and handle the beast Artemis has caught. Or at least he used to:

πάροιθέ γε, πρίν περ ικέσθαι  
καρτερὸν Ἀλκείδην· νῦν δ' οὐκέτι Φοῖβος ἄεθλον  
τοῦτον ἔχει, τοῖος γὰρ αἰὲ Τιρύνθιος ἄκμων  
ἔστηκε πρὸ πυλέων ποτιδέγμενος, εἴ τι φέρουσα  
νεῖαι πῖον ἔδεσμα (144-8)

He did earlier at any rate, at least before the mighty Alcides (Heracles) arrived; now Phoebus no longer has this labor, for such is the Tirynthian anvil: he always stands in front of the gates awaiting you, whether you may come bearing some fat piece of meat.

Callimachus' choice of the word ἄεθλος to describe Apollo's court office, now usurped by Heracles, is clearly meant to amuse us: Callimachus is toying with the idea that the hero who completed labors (ἄεθλοι) on earth now performs another on Olympus.<sup>74</sup> Likewise tickling is the idea that Heracles has left the heroic world of battling monsters to perform the courtly, refined labors of courtly etiquette. Be that as it may, I do not think Callimachus is denigrating the socially prescribed duties of court or holding it up as inferior to the court. Far from it: by calling the titled positions of court service ἄεθλοι he suggests the dignity of their challenge and the great rewards attendant upon their completion. In effect he gestures at a courtly *cursus honorum*.

In this light we can better understand the significance of Heracles taking over Apollo's ἄεθλος, unloading whatever beast she has brought her chariot. It has been suggested that Callimachus here describes a 'succession' in the courtly office, in which Apollo has been promoted.<sup>75</sup> I would argue, however, that Heracles has not inherited Apollo's office but rather usurped it. We are told that Hermes and Apollo 'meet and receive Artemis in the vestibule'

---

<sup>74</sup> So Bornmann (1968), 71 ad loc.

<sup>75</sup> Petrovic (2017), 153.

(ἀντιόωντες ἐνὶ προμολῆσι δέχονται, 142). Heracles, however, ‘stands awaiting in front of the gates’ (ἔστηκε πρὸ πυλέων ποτιδέγμενος, 147): he has not replaced Apollo but beat him to the chase. When the gods see Heracles wrangling the beast over his shoulder, they laugh unceasingly (ἄλληκτον γελόωσι, 149). As much as they laugh at the new god’s eager appetite, they are laughing at his breach of etiquette. If we are to identify Heracles with any recognizable type at court, it would be the jester whose license to break social convention at symposia and other gatherings earned the king’s laughter.<sup>76</sup>

But of divine jokes though he may be, Heracles’ role is inestimably significant for Callimachus’ audience at the court, for his ascension to Olympus makes way for the Ptolemaic kings to enter the Olympian court themselves. First, he reached Olympus in precisely the same way as Hellenistic kings reached divinity themselves, through acting as a benefactor and savior: βάλλε κακούς ἐπὶ θήρας, ἵνα θνητοὶ σε βοηθόν / ὥς ἐμὲ κικλήσκωσιν (‘Shoot at evil beasts, so that that mortals will call you a helper, like they do me,’ 153-4). The word βοηθός, strikingly rare in Homer, the idea of kings as ‘helpers’ belongs rather to the ideology of kings as providing aid to cities.<sup>77</sup> Second, his insatiable belly makes room for Ptolemaic *tryphe* at the Olympian

---

<sup>76</sup> On the jester Tryphon attested at the court of Philopator and general remarks on such men see Berrey (2017), 54.

<sup>77</sup> For example, the Athenians in an honorary inscription honoring Callias of Sphettus (270/69) record how he interceded with Ptolemy II Philadelphus to provide help to Athens as quickly as possible (ὅ[π]ως ἂν βοήθειά τις γένηται τὴν ταχ[ί]στην, *IG II<sup>3</sup> 1.911 = SEG 28.60 ll. 48-9*). Already in the fourth century see Isoc. *Evag.* 21 (king as βοηθός to kings), 52 (king as βοηθός to cities).

table. We can see better the significance of Callimachus' hungry Heracles when we compare him to his portrayal by Theocritus. In *Idyll* 17, the poet mentions that Heracles, assisted by Alexander and Ptolemy I Soter, leaves the Olympian symposium 'already sated with fragrant nectar' (κεκορημένος ἤδη / νέκταρος εὐόδοιο, *Id.* 17.28-9), thus no longer imbibing wine like a man but the drink of the gods. Callimachus, however, makes a point of emphasizing the god's persistence as a meat-eater. After he advises Artemis to shoot at big beasts harmful to men (pigs and cows, of course!) and carries off her catch, Callimachus explains:

οὐ γὰρ ὄγε Φρυγίῃ περ ὑπὸ δρυὶ γυῖα θεωθείς  
παύσατ' ἀδηφαγίης· ἔτι οἱ πάρα νηδὺς ἐκείνη,  
τῇ ποτ' ἀροτριόωντι συνήντετο Θειοδάμαντι. (159-61)

For, although he had been made a god in his limbs beneath a Phrygian oak tree, he did make an end to his insatiable eating; still he had that famed stomach with which he encountered Theiodamas at the plough.

Bornmann suggests that Heracles' insatiable belly is a bodily defect from which deification should have freed him.<sup>78</sup> We must remember, however, that the Ptolemies made their *tryphe* and ostentatious appetites a virtue.<sup>79</sup> Callimachus has brought their earthly food to the heavenly table, so that his own luxurious kings might be said to dine like Olympians. The same point is made about the food and drink consumed by Artemis' horses: they drink water (17) and eat tripetal, or lotus, from Hera's meadow which Zeus's own horses eat (163-4). Herter has noted that Callimachus here militates against Homeric epic, where divine horses drink wine and earthly

---

<sup>78</sup> Bornmann (1968), 77 on 159.

<sup>79</sup> Compare the earlier remark of Herter ([1929] 1975), 412: 'dies Motiv [i.e. Heracles' gluttony] mußte ganz besonders zugkräftig für eine Zeit sein, die die Leistungen der großen Fresser und Trinker bestaunte und literarisch verewigte.'

horses eat lotus.<sup>80</sup> This polemic is not anemically literary but politically relevant: the Olympian court is made like the Ptolemaic so that the Ptolemies may themselves mount the Olympian chariot.

Helped by her servants and unarmed, Artemis finally enters her father's house where all the Olympian gods are gathered. Two points of ceremonial of her arrival are interesting. First, Callimachus does not mention any of the gods standing up upon Artemis' arrival. Not only do the gods leap up in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* when Apollo enters, but gods rising upon the entry of an Olympian is common in the *Iliad* as well (*Il.* 1.533 (Zeus); 15.86 (Hera)). I would suggest the reason is because Artemis is neither, like Zeus or Hera, an Olympian ruler; nor is she, like her brother, a potential threat to the order: rather, her entry while all the other gods sit down suggests her assumption of her proper place in the hierarchy. Second, all the gods call to her alike, but she sits next to Apollo: as has been noted, this scene combines two Homeric references. When Iris visits the court of the winds, all four gods stand up and call her to sit next to him (*Il.* 23.203); when Hera comes to the Olympian court in *Iliad* 15, all the gods extend her a cup, but she takes only the cup of Themis, who hurried to her first (*Il.* 15.86-8).<sup>81</sup> Personal favor again is expressed through the seating order.

#### *iv. The Counter-Gift of Friendship*

Callimachus has brought Artemis back to her father's house a powerful goddess, and in so doing he has made her Olympian ascent and the Olympian court models for his royal patrons.

---

<sup>80</sup> Herter ([1929] 1975), 414.

<sup>81</sup> References noted by Herter ([1929] 1975), 414.

What does he hope for in return for this splendid hymn? Only that he and his *philoî* belong to the city upon which she casts her kindly glance:

πότνια, τῶν εἴη μὲν ἐμοὶ φίλος ὅστις ἀληθής,  
εἶην δ' αὐτός, ἄνασσα, μέλοι δέ μοι αἰὲν ἀοιδή·  
τῇι ἔνι μὲν Λητοῦς γάμος ἔσσεται, ἐν δὲ σὺ πολλή,  
ἐν δὲ καὶ Ἀπόλλων, ἐν δ' οἷ σέο πάντες ἄεθλοι,  
ἐν δὲ κύνες καὶ τόξα καὶ ἄντυγες, αἳ τε σε ῥεῖα  
θηητὴν φορέουσιν ὅτ' ἐς Διὸς οἶκον ἐλαύνεις. (136-41)

Among these men [residents of city of the just], mistress, would that whoever is my true friend be, and I myself, queen, and would that song always be my care: in it will be the marriage of Leto, and you will be in it very much, and also Apollo, and all your labors, and your dogs and bow and chariot, which easily carry you, marvelous to behold, when you drive to Zeus's house.

Callimachus is not so gauche as to ask Artemis to be her *philos*, but the patronage he longs for is figured in precisely the terms of *philia* as gift-exchange, as he imagines the song he will always have care for. What is the nature of this gift he proposes? As Bing and Uhrmeister have described, the hymn that Callimachus prayerfully imagines that he *will* compose seamlessly becomes the hymn *he is currently singing*; for the song he would sing becomes, as it were, the chariot that Artemis drives to Olympus, where she becomes a goddess.<sup>82</sup> In my opinion, however, they too readily conclude that the future hymn is the present hymn, and that the matter of Callimachus' patronage is already realized. Promised verse does issue forth the rest of the hymn, including the all-important Olympian arrival, and yet the promise of a future song remains. This is what gives Callimachus' hymn its irresistible attraction as a gift: it gives so much and yet promises more to come, if only the goddess look favorably upon Callimachus and his *philoî*. This deferral, as we have seen, is critical to the dynamic of gift-exchange and *philia*: friends always look forward to more to come.

---

<sup>82</sup> Bing and Uhrmeister (1994), 26-8.



At the same time as Callimachus allows Artemis to begin to taste the fruits of his friendship, he makes it known that his friendship is not guaranteed. After Artemis takes her seat next to Apollo, the poet recounts all the places she dances encircled by her nymphs, and then launches into a delightfully baffling digression, set up as follows: μή νειὸν τημοῦτος ἐμαὶ βόες εἵνεκα μισθοῦ / τετράγυον τέμνοιεν ὑπ’ ἀλλοτρίῳ ἀροτῆρι (‘at that time would that my cows not be cutting fallow-land of four *guai* for a wage under another ploughman,’ 175-6). After increasing our confusion by explaining the difficulty of this farm task, Callimachus finally explains that Helios stops to watch whenever Artemis dances with her nymphs, so that his cows have to labor endlessly in the endless sun (180-2).

We owe the recuperation of this passage, long condemned as a pointless exercise of tasteless wit, to Peter Bing, who has explained how its allusions to Homer and Hesiod combine into a masterful Hellenistic riddle.<sup>83</sup> He observes that plowing is a common metaphor for composing verse, and concludes that Callimachus’ point is a *recusatio* of long Homeric epic. This interpretation, however, leaves an important question unanswered: who is the foreign ploughman under whom Callimachus hopes his cows will not work? I would argue that he is another patron of poetry *qua* ploughing. Just as Callimachus earlier proclaimed his wish that he might ever have Artemis as his song, here he wishes that he might not work for another. And how differently this foreign ploughman’s patronage is from that of Artemis! Whereas Artemis’ patronage is construed as gift-exchange in the context of *philia*, he imagines any other patronage as wage labor (εἵνεκα μισθοῦ, 175) tantamount to servitude, a disgraceful exchange of

---

<sup>83</sup> Bing (1984); cf. Bing (1988), 83-9. For discussion of the intertexts see also the comments of Stephens (2015), 144-5 on the relevant lines.

commodities rather than gifts. And this is precisely the case in the passage of the *Odyssey* to which Callimachus alludes: the suitor Eurymachus mocks the beggar Odysseus by offering him work for pay on his estate (*Od.* 18.358).

To understand this riddling passage fully, then, we must look not only at metapoetics, but the metapoetics of patronage with which Callimachus as a court poet was manifestly self-interested. Timon of Phlius, we recall, sniped at the Ptolemies in his *Silloi* by framing their patronage not in terms of *philia* but as self-interested consumption by the kings of their poets as birds for the slaughter. I suggest that Callimachus likewise takes a punch at patrons other than his divine queen, Artemis. She is a friend with whom he exchanges gifts; any other patrons – may he never have to work for them! – offer only the degrading wages of servitude.

Callimachus follows up this clever praise of Artemis’ patronage *qua* friendship by asking the goddess directly which places and persons she loves the most:

τίς δέ νύ τοι νήσων, ποῖον δ’ ὄρος εὔαδε πλεῖστον,  
τίς δέ λιμὴν, ποίη δέ πόλις; τίνα δ’ ἔξοχα νυμφέων  
φίλαο καὶ ποίας ἡρώιδας ἔσχεις ἐταίρας;  
εἰπέ, θεή, σὺ μὲν ἄμμιν, ἐγὼ δ’ ἐτέροισιν αἰείσω. (183-6)

Tell me now, which of the islands, and what kind of mountain pleases you the most, which harbor, and what kind of city? And whom of the nymphs do you love most, and what kind of heroines do you have as companions? You tell me, goddess, and I will tell the rest.

I agree with Petrovic that Callimachus’ request for Artemis to state her favorites among various categories of locales and companions would seem to resonate with his audience’s experience of favoritism in the court society; indeed, that Callimachus makes such a show of asking these questions suggests the personal investment of court members in the politics of favor.<sup>84</sup> In this

---

<sup>84</sup> Petrovic (2017), 150.

light, the request with which Callimachus caps his enquiries is especially significant: ‘you tell me, goddess, and I will tell the rest’ (186). It has long been acknowledged that Callimachus’ question-and-answer style here and at other points in the *Hymns* is markedly innovative within the hymnic genre.<sup>85</sup> Here, in my opinion, we can discern a social motivation for his innovation, for by posing as Artemis’ interlocutor who will then transmit her words to others, he claims a position of exclusive, preferential favor. At the end of the hymn to Apollo we saw Phthonos be kicked away by the god after uttering impious words against Callimachus’ gift; here we see Callimachus stationing himself at Artemis’ ear, claiming the privilege of her personal conversation. And what he wants to know more than anything is the hierarchy of her favor; he positions himself as the goddess’s friend who has privileged knowledge of her friendship.

We have seen in this section that Artemis takes a very Ptolemaic journey to Olympus, and that there the Ptolemies’ ancestor Heracles has made room for Ptolemaic *tryphe*; we have seen as well that Callimachus portrays his gift of song as the means by which Artemis becomes a fully-fledged Olympian goddess. He presents himself as Artemis’ friend privileged to speak with her before the others; I would suggest that by analogy he lays claim to that same favor from his Ptolemaic patrons. What counter-gift, then, is appropriate for divinization? Access to the divine.

---

<sup>85</sup> Bornmann (1968), 88-89 on 186 discusses this passage in relation to earlier poet’s addresses to the Muses. In the *Hymns* the closest parallel for Callimachus’ request of Artemis is *Hymn* 1.7, where Callimachus asks Zeus whether the Cretans or Arcadians are lying about his being born in their territory. For an analysis of Callimachus’ staging of his conversation with the gods and goddesses in the *Hymns* see Petrovic (2007), 144-50.

## II. Poet Between City and Sovereign: Callimachus' Hymn to Delos as Political Capital

In the hymn to Artemis, Callimachus showcases his role as an agent of deification, bringing Artemis and Heracles to Olympus in Ptolemaic style. The hymn to Delos also brings new gods into being, namely Apollo and also, as we shall see, Ptolemy II Philadelphus. But the major honorand is Delos, the island and goddess who allowed Apollo's mother Leto to give birth to her son on her land when no other place would, and who first praised Apollo as a god. As I shall demonstrate, however, Callimachus forges a clear analogy between Delos' praise of the new god Apollo and Delos' later role in voting divine honors to Ptolemy I Soter. In this way Callimachus' hymn to Delos is a gift for her role not only in the mythical past, but also in the political present. The hymn's central message, therefore, is a powerful one for Greek cities throughout the world: if you grant divine honors to the Ptolemies, you will yourself be raised to the blessed company of the divine, too.

This is the longest and most structurally complex of the *Hymns*, and a brief summary of the hymn's narrative will therefore be helpful to understand how my discussion fits into the context of the whole.<sup>86</sup> Callimachus hymns the island-nymph Delos, who offered herself as a place for Leto to give birth to Apollo. At that time Delos freely roamed the Aegean Sea and was called Asteria, 'Starry,' for she had jumped down from heaven to escape Zeus's attempts at rape; from that point on she wandered the sea. During this time the goddess Leto, pregnant by Zeus with Apollo, was also traversing the Mediterranean in search of a place to deliver her baby boy,

---

<sup>86</sup> Many scholars have outlined the structure of the hymn: the diagrams of Stephens (2015), 158 and Giuseppetti (2013), 12 I have found particularly helpful.

since Zeus's jealous wife Hera was threatening destruction upon any place that would welcome Leto to give birth. During Leto's wanderings her unborn son Apollo delivers two prophecies from the womb: one for the city of Thebes, another to 'another god' (θεὸς ἄλλος, *Hymn* 4.165), Ptolemy II Philadelphus, who will be born on Cos and fight the Gallic mercenaries with him. Immediately after Apollo delivers this prophecy he directs his mother to go to the island-nymph Asteria, wandering the nearby sea. Asteria offers herself willing to Leto; after a long labor Leto gives birth, and Asteria delivers a hymn to herself, proclaiming that she will now be Delos ('Clearly Visible') to all, the most beloved place to any god, and she will no longer wander. Callimachus concludes the hymn by praising the many worshippers from then on who have brought their gifts to the island; she has indeed proven to be the dearest place to any god.

Much scholarship has been done on the hymn's formal and literary aspects, especially Callimachus' reworking of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* and Pindar.<sup>87</sup> More pertinent to my research question, however, is the hymn's role in the deification of Ptolemy II Philadelphus. Bing and Stephens have demonstrated that Callimachus aligns Apollo's birth narrative with Egyptian myth and ideology of the birth of Horus.<sup>88</sup> More recently scholars have illuminated how Callimachus' hymn reflects the contemporary political significance of Delos in the Ptolemies' competition for preeminence among the Hellenistic kings. Massimo Giuseppetti and Michael Brumbaugh in particular have both shown how Callimachus' hymn collapses Delos'

---

<sup>87</sup> For intertextual and structural studies of the hymn see especially Bing (1988), 94-128; Depew (1998); Nishimura-Jensen (2000); Slings (2004); Ukleja (2005).

<sup>88</sup> Bing (1988), 128-39; Stephens (2003), 114-21.

mythical history with its contemporary political history in various respects.<sup>89</sup> My aim is to examine how Callimachus positions himself as a broker of political and cultural capital between both the Ptolemaic court and Delos. While in the previous hymns Callimachus has angled for a position of personal distinction at court, in this hymn he vies for something more: honors not only from the divine kings Apollo and Ptolemy, but also from the city of Delos as well.

*i. The Traffic in Delian Praise*

The beginning of Callimachus' hymn lays out an intricate series of exchanges of two kinds of valuable speech, praise on the one hand, and hymns or song on the other. I have printed the passage below with words related to song or hymn in bold and words related to praise underlined:

τὴν ἱερὴν, ὦ θυμέ, τίνα χρόνον τηποττ' **αἰέσεις**  
 Δῆλον Ἀπόλλωνος κουροτρόφον; ἧ μὲν ἅπασαι  
 Κυκλάδες, αἱ νήσων ἱερώταται εἰν ἀλὶ κεῖνται,  
 εὐμυνοὶ· Δῆλος δ' ἐθέλει τὰ πρῶτα φέρεσθαι  
 ἐκ Μουσέων, ὅτι Φοῖβον **ἀοιδάων** μεδέοντα  
 λοῦσέ τε καὶ σπείρωσε καὶ ὥς θεὸν ἤνευσε πρώτη.  
 ὥς Μοῦσαι τὸν **ἀοιδόν** ὃ μὴ Πίμπλειαν **αἰέσει**  
 ἔχθουσιν, τῶς Φοῖβος ὅτις Δῆλοιό λάθεται.  
 Δῆλῳ νῦν οἴμης ἀποδάσσομαι, ὥς ἂν Ἀπόλλων  
 Κύνθιος αἰνήσει με φίλης ἀλέγοντα τιθήνης. (*Hymn* 4.1-10)

My spirit, (for?) what time...will you **sing** holy Delos, Apollo's nurse? Truly all the Cyclades, which lie as the holiest of islands in the sea, are **well-hymned**; but Delos expects to carry off the first-fruits from the Muses, since she both washed and swaddled Phoebus, who rules over **songs**, and was first to praise him as a god. Just as the Muses hate **the singer** who does not **sing** Pimpleia, so Phoebus hates whoever forgets Delos. I now bestow upon Delos her allotted share of **song**, so that Apollo Cynthios may praise me for taking heed of his dear nurse.

<sup>89</sup> See Giuseppetti (2013), 26-33; Brumbaugh (2019), 171-6.

The text of the first line is corrupt and its precise sense remains unclear: is Callimachus asking his spirit about when it will sing of Delos, for how long, both, or is the text even more corrupt than this?<sup>90</sup> Fortunately, the rest of the proem clearly elucidates the exchanges of praise and song in which I am interested, and so I will leave the question of the first line to the side. In what follows, I first sketch out the series of exchanges in this complex passage, and then consider their significance for Callimachus' positioning in the political economy of the court.<sup>91</sup>

Lines 2-6 explain that Delos expects to receive the prize of a hymn from the Muses. Her reason for this is that she was the first to praise Apollo as a god (ὥς θεὸν ἤμινεσσε πρώτη, 6). Apollo is the 'ruler of songs' (ᾠοδόων μεδέοντα, 5); and so, of all the Cyclades, which are the holiest islands and well-hymned (εὐσμνοί, 4), Delos 'expects to carry away the first-fruits of the Muses' (Δῆλος δ' ἐθέλει τὰ πρῶτα φέρεσθαι / ἐκ Μουσέων, 4-5). What are τὰ πρῶτα ἐκ Μουσέων? Pfeiffer understands them as prizes (ἄεθλα), and his interpretation is supported by many passages where a victor in a competition τὰ πρῶτα φέρεται ('carries away the first things,' i.e. prizes) *vel sim.*<sup>92</sup> More specifically, the prize for which Delos is vying for along with

---

<sup>90</sup> For an overview of the scholarly approaches to the text see Mineur (1984), 50-2 and Stephens (2015), 179 ad loc.

<sup>91</sup> On this passage now see Brumbaugh (2019), 168.

<sup>92</sup> Pfeiffer's *index vocabulorum* s.v. πρότερον cites this usage as τὰ πρῶτα (*sc.* ἄεθλα); *Il.* 23.538 is the closest comparandum, and Giuseppetti (2013), 49 n. 12 provides an ample list of others. Mineur (1984), 54 ad loc. rejects Pfeiffer's interpretation on the grounds that 'no contest [is] at stake'; in my opinion this overlooks both the possibility that the competition between islands is metaphorical and the importance of festivals in the Ptolemaic background of the hymn.

other islands comes ‘from the Muses’ (ἐκ Μουσέων, 5) and is, in other words, a hymn; D’Alessio’s translation ‘le primizie dalle Muse’ nicely captures this meaning of τὰ πρῶτα.<sup>93</sup> In exchange, then, for Delos’ gift of the first praise of Apollo as a god, she expects to receive the first-prize hymn from the Muses, since Apollo is the ruler of songs (ᾠοδᾶων μεδέοντα, 5).

Delos’ praise (ἤνεσε, 6) of Apollo long ago is now being reciprocated by a counter-gift of song by Callimachus: ‘to Delos I now bestow her allotted share of song’ (Δήλωι νῦν οἴμης ἀποδάσσομαι, 9). What is Callimachus’ motivation for offering Delos this gift? It stems from the power of Apollo, who as ᾠοδᾶων μεδέων has the power to punish or reward singers. Apollo, we learn, ‘hates the singer who forgets Delos’ (8); Callimachus offers his hymn to Delos now instead ‘so that Apollo Cynthios may praise me for heeding his dear nurse’ (ὥς ἄν Ἀπόλλων / Κύνθιος αινῇσσι με φίλης ἀλέγοντα τιθήνης, 9-10). The proem boils down to the following exchange of praise and hymn: Delos praised Apollo, Callimachus now hymns Delos, Apollo should praise Callimachus.

What significance would Callimachus’ exposition of this complicated series of exchanges have had for his audiences? Michael Brumbaugh has made an attractive suggestion that Callimachus in this hymn ‘emphasizes poetic honors as negotiated commodities in terms reminiscent of the diplomatic idiom in which kings, *koina*, and *poleis* navigated the rapidly shifting political landscape.’<sup>94</sup> I would like to build on his idea by substantiating the claim that Callimachus is drawing on ‘diplomatic idiom’ in the proem. As a result, I hope to demonstrate

---

<sup>93</sup> D’Alessio (1996), 131; followed by Stephens (2015), 180 ad loc.

<sup>94</sup> Brumbaugh (2019), 163-4.



that Callimachus presents himself as a politically valuable poet in his patron Ptolemy's arsenal for interstate relations.

Let us consider the terms in which Callimachus couches Delos' praise of Apollo as a god: ὡς θεὸν ἤνεσε πρώτη (6). The words ὡς θεὸν ἤνεσε echo the language used to describe the awarding of divine honors to kings. The verb ἤνεσε recalls the ubiquitous use of the compound verb ἐπαίνεσαι in honorary inscriptions 'to praise' individuals, including Hellenistic kings.<sup>95</sup> Callimachus, however, seems to allude more pointedly to the Nicouria decree (*IG* XII.7.506; *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 390), generally dated to ca. 280 BC,<sup>96</sup> which records the resolution of the League of Islanders to establish a quinquennial, isolympic festival in honor of Philadelphus and his parents, the *Theoi Soteres*. In the decree the Islanders take care to emphasize that they 'all honored the Savior Ptolemy with divine honors earlier' (πᾶσι τοῖς νησιώταις τετιμηκόσιμ προ[τερ]/[ον τ]ὸν σωτῆρα Πτολεμαῖον ἰσοθέοις τιμαῖ[ς], ll. 27-8); if we accept the restoration προ[τερ]/[ον], the Islanders claim is that that they awarded divine honors to Soter 'earlier' than Alexandria did.<sup>97</sup> Callimachus too lends special emphasis to Delos being the first to praise

---

<sup>95</sup> See for example *IMT* 389.12-13 (Skepsis, Asia Minor, 311/10 BC, honoring Antigonos), *IG* XII Supp. 168.5 (Ios, ca. 306-301 BC, honoring Antigonos).

<sup>96</sup> On the date of the inscription Fraser (1972), 1.224 with 2.372-3 n. 279. Hazzard (2000), 47-58 has attempted to down-date the inscription to 263, but his hypothesis has not met with support: see Hauben (2004) and the review of Chaniotis (2007).

<sup>97</sup> Scholars have long been divided over whether to read προ[τερον] or πρώ[τοις] (or even πρώ[τον]). The difference is significant, for on the latter readings the Islanders would boast that they were the first ever in the Greek world to honor Ptolemy Soter as a god, i.e. before Rhodes in

Apollo as a god by delaying πρώτη to the end of the line.<sup>98</sup> I would argue, then, that Callimachus deliberately runs together the mythic past and the political present: Delos' first address of Apollo as a god is replayed and renewed by Delos and the Islanders' early vote of divine honors to Ptolemy I Soter.

This analogy we have identified (Delos:Apollo::League of Islanders:Ptolemy) points up a political significance for Callimachus' position in the series of exchange of praise and song between Delos and Apollo:Ptolemy. Callimachus' cultural capital of song offered to Delos is in fact highly valuable political capital for Ptolemy. The cultural capital that Callimachus offers Delos requites her gift of first, or early, praise of Ptolemy as a god. Specifically, Callimachus expresses his hope that Apollo Cynthios might honor him 'for taking heed of his dear nurse' (φίλης ἀλέγοντα τιθήνης, 10). This adjective φίλης suggests that the relationship between Delos and Apollo, and by analogy Delos and Ptolemy, is one of *philia*, which was the idiom of interstate relationships between Hellenistic kings and their cities. Callimachus thus positions himself as a valuable broker of politicized cultural capital flowing from Ptolemy's house to his 'friend,' Delos. In this way, Callimachus positions himself as playing the role of a *philos* of Ptolemy himself, for the king's 'friends' were his informal ambassadors between the court and the cities outside it.

---

304. For clear discussion of the history and significance of the arguments on both sides, see Hauben (2010), 114-18, who reports a recent consensus reached by scholars for reading *omicron* instead of *omega* based on autopsy of the squeeze.

<sup>98</sup> Mineur (1984), 56 on 6 notes that 'forms of πρώτος are never found at the end of the line in Homer or Hesiod...'

It is also possible to see significance in the relationship that Callimachus creates between the Muses, Apollo, and his song. We have seen that the song that Delos expects for praising Apollo does not in fact come from Apollo: it comes from the Muses (τὰ πρῶτα.../ ἐκ Μουσέων, 4-5). Apollo, however, is the ‘ruler of songs’ (ᾠοδῶν μεδέοντα, 5), and he hates the singer who forgets Delos, and so Callimachus, in order to win Apollo’s favor, offers Delos song from the Muses. Is this triangulation of Muses, Callimachus, and Apollo not analogous to that of the Museum, Callimachus, and Ptolemy? For the members of the Museum were members of Ptolemy’s court, and the Ptolemies had asserted themselves as the legitimate arbiters of cultural production, as we saw in the first chapter. In this light, we can be more specific still about τὰ πρῶτα.../ ἐκ Μουσέων which Delos expects to receive for praising Apollo: she expects to receive a song from a poet of the Alexandrian Museum, Ptolemaic cultural *qua* political capital.<sup>99</sup> In fact, Callimachus seems to flaunt his hymn’s Museum provenance at a key point when he breaks off from his chaotic narrative to ask the Muses a tangential question about the relationship between nymphs and trees. He queries the Muses directly, saying ἐμαὶ θεαὶ εἴπατε Μοῦσαι... (‘My goddesses, tell me, Muses...,’ 82); he then seems to channel their reply in lines 84-5.<sup>100</sup> Mineur has noted that Callimachus’ appellation of the Muses as ‘my goddesses’

---

<sup>99</sup> For a similar idea developed in a different way see Mineur (1984), 54 on 4f., who thought that the hymn commemorated Philadelphus’ induction to the Museum, and so τὰ πρῶτα ἐκ Μουσέων was Callimachus’ first offering to him as a Museum member.

<sup>100</sup> Whether the words are the Muses’ own or Callimachus’ is a vexed issue: see the full discussion of Bing (1988), 40-4, and Stephens (2015), 195 ad loc. prudently concludes that there is likely an intentional ambiguity, comparing *Hymn* 1.7.

(ἐμαὶ θεαί) is unparalleled.<sup>101</sup> It is hard not to see here a nod to Callimachus' privileged position within the Museum which gave him personal access to the Muses.<sup>102</sup>

So far we have seen that Callimachus positions his hymn as Ptolemaic cultural *qua* political capital valuable both to Delos and to Apollo:Ptolemy. In lines 9-10, he reveals that praise is what he expects in return: Δήλωι νῦν οἴμης ἀποδάσσομαι ὥς ἂν Ἀπόλλων / Κύνθιος αἰνήσῃ με φίλης ἀλέγοντα τιθήνης ('To Delos I now bestow her allotted portion of song, so that Apollo Cynthios may praise me for taking heed of his dear nurse,' 9-10). As before, the verb αἰνέω recalls the language of honorific decrees, this time of poets. In a recent talk Ivana Petrovic has compared this passage to a number of inscriptions resolving to praise (ἐπαινέσαι) poets for hymns and other poetry they have offered celebrating local cults and civic history. She attractively suggests that Callimachus here gestures towards his hope for Delian honors and an honorary inscription.<sup>103</sup> To build on her argument, I would like to point to the significance that

---

<sup>101</sup> See Mineur (1984), 118 on 89.

<sup>102</sup> Morrison (2011), 343-4 points out the specific similarity to the question and answer structure of Callimachus' dialogue with the Muses in *Aetia* 1-2 and wonders whether the reader is meant to think of this work. He rightly notes, however, that chronology renders such a line of interpretation speculative. I would add, though, that surely in the later reception of both the *Hymn to Delos* and *Aetia* 1-2 this connection would come quite naturally to audiences with any passing familiarity of Callimachus' oeuvre.

<sup>103</sup> Petrovic in a 2019 talk entitled 'Local Historiography and Hellenistic Poetry,' given at the eighth *Simpósio de Estudos Clássicos da US* on the subject of Greek and Latin Historiography. In particular she cites honorary decrees awarded by Delos containing the infinitive ἐπαινέσαι for

Callimachus wishes to be praised not by Delos herself, but by Apollo Cynthus, i.e. Delian Apollo (Cynthus is the mountain on Delos). Throughout the proem we have seen Apollo serve as an analogy for Ptolemy. In this way Apollo Cynthus collapses Ptolemy and Delos and unites his expectation for both of their praise under a single sign. If Claude Meillier's attractive hypothesis that Callimachus originally wrote the hymn for the Delian *Ptolemaia* is correct,<sup>104</sup> then Apollo Cynthus' vote of praise would indeed be that both of Ptolemy and of Delos.

## ii. Weaving Delos Into Empire

After these intricate first ten lines Callimachus begins to deliver on his promise and furnish a hymn valuable as cultural and political capital to Delos, Apollo, and Ptolemy all at once. In this sub-section I will focus now on how Callimachus fashions a hymn that is valuable to both Delos and Ptolemy together.

Delos, we recall, expects to win the first-fruits of the Muses; By line 28, however, Callimachus still does not know what kind of hymn she wants to receive. So, he asks her: εἰ δὲ λίην πολέες σε περιτροχώωσιν ᾠοδαί, / ποίηι ἐνιπλέξω σε; τί τοι θυμῆρες ἀκοῦσαι; ('But if very many songs run round you, into what sort of song will I weave you? What are you eager to hear?', 28-9). Festivals had been celebrated on Delos for centuries, and cities from across the world sent the island *theoroi* ('embassies') which included choruses whose song and dance

---

both Demoteles, son of Aeschylus (*IG* XI, 4, 544 = Chaniotis 1988, E 53) and Amphiclos, son of Callistratos (*IG* XI, 4, 572 = Chaniotis 1998, E 55), and Amphicles, son of Philoxenus (*ID* 1497 = Chaniotis 1988, E 72).

<sup>104</sup> Meillier (1979), 180-91.

celebrated the island and her gods.<sup>105</sup> The verb περτροχόωσιν, as Cahen suggests, draws on choral imagery and portrays ‘very many songs’ dancing around Delos.<sup>106</sup> These songs really were many: in addition to those of Pindar and Bacchylides cited by the scholiast, the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* and many others celebrated Delos.<sup>107</sup> Never one to follow in another’s footsteps, Callimachus changes the metaphor of the dance and asks Delos ‘Into what sort of song shall I weave (ἐνιπλέξω) you? (29). This weaving metaphor gets purchase on the well-worn etymology of ὕμνος (‘hymn’) from ὑφαίνω (‘to weave’). As Mineur argues, Callimachus’ image is that of weaving Delos into a larger fabric of song.<sup>108</sup> His further suggestion, however, that Callimachus minimizes Delos’ role in the song is unpersuasive; just as picture frame does not minimize a painting, but enhances it, so too Delos’ choice of fabric shows how she wishes to be glorified. To judge from the hymn that follows, Delos wants Callimachus to weave her into a Ptolemaic song. In fact, Callimachus’ metaphor of weaving neatly figures his own work as a hymnist of bringing Delos to rest as an island ‘woven into’ the Ptolemaic fold.

As I described in this section’s introduction, Delos spends most of the hymn wandering the seas without roots. Michael Brumbaugh has made the attractive suggestion that Delos’ geographical instability bespeaks her shifting political affiliations in the decades and centuries

---

<sup>105</sup> The *locus classicus* for such *theoroi* is Thuc. 3.104.3-6, who describes the embassies of the Athenians to Delos, including choruses of women and boys.

<sup>106</sup> Cahen (1930), 162, followed by Stephens (2015), 185 ad loc.; *pace* Mineur (1984), 76 ad loc.

<sup>107</sup> Mineur (1984), 76 ad loc. provides a convenient assemblage of Delian songs.

<sup>108</sup> Mineur (1984), 77 ad loc.

before Callimachus' hymn.<sup>109</sup> His observation can be corroborated by examining the itinerary that Callimachus traces for a typical day in Delos' life. In lines 41-50, Callimachus describes her sailing first along the coast of Attica; then we hear of her rejecting the Macedonian coast of Chalcidice; finally we learn that she may be found at Sounion in Attica (again) or off Chios or Samos, both islands off the coast of Asia Minor. For Callimachus' audience these locations evoke several of her key imperial affiliations from the late sixth to early third centuries, as an island under the Persian empire, as the center of Athens' Delian League, and most recently subject to Antigonid rule from Macedonia in the League of Islanders founded by Antigonus Monophthalmos.

What finally brings Delos' geographical wandering in the hymn to the end is nothing less than Apollo's prophecy of the birth of Ptolemy II Philadelphus on Cos; for, after praising 'Ptolemy-to-be' (ἔσσομένε Πτολεμαῖε, 188) for twenty-eight lines, Apollo abruptly turns to tell his mother Leto about the island of Delos wandering the seas and instructs her to give birth to him there. Scholars have noted that Apollo's prophecy for Philadelphus serves as the narrative hinge after which Delos finally comes to rest.<sup>110</sup> I believe we may take this argument one step further: Apollo's song for Philadelphus is the larger fabric into which Delos wishes to be woven in Callimachus' metaphorical image from the beginning of the hymn. The birth and reign of Philadelphus prophesied by Apollo mirror Apollo's own birth and rule depicted after the prophecy, but because Apollo's prophecy for Philadelphus precedes his own birth, on the level of narrative it is as if Apollo's birth and reign is in fact patterned on that of Philadelphus, rather

---

<sup>109</sup> See Giuseppetti (2013), 26-33; Brumbaugh (2019), 171-6.

<sup>110</sup> Schmiel (1987), 54; cf. Giuseppetti (2013), 13.

than vice versa. For example, Apollo prophesies that ‘both lands and the islands that lie the sea will come under his (Philadelphus’) diadem, **not unwilling** to be ruled by a Macedonian’ (ὦν ὑπὸ μίτρην / ἴξεται οὐκ ἀέκουσα Μακεδόνι κοιρανέεσθαι / ἀμφοτέρη μεσόγεια καὶ αἱ πελάγεσσι κάθηνται, 166-8).<sup>111</sup> Peter Bing has noted a parallel with this passage in Apollo’s instructions to his mother Leto, when he says ‘you will come upon her, **willing**’ (κείνην γὰρ ἐλεύσεαι εἰς ἐθέλουσαν, 195). In chronological time, Delos’ willingness to Apollo precedes the world’s willingness to be ruled by Ptolemy; but in the proleptic temporality opened up by Apollo’s prophecy, Delos’ willingness seems in fact to follow *after* the world’s embrace of Ptolemaic rule.

Callimachus manipulates chronology to similar effect in the way that he caps both Apollo’s prophecy for Philadelphus and Delos’ hymn for herself after Apollo has been born. Apollo ends his praise for the future Ptolemy as follows:

ἔσόμενε Πτολεμαῖε, τὰ τοι μαντήια Φοίβου.  
αἰνήσεις μέγα δὴ τι τὸν εἰσέτι γαστέρι μάντιν  
ὕστερον ἥματα πάντα. (188-90)

Ptolemy to be, these are Phoebus’ prophecies for you. Greatly **you will praise** the prophet still in the belly later, for all days.

The praise that Philadelphus will give Apollo – note the use of αἰνέω as in the proem – is still to come later (ὕστερον, 190) when Apollo predicts it. Nevertheless, Apollo is a prophet:

---

<sup>111</sup> As Stephens (2015), 207 ad loc. has shown, Apollo’s description is rooted in both Greek and Egyptian ideology which intersect fittingly in the image of ‘both lands’ (ἀμφοτέρη μεσόγεια); these may be either understood as Europe and Asia, whose separation in prehistory was a particularly Greek idea, and Upper and Lower Egypt, which were ruled together by the single pharaoh. On the ‘two lands’ in Egyptian ideology see Stephens (2003), 238-41.



Philadelphus' praise is secured. In this way Callimachus enriches the unborn god Apollo with an endless (ἤματα πάντα, 190) supply of future praise from another unborn god, Philadelphus, and Philadelphus' praise paradoxically invests Apollo with divinity in the narrative time of the hymn. Callimachus echoes this climactic moment in the hymn when later Delos hymns herself after she has helped Leto give birth to her son. She claims that no place on earth will ever be as dear (πεφιλήσεται, 270) to a god as she is to Apollo, and concludes by saying καὶ ἔσσομαι οὐκέτι πλαγκτή ('And **I will be** no longer wandering,' 273). It is hardly a coincidence that in the very same breath as Delos proclaims that she will take her rest in the Cyclades, where still to this day she lies, that she recalls Apollo's address of 'Ptolemy-**to-be**' (ἔσσόμενε Πτολεμαῖε, 188). In Callimachus' song, Delos is already anchored to the future rule of Ptolemy Philadelphus.

In this hymn, then, Callimachus does more than incorporate a hymn to Philadelphus within a hymn to Delos; rather, he performs the miraculous feat of weaving Delos' mythical history into the larger fabric of his song of the Ptolemaic empire. I would like in closing to revisit the weaving metaphor with which this sub-section began: ποίηι ἐνιπλέξω σε; ('Into what sort of song shall I weave you?,' 22). For the readers of Callimachus' collection, this phrase takes on another meaning: the larger song-fabric is also Callimachus' *Hymns*. Being woven into Callimachus' book not only secures her the possibility of being performed by readers forever after; it anchors her in the Ptolemaic court whose image Callimachus has been building hymn by hymn.

### III. Conclusion

In this chapter I hope to have shown how vigorously Callimachus participated in the project of turning his patrons into gods and how acutely aware he aimed to make them of his poetry's value in their role. In the hymn to Artemis he makes the goddess' trek up Olympus analogous to the steps needed to secure power in the Ptolemaic court society; Artemis' development thus casts the Ptolemies' ascent at court as the process of their deification. In the hymn to Delos, Callimachus publicizes the honors that await cities who grant the Ptolemies divine praise. In return, he requests the greatest gift that each party can offer: civic honors from Delos and privileged, exclusive access from his divine patrons. These, he assures them, will be gifts that keep on giving: his song for Artemis will never end, and he has woven Delos into his poetic book where she shall forever more be read as the center of his Ptolemaic song.



## Chapter Four

### Friends, Be Warned! Courtly Transgression in the Hymns to Athena and Demeter

In this chapter I consider the final two hymns of the collection, to Athena and to Demeter. Already in antiquity the two hymns were apparently received as a pair,<sup>1</sup> and modern scholars have demonstrated ample points of contact between them.<sup>2</sup> Both are mimetic hymns for goddess composed in the literary Doric dialect.<sup>3</sup> Both, more strikingly, center around inset narratives about young men who transgress against the goddesses: Teiresias, the son of Athena's closest friend, accidentally sees the goddess naked at the bath; Erysichthon, a young prince, tries to cut down Demeter's sacred forest to build a dining room to host his friends at feasts.

For the most part these hymns have been examined separately with an eye toward their literary qualities.<sup>4</sup> Recently, however, scholars have begun to consider the two hymns together and examine their broader social significance. In her monograph on queen Berenice II Dee

---

<sup>1</sup> Stephens (2015), 22 argues persuasively that Apollonius of Rhodes' juxtaposition of episodes involving Phineus and Paraebius in *Argonautica* 2 alludes to Callimachus' doomed young men, Teiresias and Erysichthon in the *Hymns*.

<sup>2</sup> Hopkins (1984), 13-17 provides an extensive list of precise correspondences (38 on his count) between the hymns to Athena and Demeter.

<sup>3</sup> Parsons (2011), 141-5 discusses the use of Doric in these hymns; see also Stephens (2015), 26-7.

<sup>4</sup> For example, Heyworth (2004), 163-7 considers the two hymns as akin to a pair of tragedies, specifically *Oedipus Tyrannos* and *Bacchae*; how this pair fits into the larger book of *Hymns* is left unexplored.

Clayman argues that these goddesses' punishments of their male transgressors may be read as offering positive models for Berenice's murder of her first husband, Demetrius the Fair, who allegedly had an affair with her own mother.<sup>5</sup> While Clayman considers these hymns' possible significance for a single queen, Petrovic, treating the Olympians as analogies for Ptolemaic rulers more broadly, examines their function in Callimachus' poetic book, centered as it is on the family unit.<sup>6</sup> While the earlier hymns delineate an ordered, harmonious Olympian family, the final two hymns, she argues, focus on the destruction of families as a result of transgression against the gods.

My aim in this chapter is to examine the significance of Teiresias' and Erysichthon's transgressions for the Olympian court society which Callimachus' *Hymns* have so far elaborated and which serves as an analogy for the Ptolemaic court. Teiresias' offense in the hymn to Athena is to see what is unlawful, the goddess' naked body. I argue that in this hymn Callimachus inscribes the fundamental prohibition of the court society, that of seeing the divine king, into the Olympian court in order to furnish a model for the practice of this custom by his Ptolemaic patrons. Then, through a close analysis of the gifts that Teiresias receives from Athena in compensation for his punishment, I suggest that Callimachus fashions the young man as an analogy for himself as a court poet. The hymn to Demeter rounds out the collection with a particularly Ptolemaic theomachy: Erysichthon attempts to position himself as a divine king who provides his friends with endless feasts. I thus argue that Callimachus ends his *Hymns* by staking

---

<sup>5</sup> Clayman (2014a), 79-89. I discuss the Demetrius affair at length in the next chapter.

<sup>6</sup> Petrovic (2016), 171-3.

out *tryphe* and feasting as the prerogatives of his own divine patrons and warning any who would compete with them.

### I. Crime, Punishment, and the Limits of Power in the Hymn to Athena

In the mimetic Hymn to Athena, the speaker directs the ritual bath of the cult statue of Athena in Argos. Hearing the goddess' chariot approach, he directs a group of maidens to come out of the temple and prepare the water for her bath.<sup>7</sup> While the girls are tending to these ritual preparations and Athena's statue is still on her way, the speaker addresses those of us in the crowd as 'Pelasgian' (Πελασγέ, *Hymn* 5.51)<sup>8</sup> and commands us not to look upon the goddess' statue naked as it is brought in. He explains the reason for this prohibition with the story of the Theban Teiresias. This young man, who was the son of Athena's favorite nymph Chariclo, happened upon Athena one day while she and his mother were bathing. Athena swiftly took away his sight, and Chariclo launches into a lament in which she inveighs against the goddess for her cruelty.

Until recently most scholars have joined in Chariclo's attack upon the goddess and described Athena in this hymn as acting harshly and without feeling.<sup>9</sup> Keyne Cheshire, however, has offered strong arguments recuperating Athena's good name, which I summarize here: (1)

---

<sup>7</sup> For the Argive festival, see Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1924), 2.14; Bulloch (1985), 8-12.

<sup>8</sup> On the ability of 'Pelasgian' to signify both a local Argive audience and a pan-Hellenic one, see Cheshire (2014), 61-2.

<sup>9</sup> See for example Bulloch (1985), 188 on 80; Morrison (2005), 36-8.

according to Athena the ‘Cronian laws’ (Κρόνιοι...νόμοι, 100) require that Teiresias be punished, and she is powerless to change these laws; (2) Athena tells Chariclo that the punishment she has exacted from Teiresias is far more lenient than the one that Artemis will mete out to her own *philos*, Actaeon, for the same crime, for Artemis will have Actaeon turned into a stag and mauled by his own hunting dogs; (3) in keeping with her friendship with Chariclo, Athena offers Teiresias compensation for his blindness in the form of many gifts, including prophecy, long life, and sentience among the dead.<sup>10</sup> In sum, Athena does not offer Chariclo a shoulder to cry on, but we should not expect her to; instead, she offers a rational self-defense and superabundant compensation.<sup>11</sup>

Cheshire concludes that the inset narrative’s purpose is to demonstrate to Callimachus’ audiences the general point that Athena’s favor will be a boon to them in the inevitable misfortunes they will experience in life.<sup>12</sup> We should keep in mind, however, the specific reason for the speaker’s tale: to prevent us from looking upon the goddess naked. This regulation may seem unduly specific and to bear no resonance beyond its ritual context; McKay, for example, writes, ‘I suspect that it would be difficult for the *literati* of the third century B.C. to imagine a more innocuous offence than the accidental sight of a goddess at her bath.’<sup>13</sup> And yet when we

---

<sup>10</sup> Cheshire (2014), 69-77 for discussion; see also the balanced discussion of Stephens (2015), 234.

<sup>11</sup> Cheshire (2014), 72.

<sup>12</sup> Cheshire (2014), 78.

<sup>13</sup> McKay (1962a), 34.

look at the language in which the speaker couches the prescription, far-reaching consequences for the court begin to suggest themselves. Here is what the speaker says to the worshippers:

ἀλλά, Πελασγέ,  
φράζεο μὴ οὐκ ἐθέλων τὰν βασιλειαν ἴδης.  
ὅς κεν ἴδῃ γυμνὰν τὰν Παλλάδα τὰν πολιοῦχον,  
τῶργος ἐσοφεῖται τοῦτο πανυστάτιον. (*Hymn* 5.51-4)

But, Pelasgian, take care not to look upon the queen against your will. Whoever looks upon Pallas, the keeper of the city, naked, he will look upon Argos for the last time.

We should note that he does not describe Athena as a θεά ('goddess'), but as a βασίλεια ('queen'). The word is used of divine and mortal rulers alike, their point in common being their royalty.<sup>14</sup> In effect this word opens up an analogy between the Olympian goddess Athena and the Ptolemaic queens and kings whose divinity has by this point in the collection been celebrated outright: in the hymn to Delos Ptolemy II Philadelphus was announced by Apollo as 'another god.' We saw in the first chapter that the Ptolemies and other Hellenistic kings took various measures to conceal themselves from public view, making their appearance a rare privilege analogous to the epiphany of an Olympian god.<sup>15</sup> In this light, the speaker's injunction 'Take care not to look upon the *basileia* against your will' (52) suggests that one should act towards Athena as one acts towards a Ptolemaic ruler and *vice versa*.

---

<sup>14</sup> *Contra* Bulloch (1985), 160 ad loc., who argues that βασίλεια 'denotes Athena's sacral authority'; it is her authority as a queen.

<sup>15</sup> For a discussion of this point in relation to the *Hymns* see Petrovic (2017), 147-8.



*i. Chariclo as Court Favorite*

Callimachus begins the tale of Teiresias with an eleven-line description of Teiresias' mother Chariclo and her relationship of *philia* with Athena. McKay rightly draws attention to this opening as eye-catching: indeed, in what we can tell of the only extant earlier literary version of the myth Pherecydes of Athens simply described Chariclo as 'dear' (προσφιλής) to the goddess.<sup>16</sup> McKay considers Callimachus' emphasis on Chariclo's friendship with Athena 'a strange opening to a cautionary tale'<sup>17</sup> and suggests that its function must be to rouse our pity for Chariclo and her son. Who in Callimachus' audience would especially feel compassion for Chariclo? Following Petrovic, I suggest it would be the Ptolemies' *philoï*, their courtier-friends.<sup>18</sup>

Indeed, closer examination of Callimachus' portrait of Chariclo and Athena reveals that Chariclo is fashioned as the Ptolemaic *philos par excellence*. The speaker introduces Chariclo to the girls preparing the bath as follows: παῖδες, Ἀθαναία νύμφαν μίαν ἔν ποκα Θήβαις / πουλύ τι καὶ περὶ δὴ φίλατο τᾶν ἑταρᾶν ('Girls, Athena once loved one nymph of her companions in Thebes much and exceedingly well,' 57-8). Scholars have primarily tried to identify literary models for Chariclo's friendship with Athena,<sup>19</sup> but for Callimachus' audience what would have

---

<sup>16</sup> The myth is earlier told by Pherecydes, who comments simply οὔσαν γὰρ τὴν Χαρικλῶ προσφιλῇ τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ ([Apollod.] 3.6.7); see Depew (1994), 423 for discussion.

<sup>17</sup> McKay (1962a), 37.

<sup>18</sup> Petrovic (2017), 151-2.

<sup>19</sup> Hadjitoffi (2008), 30 suggests that Callimachus may allude to the friendship of Leto and Niobe preserved in a fragment of Sappho: Λάτῳ καὶ Νιόβᾳ μάλα μὲν φίλαι ἦσαν ἑταῖραι, fr. 142 V.

With only this line extant, however, this possibility is difficult to evaluate.

been more immediately striking was the courtly flavor of Chariclo's friendship. The verb φιλεῖν (φίλατο, 58) gets purchase on royal *philia*; so too the description of Athena's nymphs as her ἑταῖραι ('companions') suggests the Macedonian court title of *hetairos*, which is still attested in the Hellenistic period.<sup>20</sup> Callimachus is emphatic in using these courtly terms: he calls Chariclo a *hetaira* three times in the hymn (69, 95, 119), the last time in the mouth of Athena herself. Moreover, the language of friendship and favoritism in the story's opening couplet echoes that used in the *Hymn to Artemis*: τίνα δ' ἔξοχα νυμφέων / φίλαο καὶ ποίας ἡρώιδας ἔσχεῖς ἑταίρας; ('Which of the nymphs did you love above the others, and what sorts of heroines did you keep as companions?,' *Hymn* 3.184-5). Callimachus is determined, it appears, to portray the friendship of goddesses as analogous to court friendship.

Nor do the parallels between Chariclo's relationship and that of a favorite courtier stop there. Callimachus illustrates their *philia* by naming activities that they share: they are always together (59), they drive their chariots and visit many towns (60-64), they dance together (66-7), they even undress and bathe together (70-4). Fotini Hadjitoffi looks for parallels to these activities in literature and argues that the goddess and nymph share an asymmetrical relationship akin to that of an *erastes* and *eromenos*.<sup>21</sup> Yet closer parallels from the life of kings and their courtiers suggest themselves. The first is traveling together to cities outside the court center. Hellenistic kings and queens took care to be seen traveling with an entourage; we need only

---

<sup>20</sup> See for example Athen. 5.261c (citing Timon of Phlius' description of the philosopher Persaeus as a *hetairos* of Antigonos Gonatas).

<sup>21</sup> Hadjitoffi (2008), 30-3; see also Bulloch (1985), 167 on 60-5 citing Sappho's description of places traveled by court friends together.

recall the ithyphallic hymn sung by the Athenians for Demetrius Poliorcetes (Ath. 7.253d-f) examined in the previous chapter, in which the king is praised as being surrounded by his *philoï* like stars among the sun. Like Chariclo and Athena the Ptolemies and their *philoï* also shared in raising and racing horses: Posidippus, for example, composed an epigram for a horse-racing victory of Callicrates of Samos at Delphi (*Hippika* 74 AB), which ends with Callicrates dedicating his victory to the *Theoi Adelphoi* Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II, who were his patrons and in whose cult Callicrates served as the chief priest. In addition to racing, anecdotes from the Hellenistic courts also reveal that kings and *philoï* danced together: we need only recall the anecdote from Demetrius of Scepsis (Ath. 155b) about Antiochus III dancing the *pyrriche* with his *philoï* at a symposium, which we considered in the first chapter.

Chariclo is not just any *philos*, however: she is Athena's favorite above all her *hetairai* (58). Athena's favoritism manifests itself in how much access she grants Chariclo to her person: the two are never apart (59) and Chariclo is allowed to gaze upon Athena's naked body during the bath, fully partaking in her *charis* as befits her name. Chariclo approaches the very threshold of equality with the goddess. The detail that Athena 'many times set her [Chariclo] upon her own chariot' (πολλάκις ἃ δαίμωνιν ἐν ἑῷ ἐπεβάσατο δίφρῳ, 65) is not merely decorative, but an important symbol of status.<sup>22</sup> In the first hymn, we saw that Zeus placed Kratos and Bia next to his *diphros*; in the third hymn, Artemis' *diphros* is made of gold and only ever ridden by her as far as we are told. Athena, in setting Chariclo at her side on her own *diphros*, thus grants her a privilege signifying a status higher than that enjoyed by any *philos* in the *Hymns* so far.

---

<sup>22</sup> It may be relevant that, as Bulloch (1985), 173 ad loc. observes, the phrase is rooted in Homeric phraseology, but the transitive use of the middle is unparalleled until *Orph. Arg.* 1195.

ii. Cronian Laws and the Legitimation of Court Ceremonial

Imagine Chariclo's distress, then, when her supposed friend blinds her son for accidentally stumbling upon them bathing together on Mt. Helicon! The speaker labels this act a breach of natural law: 'he saw what was not lawful' (εἶδε τὰ μὴ θεμιτά, 78).<sup>23</sup> Stephens notes that the concept of θέμις is regularly invoked in descriptions of gazing upon areas of the body normally kept clothed.<sup>24</sup> It was also established principle that mortals could only see gods, both male and female, when the immortals themselves chose.<sup>25</sup> Not only do myths like that of Zeus and Semele demonstrate this, but there are even inscriptions detailing punishments met by those who spied upon gods.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> On the meaning of θέμις here see Bulloch (1985), 186 ad loc. with further bibliography.

<sup>24</sup> Stephens (2015), 257 on 78.

<sup>25</sup> So Bulloch (1985), 213 ad loc.: 'What Athena here formulates as religious code is part of what had always been traditional belief.' Stephens (2015), 257 on 78 notes parallels for the description of Athena's breast and loins as τὰ μὴ θεμιτά; Bulloch at 185-6 ad loc. situates the passage in a broader discussion of θέμις as natural law in Greek thought.

<sup>26</sup> See especially *TAM* II 174, an inscription (Sidyma, 150-200 CE) recording a mythological oration in which is recounted an *aetion* for the practice of shouting out greetings to Apollo before entering his cave: *TAM* II.174c9-da6 describes how 'some woman wishing to gaze upon the god suddenly without a sound' (καθοπτεῦσαι θελήσασά τις ἄφνω / ἀποφῆτι vac. τὸν θεὸν κατη- / νέχθη, c.16-da.2) was destroyed, and a stone serves as a reminder of the danger of spying upon the god. Although the inscription is dated to the reign of Commodus, sacred regulations

Callimachus' innovation is to make Athena cite this principle as a law promulgated by Cronus that requires her to punish Teiresias:

δί᾽α γύναι, μετὰ πάντα βαλεῖ πάλιν ὅσσα δι' ὀργάν  
εἶπας· ἐγὼ δ' οὐ τοι τέκνον ἔθηκ' ἀλαόν.  
οὐ γὰρ Ἀθαναίαι γλυκερὸν πέλει ὄμματα παιδῶν  
ἄρπάζεν· Κρόνιοι δ' ὥδε λέγοντι νόμοι·  
ὅς κε τιν' ἀθανάτων, ὅκα μὴ θεὸς αὐτὸς ἔληται,  
ἄθρήσῃ, μισθῶ τοῦτον ἰδεῖν μεγάλῳ. (97-102)

Excellent woman, take back everything that you said in anger. I did not make your child blind, for seizing the eyes of children is not a sweet thing for Athena. But the Cronian laws say thus: 'Whoever catches sight of any of the immortals when the god himself does not choose, he sees at great price.'

Scholars have explained the significance of the label 'Cronian laws' in two ways. For McKay, Cronus, the father of Zeus, represents the savage, child-eating ruler whom Zeus overthrew in the *Theogony*; the Cronian laws are thus a remnant of his tyrannical reign.<sup>27</sup> Other scholars, however, point to the long tradition in the Greek imagination of Cronus' rule in the Golden Age as a time of εὐνομία, 'good order' through laws.<sup>28</sup> I will argue that both valences of the Cronian laws are valid and key to Callimachus' project.

First let us consider how the Cronian laws are represented before Callimachus in Plato; given Plato's importance to Callimachus as recently demonstrated by Acosta-Hughes and

---

preserved on stone tend to be conservative, so we may presume the regulation itself is older than the inscription. I thank Ivana Petrovic for pointing me toward this inscription.

<sup>27</sup> McKay (1962a), 43-4.

<sup>28</sup> Bulloch (1985), 212 on 100; Stephens (2015), 259 ad loc. It is worth noting that Callimachus even delivers the 'law' in legal style (ὅς ἄν..., qualifying clause, form of οὗτος + inf.); see Bulloch (1985), 212 on 101-2 with parallels.

Stephens,<sup>29</sup> these passages repay investigation. In *Gorgias* Socrates tells a story, which he considers an ἀληθής λόγος ('true account,' 523a), about a dispute between Pluto and Zeus over the quality of men passing to the underworld. To introduce his story, Socrates cites a νόμος περὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ Κρόνου, καὶ αἰεὶ καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἔστιν ἐν θεοῖς ('law concerning men in the time of Cronus, [which] exists among the gods both forever and now,' 523a). Just as in Callimachus' hymn, the Cronian laws here are eternal. The law which Socrates goes on to cite (523a-b) is concerned, like the one in Callimachus, with human conduct and justice: men who live justly pass in death to the islands of the blessed, while those who are unjust suffer in Tartarus. In the *Laws* Plato offers a more general discussion of the Cronian laws: the Athenian locutor explains Cronus appointed *daimones* to rule over men, since mortals are unable to refrain from wanton violence and injustice if they hold power (713c-e). At the core of Cronus' political order is maintaining justice among men through a hierarchical separation of mortals from immortals. The Cronian law which Athena cites is of a piece with this principle. By demanding great punishment for mortals who see a god unwilling to be seen, the law strictly divides gods from men.

In my opinion Callimachus' audience would have readily perceived an analogy between this Cronian law and the same policing of access to the king and queen at court. Historical sources tell of kings granting or withholding audiences at their pleasure: Apelles, for example, the courtier of Philip V, learned he had finally fallen from the king's favor by being barred entry from the court by the king's guards, who pretended on the king's orders that the king was indisposed at the moment (Polyb. 5.26.9-11). Callimachus writes this court rule into the Cronian laws in order to provide a valuable Olympian precedent for the Ptolemies' employment of

---

<sup>29</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012), 23-83.

ceremonial. After all, if there were a social practice which desperately wanted a Greek exemplum, it was the king's restriction of his person. We saw in the first chapter that the first king in Greek imagination, Deioces, creating his kingship and court with the fundamental prohibition that no one should see the king and thus think him greater than he actually was (Hdt. 1.99.1). His custom was practiced by subsequent Persian kings and captured the attention of many Greek writers in the Classical period.<sup>30</sup> Greeks knew that the Ptolemies' ceremonial was both ancient and non-Greek. I would suggest, therefore, Callimachus makes this regulation a Cronian law in order to portray it simultaneously as ancient and associated with the tyrannical Cronus whom Zeus overthrew, and as connected to the just rule of the Golden Age.

In this light, Athena's response to the necessity of following the Cronian law, even in the case of her favorite companion's son, is a powerful delineation of power at court. 'I did not make your child blind,' Athena says to Chariclo; 'Snatching away the eyes of children is not sweet to Athena' (ἐγὼ δ' οὐ τοι τέκνον ἔθηκ' ἀλαόν. / οὐ γὰρ Ἀθαναΐαι γλυκερὸν πέλει ὄμματα παίδων / ἀρπάζειν, 98-100). As McKay notes, we are moved to *pity* Athena for having blinded Teiresias!<sup>31</sup> Athena has no power to exempt her dearest friend's son from punishment: anyone

---

<sup>30</sup> See Llewellyn-Jones (2013), 44-8 for discussion. For example, Heraclides of Cumae discussed how the prohibition impacted dining arrangements (Ath. 4.145a). An exception to the rule reported by Ctesias demonstrates how vital the Greeks understood the provision to be. One general, Arbaces, had a eunuch help him to see Sardanapallus, the legendary last king of the Assyrians who fully embodied the ideal of *tryphe*; the king allowed him to see him, but only with difficulty (Ath. 12.529a).

<sup>31</sup> McKay (1962a), 44.

who sees her when she does not wish it must be heavily punished, lest the entire division between men and gods established in the age of Cronus collapse. So too, analogy suggests, the Ptolemies cannot, must not, and will not make exceptions for any *philoï* to the rules of access: there are no exceptions to the necessity of the ruler's will to be seen.

*iii. Teiresias, Court Poet*

Athena makes this sticky situation right to Chariclo in two ways. First, she tells Chariclo that she has meted out a lesser punishment to Teiresias than Artemis will later to her own *philos* Actaeon for the same crime: Artemis will turn him into a stag hunted by his own dogs, and his mother will search for his scattered bones (103-18). As Petrovic has observed, Callimachus here seems to make the case that his own divine patrons, by analogy, are charitable in their exercise of necessary boundary-patrol.<sup>32</sup> I would further her suggestion by pointing to the way that Athena introduces the many gifts that she will give to Teiresias in recompense. She says, 'to this one [Teiresias] many other gifts of honor will remain for your sake (τῷδε γὰρ ἄλλα / τεῦ χάριν ἐξ ἐμέθεν πολλὰ μενεῦντι γέρα, 119-20). Bulloch explains that ἄλλα has appositional force and claims that the sentence means "besides" the relative lightness of the punishment Tiresias will receive πολλὰ γέρα.'<sup>33</sup> But I would follow McKay, however, and suggest instead that Tiresias' blindness is hereby construed as a γέρας, a mark of honor,<sup>34</sup> and that she transforms his punishment into a reward. By analogy, Callimachus suggests that court ceremonial works in

---

<sup>32</sup> Petrovic (2017), 151, comparing Artemis' cruelty to that of Alexander the Great.

<sup>33</sup> Bulloch (1985), 230 ad loc.

<sup>34</sup> McKay (1962a), 47.



favor of those who, like Chariclo, are extremely close to their divine kings and queens: the rules apply, but creative solutions may be found – so long as one is truly dear to the king or queen. In this way Callimachus makes court ceremonial palatable to his *philoï* and increases their investment in the system.

Now let us consider the ‘many other gifts of honor’ that await Chariclo’s son:

μάντιν ἐπεὶ θησῶ νιν ἀοίδιμον ἔσσομένοισιν,  
ἧ μέγα τῶν ἄλλων δὴ τι περισσότερον.  
γινώσεται δ’ ὄρνιθας, ὅς αἴσιος οἷ τε πέτονται  
ἄλιθα καὶ ποίων οὐκ ἀγαθαὶ πτέρυγες.  
πολλὰ δὲ Βοιωτοῖσι θεοπρόπα, πολλὰ δὲ Κάδμωι  
χρησέῃ, καὶ μεγάλοις ὕστερα Λαβδακίδαις.  
δωσῶ καὶ μέγα βάκτρον, ὃ οἱ πόδας ἐς δέον ἀξεῖ,  
δωσῶ καὶ βιότῳ τέρμα πολυχρόνιον,  
καὶ μόνος, εὖτε θάνῃ, πεπνυμένος ἐν νεκύεσσι  
φοιτασεῖ, μέγῳ τίμιος Ἀγεσίλῃ. (121-30)

[Many other gifts of honor will await him,] since I will make him a prophet sung about by future generations, far exceeding the others, I assure you. He will have knowledge of birds: which one is a good omen, which ones fly without any meaning, and of what sort their wings are not good [to see]. He will deliver many oracles to the Boeotians, and many to Cadmus, and later to the great Labdacids. I will give him a great staff, too, which will direct his feet as he needs; I will give him, too, a long limit to his life, and he alone, when he dies, will wander still breathing among the dead, honored by the great Leader of Men.

Teiresias plays a starring role in Greek literature, most memorably as the sentient prophet among the shades in *Odyssey* 11, and the prophet of Thebes in many an Attic tragedy, including *Oedipus Tyrannos*. Yet his gifts have special relevance in the context of this courtly hymn written by the court poet Callimachus; Callimachus turns our attention in this direction by saying that Teiresias will be ἀοίδιμον ἔσσομένοισιν (‘sung about by future generations,’ 121).<sup>35</sup> Teiresias’ prophetic

---

<sup>35</sup> Pace Bulloch (1985), 232 ad loc., noting that ἀοίδιμον is prosaic, says it is ‘neutral, =

“renowned”.’

specialization in augury connects him to the poetry and scholarship of the Hellenistic court: as Stephens notes, Posidippus wrote *Oionoskopika* (21-31 AB) on bird omens and Callimachus himself wrote a prose work *On Birds*.<sup>36</sup> Indeed, augury connects him directly to kings: he delivers oracles to king Cadmus and his royal descendants the Labdacids, and even in death he will be honored by the Leader of Men, Hades (Ἀγροίλαι, 130). In the *Hymns*, too, we have seen the divine king especially associated with birds and their omen-reading poets: in the hymn to Zeus we saw Zeus choose the eagle as his messenger, and Callimachus prays that Zeus send favorable omens to his own friends (*Hymn* 1.68-9). As readers of the *Hymns* collection, then, we are prepared to see Teiresias as a model for Callimachus, bird-reading court poet.

Teiresias' staff, too, merits our attention in light of the hymn's court context. Bulloch adduces to this passage *Odyssey* 11.91, in which Teiresias is described as χρύσεον σκῆπτρον ἔχων ('holding a golden scepter'). Teiresias' staff styles him as possessing an authority that places him on a kind of par with the scepter-wielding kings whom he serves. If this linking of poet and king is beginning to sound Hesiodic to our ears, we are not alone. McKay reminds us that Athena and Chariclo are bathing on Mt. Helicon (71, 90), and so we are firmly on the Muses' mountain, where Hesiod was given his staff by the Muses (σκῆπτρον, *Th.* 30).<sup>37</sup> While McKay speculates that Callimachus might be intending a humorous contrast between Hesiod's 'useless badge of office' and Teiresias' useful staff (cf. ἐς δέον, *Hymn* 5.127), there is deeper significance. Callimachus, I suggest, is construing Teiresias' initiation as a poetic initiation *à la* Hesiod. In so doing Callimachus aligns Hesiodic Teiresias closely with himself, for in *Aetia* 1-2

---

<sup>36</sup> Stephens (2015), 261 on 123.

<sup>37</sup> McKay (1962a), 48.

he dreams, famously, that he has been rejuvenated and transported to Helicon, where he converses with the Muses (*Aetia* fr. 2).<sup>38</sup> Far from punishing Teiresias, then, Athena has extolled him as high as man can go: she has made him a court poet.

We have seen in this examination of the hymn to Athena that, once again, Callimachus has carved out a distinctive position for himself at his patrons' side. By presenting the prohibition against seeing the βασίλεια Athena as an irrevocable law of Cronus, he legitimates his divine patrons' Persian-style restriction of access by means of Greek precedent. Far from condemning Athena's adherence to the Cronian law, Callimachus praises it as the means by which she richly rewarded her companion's son and made him highly honored. I would like to suggest in conclusion how we might understand Teiresias' blindness in analogy to Callimachus' position as a poet at court. By being made blind, Teiresias has received a great reward indeed. He has gotten to see Athena's beauty, and now that he is blind he can no longer transgress the Cronian law. He is thus allowed special access to the divine: he can interpret their will unlike anyone else, and he is honored (τίμιος, 130) by Hades. Callimachus seems to suggest that he, too, is able to share in such a close relationship with his divine kings and queens. He is immune to the restrictions that he in this hymn suggests apply to everyone else.

---

<sup>38</sup> Whether or not Callimachus underwent a Hesiodic initiation in the *Aetia* has been hotly debated: see the discussion of Cameron (1995), 362-73.

## II. On (Not) Feasting Like the Gods: *Tryphe* and Court Prerogatives in the Hymn to Demeter

The last of the *Hymns*, a mimetic hymn for Demeter, centers like the *Hymn to the Bath of Pallas* on a doomed young man, Erysichthon. Whereas Teiresias saw Athena naked unwittingly, Erysichthon is fully complicit in his crime. The hymn's speaker is a woman<sup>39</sup> directing the ritual procession of Demeter's *kalathos*, or ritual basket, full of sacred items through the city towards the shrine.<sup>40</sup> The ritual's participants have been fasting from food and drink, just like Demeter when she wandered the ends of the earth searching for her daughter Kore; but the speaker cuts herself off from telling this story, so as not to bring a tear to the goddess' eye. Instead, saying it is better to praise Demeter's gifts of law and agriculture (*Hymn* 6.18-20), she launches into the story of Erysichthon, the son of king Triopas who dared to try cutting down trees in Demeter's sacred grove. The goddess punished him with an insatiable hunger which drained his parents' house dry and led them in the end to cast him out onto the streets to beg for scraps. Reaching the end of the story the speaker offers prayers for the goddess to provide a bountiful harvest, riches, and to protect the city.

As with the rest of the hymns, scholars have overwhelmingly focused on its literary aspects and interpretation. Much attention, for example, has been paid to Callimachus' sources

---

<sup>39</sup> In *Hymn* 6.124 the first-person plural verb indicates that the speaker is a member of the all-female procession. On the feminine voice of the hymn see Bing (2009), 55-9.

<sup>40</sup> The hymn's ritual seems clearly to belong to the celebration of a Thesmophoria: see Hopkinson (1984), 32-43; Stephens (2015), 264-7.

for the Erysichthon myth,<sup>41</sup> his allusions to the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*,<sup>42</sup> and the relationship of the hymn to Philitas of Cos' *Demeter*.<sup>43</sup> Carl Müller and others in his wake have identified the hymn's primary function as metapoetic; they argue that Demeter is an allegory for Callimachean aesthetics, and ravenous Erysichthon her un-Callimachean antagonist.<sup>44</sup> Recently, however, questions about the hymn's social and political contexts have come to the fore, for example, how the identification in cult with several Ptolemaic women, notably Philotera, affects our interpretation of Demeter in the hymn.<sup>45</sup> In this section I will focus, however, on the significance of Erysichthon's insatiable appetite in the Ptolemaic court context, where food and feasting were highly politicized. Acosta-Hughes and Stephens have noted the similarity of Callimachus' Erysichthon narrative to fourth-century comedy lambasting the excessive consumption of kings, and they suggest that Callimachus' hymn might be read as offering a serio-comic protreptic to

---

<sup>41</sup> See especially McKay (1962b); Hopkinson (1984), 18-31.

<sup>42</sup> Bing (2009), 51-5.

<sup>43</sup> Spanoudakis (2002), 142-243; Heyworth (2004), 146-53.

<sup>44</sup> Müller (1987). Bing (1996) = (2009), 49-64 and Murray (2004) develop further metapoetic interpretations of the hymn as *l'art pour l'art*. Differently, Faulkner (2011) gestures toward a deconstructive reading, claiming that Erysichthon's emaciated poverty at the end of the tale also recalls Callimachean aesthetics: 'the tale serves as a warning not just of narrative transgression, but also of the fine line between competing poetic aesthetics' (92).

<sup>45</sup> Clayman (2014a), 84-9 reads Demeter as a model for Berenice II. On this subject see Kidder (forthcoming).

the powerful not to transgress.<sup>46</sup> In this section I consider how Eryichthon's lust for feasting and his punishment might be read in terms of the Ptolemaic ideology of *tryphe*, 'conspicuous consumption.' Eryichthon's punishment, I argue, is a protreptic against those who would compete with the Ptolemies as divine feasters.

The speaker tells us that when the good *daimon* (δέξιος δαίμων, 31)<sup>47</sup> grew angry with Triopas' family, 'the worse plan caught hold of Eryichthon' (ἃ χείρων Ἐρυσίχθονος ἄψατο βωλά, 32). The definite article here implies that 'the worse plan' was well-known. Indeed, the myth of Eryichthon or his father Triopas cutting down Demeter's sacred trees was traditional,<sup>48</sup> and scholars have noted the clear overtones of sexual violence in Eryichthon's crime.<sup>49</sup> Less attention, however, has been paid to the reason for which Eryichthon fells the trees. We should first consider the company in which Eryichthon attacks the grove, for it is highly revealing of his motivations. We are told that he attacks the grove with twenty men:

σεύατ' ἔχων θεράποντας εἴκοσι, πάντας ἐν ἄκμῃ,  
πάντας δ' ἀνδρογίγαντας ὅλαν πόλιν ἄρκίος ἄραι,  
ἀμφοτέρων πελέκεσσι καὶ ἀξίναισιν ὀπλίσσας... (33-5)

He rushed [to the forest] in the possession of twenty attendants, all in the bloom of youth, all Giant-men capable of razing an entire city, having armed them with both double- and single-headed axes...

---

<sup>46</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012), 135-7; see also Stephens (2015), 264.

<sup>47</sup> For the idea and its relation to ἄτη see Hopkinson (1984), 107-8 ad loc.

<sup>48</sup> Hopkinson (1984), 18-26.

<sup>49</sup> See Bing (1996), 32 n. 12 = (2009), 52 n. 12; Clayman (2014a), 86.

Hopkinson notes that twenty is a ‘standard number for groups of followers,’<sup>50</sup> but a passage that he cites in support of this idea suggests a more pointed significance to the number here than he allows. In the hymn to Artemis Callimachus reports that the goddess requested and collected twenty Amnisian nymphs (*Hymns* 3.15). Could Erysichthon be positioning himself as a god? The fact that he is a *theomachos* going after Demeter’s trees certainly would support the idea. So too does Callimachus’ designation of his attendants as θεράποντες. The word usually designates servants of the gods (LSJ s.v. 1), but in the Hellenistic period *therapeia* was commonly used to describe a king’s retinue and/or bodyguard.<sup>51</sup> Erysichthon’s approach to the forest makes a statement in and of itself: he, too, wishes to be a divine ruler.

When Demeter perceives the shriek of one of her trees, she assumes the form of her priestess Nicippe and tries to intercede with Erysichthon. He rebuffs her with the following threat:

‘χάζεϋ’, ἔφα, ‘μή τοι πέλεκυν μέγαν ἐν χροὶ πάξω.  
ταῦτα δ’ ἐμὸν θησεῖ στεγανὸν δόμον, ὧι ἐνὶ δαΐτας  
αἰὲν ἐμοὶς ἐτάροισιν ἄδην θυμαρέας ἄξω.’ (53-5)

‘Step back,’ he said, ‘lest I fix this great axe in your flesh. These [trees] will form my roofed chamber, in which I will always host pleasing meals for my *hetairoi* in abundance.’

No other extant version of this myth mentions these plans of endless dinner parties,<sup>52</sup> and scholars have interpreted them variously: some have argued that Erysichthon’s motivation is

---

<sup>50</sup> Hopkinson (1984), 109 on 33.

<sup>51</sup> Strootman (2014), 39 with references at n. 29. The term *therapeia* is so prominent that Bickerman (1938), 36 even considered it the technical term for the Seleucid court.

<sup>52</sup> McKay (1962b), 101; Ambühl (2005), 167.

banal;<sup>53</sup> others have noted that it makes his traditional punishment with unceasing hunger a fine act of poetic justice on Demeter's part.<sup>54</sup> I would like to suggest that Erysichthon's desire to host endless feasts for his companions is, like his possession of a twenty-man posse, marks him as a *theomachos*, and a specifically Hellenistic one at that.

We saw in the first chapter that the Ptolemies adopted *tryphe*, 'conspicuous consumption,' as their characteristic imperial virtue: they showed off their endless supply of grain and largesse by making large gifts of grain to cities and hosting lavish feasts for crowds. Erysichthon wishes to position himself similarly as a divine, Ptolemaic king. Callimachus indicates with the adverbs αἰεί ('always,' 55) and ἄδαν ('in abundance,' 55) that Erysichthon plans his banquet hall to be the site of endless, pleasing consumption. And whom does he wish to feast? His *hetairoi* of course (ἐτάροισιν, 55), that term we have encountered so many times so far in the *Hymns*, which evokes the 'friends' who made up a king's court.

Erysichthon's goal of feasting his *hetairoi* accords with Ptolemaic ideology of kingship: it is the way he tries to realize this aim that makes it a χείρων βωλά, and, even more, anti-Ptolemaic. The Ptolemies, likely starting with Soter, vigorously promoted the worship of Demeter: they named a village on the east of the city Eleusis after the site of the Mysteries in Attica, established a Thesmophorion for her worship, and sponsored festivals in her honor.<sup>55</sup> Nor did they stop there: the Ptolemies even incorporated a succession of royal women into the

---

<sup>53</sup> Müller (1987), 15-16.

<sup>54</sup> Ambühl (2005), 167-8; Faulkner (2011), 88-9.

<sup>55</sup> See Fraser (1972), 1.199-201 and Stephens (2010), 58 for an overview of Demeter's worship in Alexandria.



goddess's cult and in some cases modeled their public image after the goddess. The most notable of these women Philotera, Arsinoe II, and Berenice II.<sup>56</sup> Partly this alignment with Demeter seems motivated by a desire to promote the queen as Isis, the pharaoh's consort and Demeter's Egyptian counterpart. But the move is also legible in Greek terms, for identifying Ptolemaic women with the goddess of grain recognized their role as securing the Egyptian land's fertility and their generous provision of grain; and this *polytrophia* was a major reason why cities awarded them divine honors in the first place. In sum, the Ptolemies assumed Demeter's central functions but did so while maintaining her worship.

Erysichthon charts the opposite course, for rather than worshipping Demeter to receive abundantly from her, he seeks to deprive her of her divine honors and appropriate them for himself. It has not been sufficiently acknowledged in scholarship that Erysichthon's motive, feasting his friends, is intricately bound to his crime. Twice the hymn's speaker asks her fellow participants in Demeter's procession to join her in a refrain which hails the goddess as πολυτρόφος ('much nourishing,' 2, 119) and πολυμέδιμνη ('of many bushels of wheat,' 2, 119). Whose wood would better house Erysichthon's feasts than those of Demeter, the goddess of plenty herself? Erysichthon knows full well whose shrine (ἱερόν, 49) he is cutting down trees from; if there were any doubt, Demeter removes it by coming in the form of her priestess Nicippe to warn him. In making timber of Demeter's trees for his banquet hall, I suggest that

---

<sup>56</sup> Philotera was associated in cult with Demeter, as we know from Callimachus' *Ektheosis Arsinoes*; two streets in Alexandria were named after Arsinoe *Thesmophoros* and *Eleusina*, both suggesting her assimilation in cult to those aspects of Demeter; and Berenice II featured motifs of the goddess on her coins, including grain, poppies, and cornucopiae.

Erysichthon wishes to make himself not only equal in divine honor to Demeter, but even superior to her. Demeter describes his attack on her grove as ‘plundering’ her temple (ἐκκεραΐζεις, 49), a word drawn from the field of military conquest and despoliation.<sup>57</sup> He is waging theomachy in the full sense of the word.

In his impious attempt to become πολυτρόφος Erysichthon acts as a foil for the Ptolemaic rulers who promoted and aligned themselves with Demeter. Callimachus’ speaker never mentions the Ptolemies by name; nevertheless, at several points she alludes to their connection with the goddess with plays on words. The first of these has been recently discussed by Dee Clayman. The name of the priestess Demeter disguises herself as, Nicippe (Νικίππα, ‘Victorious with Horses’), an uncommon name, evokes the name Berenice (Βερενίκη, ‘Bearing Victory’).<sup>58</sup> Clayman argues that the Berenice Callimachus alludes to is Berenice II, whose victories in pan-Hellenic chariot races were highly publicized. There were, however, two other earlier Berenices, the wife of Soter, Berenice I, and the sister of Philadelphus and Arsinoe II, Berenice Syra. Her suggestion, however, may be lent further support by the hymn’s second Ptolemaic word play. In the catalogue of the unfathomable animals Erysichthon consumes in his hunger, the penultimate entry is two horses: καὶ τὰν ἀεθλοφόρον καὶ τὸν πολεμήϊον ἵππον (‘both the prizewinning mare and the war horse,’ 109). Is it only coincidence that the mare is ‘prize-winning’ (ἀεθλο-φόρος) just like Berenice ‘brings victory’ (Βερε-νίκη) in horse racing, while the male is ‘martial’ (πολεμήϊος) like Πτολεμαῖος, a ‘warrior’ king? Bergk sought to

---

<sup>57</sup> See LSJ s.v. κεραΐζω 1.

<sup>58</sup> Clayman (2014a), 87 listing three other attestations of the name Nicippe at 207 n. 37.

emend the line, objecting that in Greece the same horses were used for both racing and fighting; an allusion to the Ptolemaic king and queen strongly suggests the line should stay as is.<sup>59</sup>

Rather than speculate on which Berenice and Ptolemy these illustrious horses may reflect,<sup>60</sup> I think it important to emphasize the more general point that Erysichthon, in his all-consuming hunger, devours horses who emblemize the Ptolemaic dynasty itself. The significance of his foul meal can be best understood in the wider context of his consumption. Before Erysichthon's father king Triopas names the horses, he laments that Erysichthon not only ate all the family's livestock, including mules which are not fit for eating (105-7), but also 'ate the heifer which his mother was fattening for Hestia' (καὶ τὰν βῶν ἔφαγεν, τᾶν Ἑστίαι ἔτρεφε μᾶτηρ, 108). Depriving his family of its victim for the goddess of the hearth jeopardizes not only their continued ability to cook him meals, but also to offer sacrifices to the gods. Paired with this deprivation of the gods, though, is his devouring of the prize-winning mare and war horse. In so doing, he dismantles the military and symbolic bases of his house's power and prestige, the very

---

<sup>59</sup> Bergk (1886), 189.

<sup>60</sup> The hymn bears a strong connection to the *Ektheosis Arsinoes*, which has led scholars to suggest a date of composition in the 270s: see Stephens (2015), 21-22. As I mentioned above, Berenice was already a recognizably Ptolemaic name in the days of Soter, so the two plays on her name could have readily been appreciated at this time. Given, however, Berenice II's chariot victories, it might be attractive to posit that these plays on words were added at a later date in the 240s, when Berenice II had married Ptolemy III, a new dynastic pairing of 'both the prize-winning mare and the war horse.' This line of inference, however, can be no more than suggestive and is irrelevant to my argument here.

same ones which the Ptolemies themselves relied upon. Moreover, just as he devours a sacrificial animal for the gods, he eats up the horses symbolic of the Ptolemies themselves. His theomachy is coextensive with war against the Ptolemies, just as the speaker of the hymn to Apollo claimed: ὃς μάχεται μακάρεσσιν, ἐμῶι βασιλῇι μάχοιτο· / ὅστις ἐμῶι βασιλῇι, καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι μάχοιτο (*Hymn* 2.26-7).

Up to this point I have treated Erysichthon's state of perpetual hunger as wholly negative, and indeed it is easy to do so, for we need only look to the language with which the speaker describes it for support: it is a χαλεπός καὶ ἄγριος λιμός ('harsh and beastly hunger,' 66), even a νόσος ('plague,' 67). To describe his hunger as negative, however, obscures an important point about Ptolemaic ideology. We cannot forget that the Ptolemies did not hide but celebrated their own similarly extravagant *tryphe*. We have even seen that Callimachus in the hymn for Artemis offers Heracles as a divinized role model for their behavior: the Ptolemies' ancestor still practices 'gluttony' (ἀδηφαγία, *Hymn* 3.160) on Olympus and has 'that belly' (νηδὺς ἐκείνη, 160) he had on earth when he stole a cow from Thiodamas, precipitating a war in which he sacked his city. Far from barring Heracles from Olympus, we saw that it only provokes his fellow gods to unrelenting laughter (149).

We must be careful, therefore, not to characterize the hunger with which Demeter punishes Erysichthon as an evil in itself. Instead, Erysichthon's punishment with *tryphe* serves to reveal how far below the divine he actually ranks. Heracles and his descendants, the Ptolemies, could practice *tryphe* because they possessed unending resources and unending wealth. At least that was the ideology they promoted. For them, *tryphe* was a way to 'prove' that ideology right, showing the world that despite their unending, luxuriant consumption they could never go broke. In Erysichthon's case, this same *tryphe* was no blessing but a curse, for it revealed how quickly

even his ‘deep house’ (βαθὺν οἶκον, 113) could be emptied. The narrative, we must remember, begins when ‘the good *daimon* began to grow angry with Triopas’ descendents’ (Τριοπίδαισιν ὁ δεξιὸς ἄχθετο δαίμων, 31). Unlike the Ptolemies, Triopas’ family is hated by the gods, and so while *tryphe* displays the divinity of the former, it brings the latter to ruin.

As I mentioned at the beginning of this section, Acosta-Hughes and Stephens have suggested that the hymn may be read as ‘a mirror held up to those in power that reflects their own egregious behavior...’<sup>61</sup> How might this hymn have been received at the Ptolemaic court, and what message would it have sent? We have seen that the hymn, far from criticizing Ptolemaic excess, aligns the Ptolemies with Demeter as πολυτρόφοι. The targets of the hymn, rather, are those who, like Erysichthon, try to usurp the divine πολυτρόφοι, Demeter and her devoted Alexandrian rulers. After Erysichthon has been cast out of his father’s house, the speaker prays: Δάματερ, μὴ τῆνος ἐμὴν φίλος, ὅς τοι ἀπεχθής, / εἴη μὴδ’ ὁμότοιχος· ἐμοὶ κακογείτονες ἐχθροί (‘Demeter, would that one who is hateful to you not be my *philos*, nor be my neighbor; bad neighbors are my enemies,’ 116-17). Read in the court context, Callimachus’ words read as a comment on the membership of the in-crowd, shunning any *philos* who would try to compete with the Ptolemies in their capacity as hosts and feasters. There is only one hand Callimachus will take bread from; anyone who would do otherwise is asking for punishment.

---

<sup>61</sup> Stephens (2015), 264.

### III. Conclusion

Over the past three chapters we have charted the development of the Olympian court society across the *Hymns*: from the establishment of the court and patronage in the hymns to Zeus and Apollo; to the creation of new gods in the court society the hymns to Artemis and Delos; and finally to the prescription of court ceremonial and divine prerogatives not to be transgressed in these final two hymns. The Ptolemies' appropriation of divine status and a court society that befitted it significantly altered the pre-existing structures of power. What Callimachus provided his patrons in the *Hymns* was an invaluable gift of cultural capital: a book which could travel beyond the court's limits to celebrate an Olympian order analogous to the very one that the Ptolemies were in the process of elaborating. In exchange, Callimachus postulates a place of distinction at his patrons' side, and their continual favor. Nothing less, nothing more; and in the court economy he has fashioned, nothing could be more.



## Chapter Five

### Courting Poetry: Patronage as Marriage in *Aetia* 3-4

A major claim of recent scholarship on the Hellenistic court, this dissertation included, is that the relationships of cultural patronage were performed as relationships of *philia*, long-term bonds of ‘friendship’ maintained by the reciprocal exchange of gifts. Figuring patronage in this way radically expanded *philia*’s egalitarian nature to accommodate the highly asymmetrical relationships that bound kings to their many and varied courtiers. Kings, however, were not the Hellenistic courts’ only patrons: queens were, too, nowhere more famously than in Alexandria. Callimachus, in fact, is better known for his poetry for his queens than his kings. Did *philia* also expand to include the relationships of poets and their queens? In this chapter I will explore how Callimachus positions himself toward Berenice II in *Aetia* 3-4. Friendship, I argue, is not the discourse of patronage that Callimachus adopts in his poetry for her; rather, it is marriage.

*Aetia* 3 opens with the *Victoria Berenices* (fr. 54-60j Harder), an elegy celebrating Berenice’s victory in horse-racing at Nemea, and it closes with the *Coma Berenices* (fr. 110), an elegy spoken by a lock of Berenice’s hair dedicated to the gods for her new husband Ptolemy’s safe return from war and miraculously transformed into a constellation in the sky. Upon publishing substantial fragments of the *Victoria Berenices* in 1977, Peter Parsons made the persuasive argument that *Aetia* 3-4 is a unified collection that Callimachus added to his pre-existing books *Aetia* 1-2 at some point after the marriage of Berenice II to Ptolemy III in 246 BC, which is referred to in both the *Victoria* and *Coma Berenices*; his view has become



*communis opinio* which I support.<sup>1</sup> Subsequent scholars looking for thematic coherence among the individual poems of *Aetia* 3-4 have noticed an emphasis on love and marriage, especially in book 3.<sup>2</sup> Anthony Bulloch has argued that Callimachus intended these poems on brides and mothers to be ‘reassuring and sympathetic’ to Berenice in the period just after her marriage to Ptolemy while he was away from Alexandria fighting the Third Syrian War.<sup>3</sup> This hypothesis, however, is unsatisfactory for two major reasons. First, while the *Coma Berenices* has the tone of a *consolatio* for the queen who misses her newly-married, absent king, none of the other poems in the collection seem to share this tone. Second, while Callimachus may have originally written the *Coma* as an occasional piece in the time when Ptolemy was absent from Alexandria, there is no evidence that the entire collection dates to this time.<sup>4</sup>

Others have argued that Callimachus’ emphasis on marriage serves his patrons’ political and ideological ends. The harmonious marriage of the Ptolemaic couple was presented as the source of their empire’s welfare and prosperity. In her commentary Annette Harder notes, for

---

<sup>1</sup> Parsons (1977), 48-50; Harder (2012), 1.2-8 provides a useful overview of subsequent scholarship supporting his claim.

<sup>2</sup> See the remarks of Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 47; Bulloch (2006), 503-6 provides a schematic description and analysis of the themes of book 3, highlighting the feminine themes of marriage and motherhood; Massimilla (2010), 47 and Harder (2012), 1.12 likewise note the book’s focus on love and prenuptial rites.

<sup>3</sup> Bulloch (2006), 506; for this idea see also Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 47.

<sup>4</sup> For the difficulty of dating of *Aetia* 3-4 see Harder (2012), 1.21-3, who concludes that we should regard the work as having been composed throughout Callimachus’ life.

instance, that in the elegies of ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ (fr. 67-75) and ‘Phrygius and Pieria’ (fr. 80-83) marriage leads to long-lasting political influence or unity.<sup>5</sup> Dee Clayman sees Callimachus’ poems on brides as serving a more pressing political need. Berenice came to Alexandria as Ptolemy’s bride with a murder behind her, that of her previous consort Demetrius the Fair; Clayman argues that many of Callimachus’ faithful women are mythological exempla for Berenice intended to create a positive public image for the queen in a court which might have been threatened by her previous, violent exercise of power.<sup>6</sup> I too shall argue that the murder of Demetrius the Fair was a matter Callimachus sought to finesse in *Aetia* 3-4, but just as consolatory tone of the *Coma* does not carry over to the entirety of the collection, so too exculpation is not the only motive of Callimachus’ portrayal of Berenice as a bride.

In this chapter, I argue that Callimachus uses marriage as a metaphor to figure the kind of patronage-relationship he wishes to enjoy with Berenice. He poses, that is, as a suitor hoping to wed Berenice and be joined to her in an exclusive, long-lasting exchange of gifts, his poetry for her *charis*. This argument will perhaps come as a surprise in light of the poets’ promotion elsewhere of the Ptolemies’ harmonious marriage for the stability of their empire.<sup>7</sup> But the relationship Callimachus proposes with Berenice is not a physical union, but rather the poetic exchange of *charis*. As we shall see, his poetry’s figuration of Berenice as a *nympha* and himself

---

<sup>5</sup> See her comments at Harder (2012), 2.545, 670.

<sup>6</sup> Clayman (2014a), 78-104.

<sup>7</sup> See for example Pomeroy (1984), 31-8; Gutzwiller (1992), 362-9; Hunter (2003), 128-30 on *Id.* 17.38-9; Caneva (2014), especially 31-6.

as her prospective groom offers her a splendid literary and public image as a powerful, ever-youthful bride.

In the first section I offer a new interpretation of the marital imagery at the beginning of the *Victoria Berenices*, with which Callimachus opens *Aetia* 3. Callimachus designates his epinician elegy as a ‘bride-price’ (ἔδνον, fr. 54.1 Harder) for Berenice, whom he calls νύμφα (fr. 54.2), ‘bride.’ I argue that Callimachus here adapts a Pindaric discourse of patronage as marriage to pose as Berenice’s suitor. Callimachus’ metaphor hearkens back to the Archaic past when suitors competed for a bride by offering the girl’s parents marvelous gifts of ἔδνα. In this way Callimachus angles for a distinctive position at court as Berenice’s only, ‘wedded’ poet.

After examining how this opening metaphor of *Aetia* 3-4 functions in the *Victoria Berenices*, I then consider how it works in the best-preserved poem of the *Aetia*, ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ from *Aetia* 3. ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ tells the story of how the youth Acontius won the beautiful girl Cydippe as his bride by inscribing an oath to marry him on an apple, which she read and was thereby bound to uphold; the two produced a famous and politically powerful lineage, and Callimachus writes how he learned about their marriage in a prose history by Xenomedes of Ceos. I argue that Callimachus fashions ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ as a poignant analogy for the poetic marriage that he proposes to Berenice: just as Acontius’ inscribed apple is his ἔδνον which promises Cydippe immortal κλέος, so too is his poetic ἔδνον for Berenice the beginning of a textual production that will celebrate her fame forever.

I finally turn to the concluding elegy of *Aetia* 4, the *Coma Berenices* spoken by Berenice’s lock of hair which she dedicated to the gods after her marriage and was subsequently turned into a constellation ‘discovered’ by the court astronomer Conon. I draw attention to previously unrecognized metapoetic imagery in the *Coma* and argue that Callimachus asserts his

value to Berenice as her poet by preserving her virginal lock of hair as a text whose readers renew her own status as a bride on the verge of marriage. Circling back to the *Victoria Berenices*, I argue that Callimachus' ἔδνον for Berenice is the status of eternal bride. I close by suggesting that the *Coma*'s prayer that Berenice offer it lavish gifts of married women's perfumes stands in for his own demand as her poet-suitor that she reciprocate his ἔδνον and offer her exclusive favors to him and his poetry.

#### I. Here Comes the Bride: The *Victoria Berenices* as Bride-Price (ἔδνον)

Callimachus opens his elegy celebrating Berenice II's victory in chariot racing at Nemea by calling it a χαρίσιον ἔδνον:

Ζηνί τε καὶ Νεμέῃ τι χαρίσιον ἔδνον ὀφείλω,  
 νύμφα, κα[σιγνή]των ἱερὸν αἶμα θεῶν  
 ἡμ[ε]τερο[ν] [.....] εὖ ἐπινίκιον ἵππων[ν].

To Zeus and Nemea, bride, holy blood of the Sibling Gods, I owe a pleasing *hednon*, our epinician...of horses.<sup>8</sup>  
 (Callim. fr. 54.1-3 Harder)

The meaning of this phrase has long proved troublesome. οὐ νέμεσις: the word ἔδνον is rare and largely restricted to Archaic epic, where it appears to designate both bride-price and dowry; worse still, in some cases neither meaning appears to make sense. Callimachus' ἔδνον has long been taken as one of these exceptions. *Communis opinio* established by Parsons holds that

---

<sup>8</sup> All translations are my own.

Callimachus probably uses ἔδνον to nod to Berenice's marriage to Ptolemy III in 246,<sup>9</sup> but that the word here – for the first time – likely means 'gift' without reference to marriage.<sup>10</sup>

In this section I argue that Callimachus figures his *Victoria* as a metaphorical 'bride-price' for Berenice, his patron and victor *qua* 'bride', and thereby construes the sort of patronage he desires as akin to marriage. I first review the usage of ἔδνον and challenge the view that it means no more than 'gift' here. I argue instead that Callimachus' ἔδνον establishes a new metaphor for patronage as marriage whose seeds lie in Pindaric epinicia, especially the Cyrenean ode *Pythian* 9. Next I examine how Callimachus weaves brides and marital imagery throughout the *Victoria*'s extant fragments to bolster his opening conceit. I especially offer a new interpretation of two fragments in which Heracles, Berenice's Ptolemaic 'ancestor' and star of the poem's inset narrative, is surprisingly portrayed as a bride. Finally I argue that Callimachus' ἔδνον-metaphor reflects the agonistic social dynamics of Hellenistic courts by portraying Berenice as a patron *qua* bride desired by many suitors offering her ἔδνα. Callimachus thus

---

<sup>9</sup> See especially Pfeiffer (1949), 308 ad fr. 383.1; Parsons (1977), 8; Fuhrer (1992), 129-30; Massimilla (2010), 227 ad fr. 143.2; Harder (2012), 2.395 ad fr. 54.2. All prudently observe that ἔδνον and νύμφα cannot be taken as sure evidence for the Nemean victory's celebration on the heels of the royal wedding, since royalty can always be styled young; nevertheless, the victory is generally dated to the Nemean games of 245 or 241.

<sup>10</sup> Hunter (1998), 116 n. 9, however, noted marriage's significance to the poem, and now Kampakoglou (2019), 34-44 explores the *Victoria*'s intertwining of marriage and victory. I discuss his interpretation of ἔδνον below.

angles for the distinction of being her only wedded poet in an exclusive relationship of patronage.

*i. The poet's bride-price*

What did Callimachus and his readers think that ἔδνον meant? Before Callimachus, ἔδνα appear primarily in Archaic epic (fourteen times in Homer, six in Hesiod), but also in iambic (once in Hipponax), lyric (twice in Pindar), and tragedy (twice in Aeschylus, once in *Prometheus Bound*, three times in Euripides). ἔδνον was thus a word redolent of the heroic past. In most instances it refers to an archaic marital practice whereby suitors offered gifts ('bride-price'<sup>11</sup>) for a bride to her father or male kin.<sup>12</sup> Already in Homeric epic, however, in two passages regarding Penelope (*Od.* 1.277 = 2.196) ἔδνα may signify gifts given by the bride's family. The scholia express confusion over these passages,<sup>13</sup> and modern scholars disagree over whether dowry is really meant here.<sup>14</sup> Be that as it may, in Pindar (*O.* 9.10) and Euripides (*Andr.* 2) the term's use

---

<sup>11</sup> The term 'bride-price' wrongly implies sale, as demonstrated by Finley (1955) (= 1981, 233-45). I use the term only for convenience's sake.

<sup>12</sup> *Lfgre* s.v. ἔδνα, ἔεδνα 1; *LSJ* s.v. ἔδνον 1. Snodgrass (1974), 116 cautions that there is generally not enough context in Homer to determine whether these ἔδνα are given to the bride's family (bride-price) or to the bride (indirect dowry); since he cannot identify any sure case of indirect dowry, I treat these all as bride-price.

<sup>13</sup> See the scholia to *Od.* 1.277 and 2.196, both discussed by Finley (1955), 182-3 (= 1981, 239).

<sup>14</sup> *Lfgre* s.v. ἔδνα, ἔεδνα 2; *LSJ* s.v. ἔδνον 2. Whether ἔδνα in Homer ever means 'dowry' has been hotly debated. On the one hand, Finley (1955), 184-7 (= 1981, 240-1) and Lacey (1966),

for dowry is secure. To complicate matters further, three ἔδνα have long been alleged to be neither bride-price nor dowry, but ‘wedding-presents to a wedded pair by their guests’ (LSJ s.v. 3; cf. *BDAG* s.v. 2); and in *Idyll* 25 ἔδνον is claimed to mean ‘gift’ without connection to marriage (LSJ s.v. 4), as proposed for the *Victoria*.

Upon closer reading, however, the evidence for these aberrant ἔδνα proves slim. The only alleged exception pre-dating Callimachus occurs in Pindar. At *Pythian* 3.94-95 Pindar describes ἔδνα that Cadmus and Peleus received from the gods at their weddings to Harmonia and Thetis on Olympus. The scholiast writes ἀκύρως τὰ δῶρα ἔδνα εἶπε (‘[Pindar] incorrectly called the gifts *hedna*’),<sup>15</sup> and modern scholars argue that these ἔδνα are guests’ wedding presents.<sup>16</sup> Yet Harmonia and Thetis are goddesses, so the gift-givers are their kin; further, both Pindar and the scholia specify that the gifts are received by the grooms, not the couple together.<sup>17</sup>

---

55-61 argue for a Homeric marital exchange in which the bride’s father gave the groom ἔδνα counter to those the groom offered for the bride, while Snodgrass (1974), 115-18 argues that dowry exists in Homer as a result of the epics’ conflated historical strata. On the other hand, Morris (1986), 106-10 and Perysinakis (1991) argue that ἔδνα in Homer are only bride-price. Their argument, however, that at *Od.* 1.277 = 2.196 ἔδνα refers the bride-price Penelope’s kin will fetch from her suitors rather than gifts they will furnish her seems to rest on a dubious interpretation of ἀρτυνέουσιν.

<sup>15</sup> Σ *Pyth.* 3.167a, ed. Drachmann (1910).

<sup>16</sup> See e.g. Gentili et al (1995), 422 ad loc.

<sup>17</sup> *Pyth.* 3.94-5 ἔδνα τε / δέξαντο, the subjects of which are Cadmus and Peleus; the scholia likewise specify that the gifts are received by Peleus (τῶι...Πηλεῖ) and Cadmus

These ἔδνα, then, seem to be the gods' dowries given to their progeny's husbands. The two other alleged 'wedding presents', much later than Callimachus (Cassius Dio 79.12.2, Orphic *Argonautica* 873), similarly seem to be bride-price rather than wedding gifts.<sup>18</sup>

Also admitting reconsideration is the claim that ἔδνον in *Idyll* 25 means 'gift' without marital significance. Here the poet, a third-century figure who had read Callimachus and perhaps Apollonius,<sup>19</sup> calls the innumerable herds given by Helios to his son Augeas τόγε μυρίον ἔδνον ('this countless *hednon*', 114). Since the livestock are a gift from father to son, scholars translate ἔδνον as 'gift' and assume catachresis.<sup>20</sup> In fact pseudo-Theocritus has good reason to call the

---

(τῶι...Κάδμῳ). The scholia then gloss the famous gifts the men received and their givers (Poseidon gave Peleus horses, Hephaestus gave a sword, and Aphrodite gave Cadmus Harmonia's necklace); I am not convinced that Pindar had these specific gifts in mind.

<sup>18</sup> Cass. Dio 79.12.2 describes how the emperor Elagabalus (called 'Sardanapalus') collected ἔδνα from his subjects for Urania, whom he had wooed. These are not wedding presents from Elagabalus' subjects but property he has extracted to give her as bride-price. Orph. A. 873 calls the dragon's teeth Jason sows a ἔδνον that Phrixus brought to Colchis. Since Phrixus married king Aetes' daughter Chalciope (Apollod. 1.9.1), we may reasonably suppose that the poet considered these teeth Phrixus' bride-price.

<sup>19</sup> Schmitz (2012), 260. For *Id.* 25's lexical borrowings from the *Victoria* see Parsons (1977), 44.

<sup>20</sup> So Gow (1950), 2.453 ad loc. Gow supports his argument by referring to Callimachus' supposedly catachrestic ἔδνον, thereby risking circularity.



herds a ἔδνον, for cattle and other animals were the ἔδνα *par excellence* in Archaic epic.<sup>21</sup>

Hellenistic poets knew this well: Callimachus in ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ writes that mothers tried to offer oxen as bride-price for Cydippe (ἐδνησιν κεράων...ἀντὶ βοῶν, ‘a bride given in exchange for the bride-price of horned cattle’, fr. 67.10); and when Acrotimo of *Idyll* 27 asks Lycidas what ἔδνον he will offer (33), Lycidas replies πᾶσαν τὴν ἀγέλαν, πάντ’ ἄλσεα καὶ νομὸν ἐξεῖς (‘you will have my entire flock, all my groves and pasture’, 34). So there is a connection between Augeas’ livestock in *Idyll* 25 and marital exchange: his wondrous herds are a μυρίον ἔδνον in substance, with potential to be given as bride-price.

The last evidence scholars have adduced in order to argue that Callimachus’ ἔδνον is a non-marital gift comes from Pindar’s fragmentary fourth *Paean*, whose fourth line presents ἐδνώσεται (‘he/she/it will offer bride-price/dowry’, fr. 52.4); the scholiast explains ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑμνήθη (‘instead of “he/she was hymned”’).<sup>22</sup> Accepting that Pindar used ἐδνόομαι in a way semantically bleached of marital exchange, Fuhrer argues that Callimachus followed suit in the *Victoria*, perhaps to make a philological point on Pindaric usage.<sup>23</sup> We cannot fully evaluate Pindar’s usage for ourselves owing to the text’s fragmentary state. Even so, it seems as likely as

---

<sup>21</sup> See *Lfgre* s.v. ἔδνα, ἔεδνα 1. Similarly ἀλφεσίβοιος (‘yielding cattle’) at *Il.* 18.593 and *Hom. Hymn Aphr.* 119 is used of a marriageable girl: see Finley (1955), 181 n. 44 (= 1981, 293 n. 41); Edwards (1991), 229 ad *Il.* 18.593-4.

<sup>22</sup> The scholiast evidently read ἐδνώσατο instead of the papyri’s ἐδνώσεται. Rutherford (2001), 285 n. 10 prints the aorist, but the future may be third-person performative.

<sup>23</sup> Fuhrer (1992), 129-30.

not that Pindar used ἔδνoμαι metaphorically, with bride-price or dowry as a metaphor for song.<sup>24</sup>

In a recent discussion Kampakoglou argues that Callimachus' ἔδνον indeed has marital significance and “merges the celebrations for Berenice's Nemean victory with the rituals for her wedding to Ptolemy III”.<sup>25</sup> His interpretation of ἔδνον, however, presents several problems. He dismisses the Homeric meaning of ἔδνον as bride-price or dowry as irrelevant to the *Victoria*'s context, while at the same time he maintains that ἔδνον situates the poem at Berenice's wedding: “One needs to take ἔδνον here, more generally, as a textual marker of the occasion for the embedded textual performance”.<sup>26</sup> This simultaneous rejection of and insistence upon the term's Archaic meaning is unpersuasive. He then seeks to explain the meaning of ἔδνον by turning to the adjective χαρίσιον which modifies it. Kampakoglou considers the adjective's use in Aristophanes (fr. 211.2 K-A) and Eubulus (fr. 1.3 K-A), both fragments cited by Athenaeus (14.646b), to refer to a kind of cake: in Aristophanes χαρίσιος modifies the noun πλακούς (‘flat cake’), and in Eubulus it functions substantively. Kampakoglou claims that the χαρίσιος was specifically a sacrificial cake and concludes that Callimachus' χαρίσιον ἔδνον is a sacrificial offering that he makes to Zeus and Nemea at Berenice's wedding on her behalf.<sup>27</sup> This interpretation emphasizes the substantive meaning of χαρίσιος so much that it overshadows the noun ἔδνον and makes it bear the unprecedented meaning of a sacrificial offering made at a

---

<sup>24</sup> Thus Rutherford (2001), 28; Kampakoglou (2019), 41-3.

<sup>25</sup> Kampakoglou (2019), 35.

<sup>26</sup> Kampakoglou (2019), 34 n. 61.

<sup>27</sup> Kampakoglou (2019), 34-5.

wedding. In addition, according to Athenaeus (15.668c) the *χαρίσιος* was not a sacrificial cake but one awarded at a *παννυχίς* ('all-night celebration') to the man who stayed awake all night dancing. Callimachus himself seems to refer to this custom in his *Pannychis* (fr. 227), where he writes *ὁ δ' ἀγρυπνήσας...τὸν πυραμοῦντα λήψεται* ('the man having stayed awake...will receive the sesame-cake', fr. 227.5-6); but we must be careful here, as Callimachus does not call this bread a *χαρίσιος*. In light of these problems, we should seek another interpretation of Callimachus' *ἔδνον* which takes into account not only its general connection to marriage, but its specific meaning of bride-price or dowry.

What Parsons and others have not considered is whether Callimachus could have used *ἔδνον* metaphorically, that is, posing as either Berenice's suitor offering her bride-price or as her father offering her dowry. Could either possibility make sense? A dowry-song might at first seem attractive owing to the historical circumstances of Berenice's wedding. Berenice's father, Magas of Cyrene, died around 250,<sup>28</sup> so when she came to Alexandria in 246 as Ptolemy III's bride she had no father. As her fellow Cyrenean and a long-prominent poet at the Ptolemaic court, might Callimachus have stepped in as her civic kin presenting her with a dowry-song? There are, however, several problems with this hypothesis. According to Callimachus Berenice does have parents: she is 'holy blood of the Sibling Gods' (*ἱερὸν αἶμα θεῶν*, fr. 54.2), Ptolemy II and his sister-wife Arsinoe II, whose full blood daughter Berenice was claimed to be upon her

---

<sup>28</sup> Determining Magas' death-date is difficult: van Oppen de Ruiter (2015), 8-13 summarizes the problems and possibilities.

marriage to Ptolemy III.<sup>29</sup> Second, Callimachus specifies that his ἔδνον is owed to Zeus and Nemea, while a dowry would be given to Berenice or perhaps to her conspicuously absent groom, Ptolemy III. Finally, dowries are parting gifts that mark the bride's departure from her father's home to her husband's,<sup>30</sup> while in the mid to late 240s Callimachus would have been looking to develop or strengthen his relationship with his new patrons in Alexandria.<sup>31</sup>

On the other hand, by offering his poem as a bride-price Callimachus could powerfully figure the close relationship he wished to enjoy with his new queen. In 'Acontius and Cydippe', as mentioned above, Callimachus uses the idea of ἔδνον as a bride-price; might he have intended his *Victoria* to be understood in the same way? One might immediately object that this metaphor would contradict the Ptolemaic poets' portrayal of their queens as 'sexually passionate wives' whose reciprocal and faithful love with their husbands secured the empire's welfare.<sup>32</sup> But the 'marriage' Callimachus proposes is not a threat to Ptolemy's marriage of physical *charis*. It is a

---

<sup>29</sup> Van Oppen de Ruiter (2015), 36-40 discusses the sources and possible motivations for Berenice's full-blood Ptolemaic genealogy.

<sup>30</sup> ἔδνα are only associated with marriages in which the bride transfers to a new house: Lacey (1966), 55.

<sup>31</sup> Differently Gutzwiller (1992), 373 writes that Callimachus' continued influence at court was "assured" with Berenice's arrival from Cyrene. This claim, however, risks construing as inevitable an influence Callimachus likely worked hard to achieve by leveraging his existing connection to the queen.

<sup>32</sup> See e.g. Pomeroy (1984), 31-8; Gutzwiller (1992), 362-9; Hunter (2003), 128-30 ad *Id.* 17.38-9; Caneva (2014), 31-6.

poetic marriage where the *charites* exchanged are the poet's verses and his patron's favors and privileges.

The metaphor of marriage as the relationship between poet and patron in fact originates in the very genre Callimachus' *Victoria* resurrects: Archaic epinician.<sup>33</sup> Seiler and now Kampakoglou suggest that Callimachus' ἔδνον recalls Pindar's extended simile at *Olympian* 7.1-12, where the poet's epinician, bringing χάρις to the victor, is compared to an all-golden bowl filled with wine, libations from which effect a bond between father and future son-in-law.<sup>34</sup> Yet there is a crucial difference between these passages: whereas Pindar plays father-in-law to the victor *qua* groom, Callimachus poses as his *laudanda*'s groom-to-be, thereby adapting his archaic model's metaphor to the present demand for praise for a victorious woman, a reality unthinkable in Pindar's day.

Closer to Callimachus' stance in the *Victoria* is Pindar's self-portrayal as an ἐραστής offering his victors *qua* ἐρώμενοι the gift of praise.<sup>35</sup> Still closer, however, was a poem common to both Callimachus and Berenice as Cyreneans: *Pythian* 9 for Telesicrates of Cyrene. In this ode Pindar famously tells of the marriage of Apollo and the nymph Cyrene, the foundation of her city, and the city's subsequent successes in athletic victories. Apollo desired Cyrene, Pindar tells us, upon catching sight of her 'wrestling a mighty lion alone, without weapons' (λέοντι... / ὀβρίμῳ μούναν παλαίοισαν ἄτερ ἐγχέων, *Pyth.* 9.26-28). Impressed by her 'courage and great strength' (θυμὸν γυναικὸς καὶ μεγάλην δύνασιν, 30), he asks the centaur Chiron who she

---

<sup>33</sup> See Kurke (1991), 116-34.

<sup>34</sup> Seiler (1992), 52; Kampakoglou (2019), 37-9.

<sup>35</sup> Nicholson (2000), discussing especially *Isthm.* 2; *Pyth.* 6; *Ol.* 1.

is and if it is right for him to marry her. After humorously reproving the god of prophecy for asking what he must already know, Chiron answers:

ταύτα πόσις ἵκεο βᾶσσον  
τάνδε, καὶ μέλλεις ὑπὲρ πόντου  
Διὸς ἔξοχον ποτὶ κᾶπον ἐνεῖκαι·  
ἔνθα νιν ἀρχέπολιν θήσεις, ἐπὶ λαὸν ἀγείραις  
νασιώταν ὄχθον ἐς ἀμφίπεδον·  
νῦν δ' εὐρυλείμων πότνιά σοι Λιβύα  
δέξεται εὐκλέα νύμφαν δώμασιν ἐν χρυσέοις  
πρόφρων· ἵνα οἱ χθονὸς αἴσαν  
αὐτίκα συντελέθῃεν ἐννομον δωρήσεται,  
οὔτε παγκάρπων φυτῶν νά-  
ποινον οὔτ' ἀγνώτα θηρῶν.

You have come to this glen as her [Cyrene's] spouse, and you are about to carry her beyond the sea toward the excellent grove of Zeus; there you will make her a ruler of a city, having gathered a host of islanders to the hill surrounded by plains. But now mistress Libya of wide meadows will receive your famous bride graciously in golden chambers; there straightaway she will present to her as a gift an allotment of land to hold lawfully, a land neither without compensation of plants bearing all kinds of fruits nor without knowledge of beasts.  
(*Pyth.* 9.51-59)

In this marriage exchange, Apollo will take Cyrene as his bride and in return make her the ruler of a city, the future Cyrene, for which he will gather the men, while Libya will offer her the gift (δωρήσεται, 58) of her most fertile portion of land. Pindar thus gives an aetiology for Cyrene as the nymph Cyrene's ἔδνον. Her bride-price is a gift that keeps on giving, for the athletic nymph Cyrene subsequently flourishes in athletic contests (κλεινάν τ' ἀέθλοις, 70) through her civic sons. As Carson and Kurke demonstrate, Pindar describes these victories in marital terms, so that each Cyrenean victory replays and renews Cyrene's marriage to Apollo.<sup>36</sup> In his Pythian victory, for example, Telesicrates 'mingled her [Cyrene] with flourishing success' (νιν...εὐθαλεῖ συνέμειξε τύχῃ, 71-72), a sexual image which conflates his victory with Cyrene's marriage to

---

<sup>36</sup> Carson (1982), 121-5; Kurke (1991), 127-33.

the Pythian god.<sup>37</sup> The collapsing of marriage and victory is in fact present in the beginning of the ode, where Pindar says he wishes to proclaim (γεγωναῖν, 3) Telesicrates a στεφάνωμα Κυράνας ('crown of Cyrene', 4). This image recalls not only the crowns awarded victors at the pan-hellenic games, but also the crowns worn by brides.<sup>38</sup> In proclaiming Telesicrates a victor, Pindar thus crowns Cyrene as a victorious bride once more.

Scholars have noted that Callimachus' use of ἔδνον forms a direct link with Pindar, apparently the first to use the word's singular form.<sup>39</sup> I suggest further that with ἔδνον Callimachus fashions a close link between his *Victoria* and *Pythian* 9. His use of the ode elsewhere suggests it was both well-known and important to him;<sup>40</sup> for the occasion of Berenice's victory it offered unbeatable possibilities for praise. Many have noted Berenice's similarity in the poem to Pindar's Cyrene: the latter, Pindar's most athletic female character, inflames Apollo as she wrestles a lion with her bare hands, while Berenice is compared

---

<sup>37</sup> Kurke (1991), 131-2.

<sup>38</sup> On bridal crowns see LSJ s.v. 1.2; Oakley & Sinos (1993), 16-21. Kampakoglou (2019), 35 makes a related point about Berenice's victory crown (not mentioned in the *Victoria*'s extant fragments) as both athletic and bridal. This association originates with Pindar.

<sup>39</sup> Fuhrer (1992), 129-30; Massimilla (2010), 227 ad fr. 143.2; Harder (2012), 2.396 ad fr. 54.2.

<sup>40</sup> *Pythian* 9 is an important intertext for Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*, as Stephens (2015), 75 notes; see her commentary for specific examples.

implicitly, as we shall see, to lion-slaying Heracles.<sup>41</sup> Following in the footsteps of Apollo, Telesicrates, and finally Pindar himself, Callimachus presents Cyrene's latest daughter Berenice with his own ἔδνον, a Pindaric elegy, renewing once more Cyrene's original marriage to Apollo.

In fact, when we consider the historical circumstances of Berenice's marriage to Ptolemy III, we may read the *Victoria* profitably as a kind of counter-ἔδνον to Cyrene's ἔδνον in *Pythian* 9. When Berenice came to Alexandria as Ptolemy's bride, she in effect brought the Cyrenaica, which had been estranged from Ptolemaic power for decades under the rule of Magas, as her dowry.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, as we shall see in the next section, she seems to have taken an impressively active role in making her marriage to Ptolemy. Similarly, scholars of *Pythian* 9 have noted the remarkable agency with which Libya willingly offers the gift of her fertile land to form part of Cyrene's ἔδνον (cf. πρόφρων, 57; δωρήσεται, 59).<sup>43</sup> There is thus a significant intertextual and historical link between Libya, who gave the Cyrenaica to Apollo's bride Cyrene, and Berenice, who offered Cyrene's ἔδνον to Ptolemy III. I suggest that Callimachus, in commemoration of and in return for Berenice's 'Libyan' gift to Ptolemaic Alexandria, offers her a marvelous ἔδνον in return: a Pindaric-style epinician that not only writes her into Cyrenean literary history

---

<sup>41</sup> Clayman (2014a), 146 connects lion-slaying Heracles to Cyrene in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* 90-2; Kampakoglou (2019), 43-4 notes Berenice's alignment with Cyrene as a bride and discusses the importance of "Cyrenean folklore" to both *Pythian* 9 and the *Victoria*.

<sup>42</sup> Clayman (2014a), 39-41.

<sup>43</sup> See Carey (1981), 81 ad *Pyth.* 9.58b; for *Pythian* 9's interrelation of colonization and marriage see Dougherty (1993), 136-56.



inaugurated by *Pythian* 9, but also imports her and Cyrene's literary history into the Alexandrian court, her marital home.

For the metaphor of bride-price I have proposed to work, we must take account of a significant detail in the first line: Callimachus claims he owes his ἔδνον to Zeus and Nemea (Ζηνί τε καὶ Νεμέῃ τι χαρίσιον ἔδνον ὀφείλω, fr. 54.1). If Callimachus' ἔδνον is a bride-price, then Zeus and Nemea must play the role of Berenice's parents. This might seem odd, if not impossible, since Callimachus names the Sibling Gods in the next line as her parents. But what I suggest we must keep in mind is the blatant artificiality of Berenice's Ptolemaic genealogy. Everyone knew that Berenice was the daughter of Magas, not the Sibling Gods; courtiers nevertheless won favor by promoting the dynastic fiction. If Callimachus, then, could celebrate Berenice's descent from the Sibling Gods which came about through her marriage to Ptolemy, why not fashion her a new genealogy upon her Nemean victory that emblemized the ideological significance of her achievement for her reign? Hellenistic rulers capitalized on pan-hellenic victories to confirm their royalty.<sup>44</sup> By portraying Berenice as the child of Zeus and Nemea, Callimachus makes manifest her newly-proven status as a Ptolemaic queen. As a Nemean victor she is Nemea's daughter, and as a queen she is a child of Zeus; as Callimachus earlier proclaimed at *Hymn* 1.79, quoting Hesiod (*Op.* 57), 'Kings come from Zeus' (ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες). By offering his ἔδνον for Berenice to Zeus and Nemea, Callimachus puts on full display his value as a court poet: not only can he promote the current ideology of Berenice's Ptolemaic descent, but he can also fashion new public images for her queenship.

---

<sup>44</sup> See Barbantani (2012), 45-6.

ii. *Brides and marriage in the Victoria Berenices*

Thus far we have considered the bride-price metaphor in the *Victoria*'s first couplet. In this section I will demonstrate that, Like Pindar in *Pythian* 9, Callimachus weaves marital imagery throughout his epinician so that his ἔδνον culminates a long history of marital exchanges into which Callimachus inscribes Berenice.

Just after the opening lines, Callimachus describes how word of Berenice's victory reached Alexandria:

ἄρμοῖ γὰρ ἸΔαναοῦ γῆς ἀπὸ βουγενέος  
εἰς Ἑλένη[ς νησίδ]α καὶ εἰς Πάλληνα μά[ντιν,  
ποιμένα [φωκάων], χρύσειον ἦλθεν ἔπος.

For recently the golden word came from the land of cow-born Danaus to the island of Helen and to the Pallenean prophet, shepherd of seals.  
(fr. 54.4-6 Harder)

Scholars have discussed these lines as a *tour de force* of allusive geopoetics evoking the history of migrations between Greece and Egypt.<sup>45</sup> In light of Callimachus' ἔδνον-metaphor, what comes to the fore are the marital concerns motivating each migration. By calling the Argolid 'the land of cow-born Danaus', Callimachus recalls not only Io's bovine wanderings from Greece to Egypt,<sup>46</sup> but also her son Danaus' flight from Egypt back to Greece. He left Egypt with his fifty

---

<sup>45</sup> Stephens (2010), 60-1; Acosta-Hughes & Stephens (2012), 163-5, 168-70, 185-7; Clayman (2014a), 146.

<sup>46</sup> It is tempting to see in βουγενής, which Harder (2012), 2.401 ad fr. 54.4-6 shows is connected to bees, another Callimachean allusion to the bee's pharaonic symbolism, on which see Stephens (2003), 1-4, 107-8.

daughters because his brother Aegyptus was forcing on them the marriage of his fifty sons. The Aegyptids, however, pursued Danaus and the Danaids, and so on their wedding night Danaus had his daughters murder their cousin-grooms. All obeyed except Hypermnestra, whether because he allowed her to preserve her virginity (Apollod. 2.1.5) or because she loved him (Aesch. *PV* 865-868; Σ Pind. *Pyth.* 9.195b).

All the Ptolemies claimed descent from Hypermnestra, but she and her sisters were especially important ancestors for Berenice in light of her tumultuous path to Alexandria. Berenice's father Magas had betrothed her to Ptolemy III (Just. *Epit.* 26.3),<sup>47</sup> but after Magas' death her mother Apame, a Seleucid, arranged for Demetrius the Fair to wed Berenice. According to Justin Apame then began an affair with Demetrius, whereupon Berenice had Demetrius killed in her mother's bed (*Epit.* 26.4-8). Berenice then made herself Ptolemy's bride as her father had intended.<sup>48</sup> Berenice's new Ptolemaic 'ancestors' offered attractive models for his queen who had a hand in her prior husband's death.<sup>49</sup> In fact, Berenice united and reconciled

---

<sup>47</sup> On Berenice's betrothal to Ptolemy III see Clayman (2014a), 32; van Oppen de Ruiter (2015), 19.

<sup>48</sup> On Justin's account see Clayman (2014a), 36-9; van Oppen de Ruiter (2015), 19-20.

<sup>49</sup> Clayman (2014a), 95-6 discusses the Danaids as paradigmatic for Berenice but without emphasis on Hypermnestra. Van Oppen de Ruiter (2015), 25-6 rejects *tout court* Clayman's attempts to interpret tales of rape and murder in Callimachus and Apollonius as efforts to find positive models for Berenice's conduct. I agree that we must be extremely cautious in using literature as historical evidence, but in case of the *Victoria*, which celebrates Berenice, I think that analogies between her and the poem's mythical women would have been easily drawn.

the divergent actions taken by Hypermnestra and her sisters. Like the latter, she killed a husband forced upon her against her father's will, while like the former she married her Egyptian cousin-  
'brother'. The transit of Berenice's victory-report 'from the land of cow-born Danaus' to Alexandria thus evokes a return of the Danaids in the person of their 'descendent' Berenice.

From Argos news traveled 'to Helen's island' off Alexandria's coast, where Helen waited out the Trojan War fought over her shadow. Many have noted that this mention of Helen cements Berenice's Ptolemaic ancestry, for Helen was assimilated to Arsinoe II, Berenice's 'mother'.<sup>50</sup> But Helen also offers, like the Danaids, an important model for Berenice, in this case for her masculine athleticism. In Theocritus' epithalamium for Helen, the Spartan maidens describe how none of them, when they anoint themselves with manly oils, rival Helen in athletics (*Id.* 18.22-25). Callimachus' mention of Helen thus forges new link between the Spartan princess and Berenice, Arsinoe-Helen's dynastic 'daughter'.

We do not expect to find bridal imagery in the rest of the poem, concerned as it was with the *xenia* of Heracles and Molercus, but even here it is present.<sup>51</sup> It has often been acknowledged that Callimachus implicitly compares Berenice, his Nemean victor, to her Ptolemaic ancestor

---

<sup>50</sup> On Arsinoe II's identification with Helen see Visser (1938), 19-20; Griffiths (1979), 86-91; Basta Donzelli (1984); Prioux (2011), 221-2; Caneva (2014), 38-9.

<sup>51</sup> There is, however, tantalizing mention of the Danaids, Danaus, and Aegyptus in a new fragment (54a Harder) attributed to the *Victoria*'s beginning: cf. lines 2 Ἰναχ[ίδα]ις, 4 Ἀμυμῶν[η], 6 Δαναοῦ, 8 Αἴγυπτος. For its attribution and possible content see Harder (2012), 2.413-15.

Heracles, slayer of the Nemean lion.<sup>52</sup> What has not been noted is that he makes this comparison blatant in fragment 60a Harder (= fr. 677 Pf.), where he describes how Heracles made the lion-skin his headgear: τὸ δὲ σκύλος ἀνδρὶ καλύπτρη / γιγνόμενον, νιφετοῦ καὶ βελέων ἔρυμα ('and its hide becoming a veil for a man, a defense against snow and missiles').<sup>53</sup> Other descriptions of the lion-skin use the verbs καλύπτω and ἀμφικαλύπτω,<sup>54</sup> but Callimachus adds a gendered spin: a καλύπτρα is properly speaking a woman's veil, hence ἀνδρί.<sup>55</sup> There is, to be sure, formal similarity between the hide and a καλύπτρα: both are precious garments, and both

---

<sup>52</sup> Fuhrer (1992), 107-12 discusses Heracles as paradigmatic for Berenice's position between divinity and mortality; Gutzwiller (1992), 378-9 n. 54 and Prioux & Trinquier (2015), 44-5 note an implicit comparison between Heracles and Berenice; Kampakoglou (2013), 118-20 discusses Berenice's public image as a 'warrior queen' (120).

<sup>53</sup> Pfeiffer (1949), 445 ad fr. 677 argued against attributing this fragment to Callimachus' narrative of Heracles and Molercus because he thought that Apollodorus (2.5.1) depicted Heracles dragging the Nemean lion to Mycenae alive. Harder (2012), 2. 489 ad fr. 60a, however, rightly notes that in Apollodorus' account Heracles strangled (ἔπνιξε) the lion before going to Mycenae and thus he could have worn its skin. Additional evidence supports the fragment's attribution to the *Victoria*, especially its lexical similarities with *Id.* 25: the fragment's gloss σκύλος is used at *Id.* 25.142, and καλύπτει at *Id.* 25.176 echoes the fragment's καλύπτρη. See Harder (2012), 488-9 for full discussion of the attribution.

<sup>54</sup> See Harder (2012), 2.488 ad fr. 60a.

<sup>55</sup> Pfeiffer (1949), 445 ad loc.; cf. LSJ s.v. καλύπτρα 1; Massimilla (2010), 550-1 ad fr. 274; Harder (2012), 2.289 ad loc.

cover much of the body.<sup>56</sup> But in light of Callimachus' use of ἔδνον and νύμφα in the first couplet, it is also significant that καλύπτραι were a necessary adornment for brides.<sup>57</sup> The Nemean lion-skin is even the same color as a bridal veil: Euripides describes it as πυρσός ('flame-colored', *HF* 361), and Greek bridal veils were most likely saffron-colored.<sup>58</sup>

Strange as a bridal Heracles might seem to us, he would have been familiar to Callimachus' audience. After all, for a year the hero had been the Lydian queen Omphale's slave, and his attendant feminization is attested in cultural productions from the fifth century on. A red-figure vase (ca. 430), for example, shows Heracles exchanging his lion-skin for a robe as Omphale beckons.<sup>59</sup> Ion wrote a satyr-play *Omphale* in whose extant fragments Heracles is made to dress in voluptuous Lydian style, perhaps as a woman.<sup>60</sup> In a comedy Heracles even seemingly starred as a bride: Justin Pollux attributes to Aristophanes' contemporary Nicochares a Ἡρακλῆς

---

<sup>56</sup> Llewellyn-Jones (2003), 32 describes καλύπτραι and their occasional exoticism.

<sup>57</sup> See Oakley & Sinos (1993), 14, 16-20; Llewellyn-Jones (2003), 215-58 examines veiling rituals at weddings.

<sup>58</sup> See Llewellyn-Jones (2003), 223-27.

<sup>59</sup> The vase is Brit. Mus. E370; see Vollkommer (1988) for discussion. Kirkpatrick & Dunn (2002), 40-1 n. 28 note additional parallels.

<sup>60</sup> Ion *TrGF* 19 fr. 17a-33a; the fragments concerning adornment are 22, 24, and 25, discussed by Easterling (2007), 287-8. Achaëus also wrote a satyr-play *Omphale*, whose contents are unknown.

γαμούμενος ('Heracles being married,' 7.40).<sup>61</sup> Meineke suggests that the comedy might have concerned Heracles' year with Omphale;<sup>62</sup> the play likely got its name from a scene or gag featuring Heracles being dressed as a bride. In the Hellenistic period, the hero may even have described his servitude to Omphale in Diotimus' epic *Labors of Heracles*.<sup>63</sup>

There is also ample precedent for the way that Callimachus analogizes his female victor Berenice to Heracles veiled in the lion-skin. *Pythian* 9, where Telesicrates is implicitly compared to lion-wrestling nymph Cyrene, may have served as inspiration.<sup>64</sup> The Lydian queen Omphale, who is depicted donning Heracles' lion-skin as early as the fourth century, may also have been a model.<sup>65</sup> Turning to historical women, Alexander's mother Olympias may have been another: a Severan-period contorniate depicts Olympias wearing the lion-skin and holding a club.<sup>66</sup> While

---

<sup>61</sup> Frustratingly the *Suda* (N 407 Adler) transmits Ἡρακλῆς γαμῶν ('Heracles marrying'), but this can be explained as a scribal correction of the surprising Ἡρακλῆς γαμούμενος.

<sup>62</sup> Meineke (1839), 255.

<sup>63</sup> For this hypothesis, see Nelson (forthcoming a).

<sup>64</sup> Carson (1982), 124-5; Dougherty (1993), 139-40.

<sup>65</sup> Coins from Phocaea (ca. 387-326 BC) depict Omphale wearing the lion-skin: see *BMC Ionia* 211, 52-5, pl. 5, 8; *LMC* s.v. 'Omphale' no. 55.

<sup>66</sup> See Carney (2006), 122-3.

we cannot know if this iconography of Olympias dates to Callimachus' day,<sup>67</sup> it would cohere with her image promulgated elsewhere in the early Hellenistic period.<sup>68</sup>

Callimachus' analogy of Heracles veiled in the lion-skin to Berenice suggests another positive model for the action Berenice took as Ptolemy's bride. Just as Heracles felled the Nemean lion, made it hide his veil, and restored fertility to Argos, Berenice had Demetrius killed, veiled herself as Ptolemy's bride, and brought the fertile Cyrenaica into the Ptolemaic fold.<sup>69</sup> Callimachus' use of the lion to negotiate Berenice's gendered power strongly resonates with an anecdote from Aelian (*NA* 5.39) that a Ptolemaic Berenice was accompanied at court by a lion who licked her face and smoothed her wrinkles. Prioux and Trinquier have persuasively argued that this story concerns Berenice II<sup>70</sup> and explain how by taming the lion associated elsewhere with masculine heroes, Berenice puts the beast instead at the service of the "feminine world of the women's quarters".<sup>71</sup> Callimachus does much the same: his Heracles turns the beast

---

<sup>67</sup> Prioux & Trinquier (2015), 46 suggest with hesitation the possibility of a Hellenistic original.

<sup>68</sup> Douris of Samos tantalizingly portrays Olympias as going to war like a bacchant (*Athen.* 13.560f).

<sup>69</sup> See Prioux & Trinquier (2015), 45 for the analogy. On Cyrene's fertility see e.g. Pind. *Pyth.* 9.6a-8.

<sup>70</sup> Prioux & Trinquier (2015), 40-8.

<sup>71</sup> Prioux & Trinquier (2015), 45.



into a veil which makes him a model for the victorious bride Berenice.<sup>72</sup> Callimachus' veiled Heracles can also be read profitably in tandem with the many well-known coin series depicting Berenice wearing a veil and diadem on the obverse and an overflowing cornucopia on the reverse.<sup>73</sup> Ager suggests that such coins depicting veiled queens with cornucopiae recall their identity as abundantly fertile brides.<sup>74</sup> Callimachus' collapsing of Berenice and Heracles seems to make a further point: Berenice's violent exercise of power in murdering Demetrius before becoming Ptolemy's bride was a prerequisite for bringing the fertile Cyrenaica into the Ptolemaic house.

In many ways, then, Callimachus' portrayal of Heracles' lion-skin as a bridal veil offers a positive model for his powerful queen, particularly in casting her *bonum facinus* (Cat. 66.27), killing Demetrius, as an imitation of her 'ancestor' Heracles' killing of the lion. But there is an important qualification. As we have seen, Ἡρακλῆς γαμούμενος is a figure from comedy who coheres with the Molercus' episode's humble register.<sup>75</sup> Callimachus may compare his powerful queen to Heracles, but only at the hero's weakest and most laughable. In this way Callimachus

---

<sup>72</sup> It is tempting to regard Aelian's anecdote as influenced by Callimachus' bridal Heracles and Berenice, but perhaps the more likely scenario is that Callimachus' poem and the anecdote betray a common association between Berenice and lions at court.

<sup>73</sup> For images and analysis see Mørkholm (1991), no. 307 with discussion at 108; Kyrieleis (1975), 95-6; Clayman (2014a), 128-9; van Oppen de Ruiter (2015), 45-9.

<sup>74</sup> Ager (2017), 174-5.

<sup>75</sup> For comedy's influence on the episode see Ambühl (2002), 26-32.

tempers his new queen's power and violence so as to make it seem less threatening and more palatable.

After felling the lion and leaving Molorcus' hut the next morning, Heracles remembered to thank his host: οὐδὲ ξεινοδόκῳ λήσαθ' ὑποσχέσις, / πέμψε δέ οἱ τὸ[ν] ὄρῃα, τίεν δέ ἐ ὥς ἕνα πηῶν ('And he did not forget his promise to his host, but sent him the ass and paid him honors like one of his in-laws', fr. 54i.19-20 Harder). Scholars generally understand πηοί as 'kin',<sup>76</sup> the word's original and commoner meaning, however, is 'relative by marriage'.<sup>77</sup> Given Callimachus' demonstrated interest in Archaic kinship terminology,<sup>78</sup> it seems reasonable to assume that he intended the latter meaning. After all, Heracles has by now donned the lion-skin as his καλύπτρα. We are thus invited to regard Heracles as if married into the house of his host Molorcus, and not as a son-in-law, but as a bride.

This passage concludes epinician's mythic panel, if not also the poem.<sup>79</sup> Callimachus' ring composition returns us to his opening proposal (Ζηνί τε καὶ Νεμέῃ τι χάρισιον ἔδνον ὀφείλω, / νύμφα, κα[σιγνή]των ἱερὸν αἶμα θεῶν, fr. 54.1-2) and suggests how Berenice should respond. The victorious, bridal Heracles thanked his poor host for his hospitality with a gift worthy of an in-law; Berenice, too, should reciprocate by accepting his ἔδνον and sealing their poetic marriage.

---

<sup>76</sup> Pfeiffer (1949), 64 ad loc.; Gow (1950), 2.310 ad *Id.* 16.25 πηῶν; Harder (2012), 2.482 ad loc.

<sup>77</sup> Miller (1953), 49, noted by Harder (2012), 2.482. See LSJ s.v.

<sup>78</sup> See *h.Art.* 135 εἰνότερες γαλόφω τε with Bornmann (1968), 67 ad loc.

<sup>79</sup> See Harder (2012), 2.474 ad fr. 54i.

iii. *Competing for the queen's hand*

However the *Victoria* debuted, its primary audience was the Ptolemaic court, where Callimachus was far from the only poet fighting for Berenice's attention. We now possess three epigrams of Posidippus (*Hippika* AB 78, 79, 82) celebrating horse-racing victories by Berenices, all of whom seem likely to be Berenice II.<sup>80</sup> A royal victory offered poets the chance to compete for patronage and court status and to win their rulers' favor.<sup>81</sup> Posidippus' epigram AB 78 from the *Hippika* makes this competition all but explicit. This epigram for an Olympic victory is spoken by Berenice herself, who pronounces [ε]ἴπατε, πάντες ἀοιδοί, ἐμὸν [κ]λέος ('Tell, all you singers, of my fame', 1). Enjoining all poets to commemorate her victory, Berenice effectively opens a competition among them to produce the finest poem. How was one to stand out from the rest? The last couplet suggests Posidippus' answer. Having begun by addressing all poets, Berenice concludes by addressing the Macedonians specifically: τεθρίππου δὲ τελείου ἀείδετε τὸν Βερ[ε]νίκης[ς] / τῆς βασιλευούσης, ὦ Μακέτα[ι], στέφανον ('Sing on, Macedonians, of the crown of reigning Berenice for her perfect four-horse team', 13-14). By

---

<sup>80</sup> Huß (2008) and Clayman (2014a), 147-58 attribute the victories to Berenice II, refuting the arguments of Criscuolo (2003) and Thompson (2005) in favor of Berenice Syra.

<sup>81</sup> Other court festivities welcomed poetic competitions: see Nelson (forthcoming b) on Lucian's anecdote (*Pro Imaginibus* 5) about a poetic competition sponsored by the Seleucid queen Stratonice to praise her hair. Callimachus' twelfth *Iambus* describes the gods' competitive gift-giving at Hebe's birth, with Apollo's poem besting the other gifts; the Olympian court's competition may be read as a model for competition at the Ptolemaic court. On this poem see now Petrovic (2019); I thank Annemarie Ambühl for suggesting this parallel.

honing in on one audience for Berenice's praises, Posidippus suggests himself as the preeminent poet for the Macedonians.<sup>82</sup>

Callimachus, however, wanted to be more than just one of Berenice's many poets. By casting his epinician as a *ἔδνον*, he angles for an exclusive position. His metaphor hearkens back to the heroic past when suitors competed for the hands of brides by offering the most numerous and pleasing gifts.<sup>83</sup> The mentality governing this competitive giving is revealed in Helen's wooing in Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women*. The Athenian hero Menestheus' *thymos* urges him to give exceeding gifts ἐπεὶ ο[ὐ] τιν' ἐέλπ[ε]το φέρτατον εἶναι / [πάντῳ]ν ἡρώων κτήνεσσι τε δω[τίναις τε] ('since he expected none of all the heroes to be superior both in possessions and in gifts', fr. 200.8-9 M-W). A man only gave *ἔδνα* for Helen if he thought he had a chance to win her, and so gave as much as he could. Competing for Berenice's patronage was a game of similar stakes. Callimachus' metaphor of *ἔδνον* exalts Berenice as a queen worth fighting for and implies that this poem is the most splendid gift he has to offer. And it is a splendid poem: a full-blown Pindaric epinician casting her as the latest bride in the line of Pindar's Cyrene, the Danaids, Helen, and even Heracles. His *ἔδνον* is one to cast all other victory poems, Posidippus' epigrams included, in the shade.

Who, though, gets to decide whether Callimachus will be Berenice's 'wedded' poet? In the Archaic world, the decision lay in the hands of the father. But is that the case here? Callimachus announces that he owes his *ἔδνον* to Zeus and Nemea, yet he says this to Berenice,

---

<sup>82</sup> On Callimachus' and Posidippus' competition and differing audiences, see Stephens (2005).

<sup>83</sup> See e.g. ἐπεὶ πόρε μυρία ἔδνα (*Il.* 16.190, 22.472; *Od.* 11.282) and πορῶν ἀπερείσια ἔδνα (*Il.* 16.178, 19.529) describing how men win brides.

whom he calls νύμφα. His direct address, I think, suggests that Berenice has an important role to play in deciding whether or not to accept Callimachus' ἔδνον, and thus the matter of her own patronage *qua* marriage.

Callimachus' epinician ἔδνον, then, creates a powerful public image for Berenice as a victorious bride sought after by many poet-suitors and endowed with the power to choose between them. This power, however, comes at a price. If Berenice accepts Callimachus' ἔδνον, as his inclusion of the poem as the opening elegy of *Aetia* 3-4 strongly suggests she did, then Callimachus professes his entitlement to recognition as her special poet. He demands fidelity, even exclusivity in her attentions to him and his poetry, a lifetime relationship of poetic *charis* for the *charis* of a patron. The power he offers her, in other words, continues only as long as she returns his favor.

## II. Read at Your Own Risk: Writing Marriage in 'Acontius and Cydippe' (fr. 67-75)

Fragments 67-75 of *Aetia* 3 belong to an elegy called by modern scholars 'Acontius and Cydippe' which tells the story of how a beautiful young man, Acontius of Ceos, won a beautiful girl, Cydippe of Naxos, as his bride and gave rise to the clan of Acontiads who bore his name. Acontius saw Cydippe at a festival on Delos, whereupon he was immediately struck with desire for her. In response the love god Eros taught Acontius a trick (*techne*, fr. 67.3) by which he might make her his wife: he wrote upon an apple the oath 'By Artemis I will marry Acontius' and rolled the apple in front of Cydippe's nurse, who gave it to her charge to read. Having read it, Cydippe unwittingly bound herself to marry Acontius. Three times her father Ceyx tried to marry her to someone else, and three times Cydippe fell ill. Ceyx finally consulted Apollo,

learned about his daughter's oath and the noble identity of her betrothed, and had her married. Callimachus ends the tale on a scholarly note, providing a synoptic overview of the history of Ceos by the fifth-century writer Xenomedes 'from whence the boy's story ran to our Calliope' (ἐνθεν ὁ παῖδός / μῦθος ἐς ἡμετέρην ἔδραμε Καλλιόπην, fr. 75.76-7).

The elegy contains the longest extant fragment of the *Aetia*, fr. 75 and has accordingly received abundant attention. Its witty and scholarly tone, for example, has been taken by many as exemplary of the overall character of the *Aetia*.<sup>84</sup> Not surprisingly Acontius' tricky use of writing has interested many Callimacheans; the lenses of epistolarity and love magic have lately shown how Acontius' inscribed apple gains power over his reader, Cydippe.<sup>85</sup> Recently scholars have turned to consider the elegy's ideological significance in its literary context of *Aetia* 3-4. Harder notes that Acontius' and Cydippe's life-long marriage produces an enduring political dynasty on Ceos and suggests that 'These notions of love as a condition for political stability may be read as a background for the *Lock of Berenice* and underline the importance of the love between the royal couple, which was part of the Ptolemaic kingship ideology.'<sup>86</sup> Clayman has drawn attention to detailed correspondences between Cydippe's and Berenice's tumultuous roads to marriage and

---

<sup>84</sup> For an analysis of the fragment's narrative style see e.g. Cairns (1979), 115-20. Hutchinson (1988), 28-33 focuses on Callimachus' use of emotion and ironic deployment of scholarship; Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 60-6 argue that the elegy displays Callimachus' self-conscious practice of aetiology and reflections on the process of writing.

<sup>85</sup> For an epistolary approach see Rosenmeyer (2006); for a focus on love magic see Rynearson (2009).

<sup>86</sup> Harder (2012), 2.545.

argues that Cydippe's story helps to put a positive spin on Berenice's murder of her first husband Demetrius.<sup>87</sup> Following these scholars' lead I would like to consider the implications that Acontius' textually-brokered marriage to Cydippe has for Callimachus' metaphor of marriage as patronage in the *Victoria Berenices*.

In this section I argue that the story of Acontius' marriage to Cydippe by means of his *techne* of an inscribed apple offers a provocative analogy for the marriage that Callimachus offers Berenice at the beginning of *Aetia* 3-4. More than textual ἔδνα link the lovers of Callimachus' story to the poet and his queen. I begin by tracing the remarkable parallels that link Berenice to Cydippe and Callimachus to Acontius. I then demonstrate that at the beginning of 'Acontius and Cydippe' Callimachus contrasts ἔδνα of material gifts with those of words, especially words sent from a distance; even more, he frames Acontius' inscribed apple as his ἔδνον for Cydippe. I argue that in this way Callimachus sets up Acontius, Cydippe, and their marriage as an analogy for his own proposed marriage to his queen. The power of Callimachus' analogy, I suggest, lies not only in portraying the benefits that will accrue to Berenice as Callimachus' 'bride,' but also the value of her patronage with respect to other assets at court, like money, victory, and fame. Finally, by crafting an analogy between Acontius' tricky ἔδνον and his own, Callimachus playfully suggests the obligation she has incurred to marry him and no other.

---

<sup>87</sup> Clayman (2014a), 189-93; (2014b).

i. *Cydippe and Berenice, Acontius and Callimachus*

Let us begin our examination of ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ with the figure of the bride, for Cydippe’s relationship to Berenice has recently been the object of discussion. To argue for any resonance between Cydippe and Berenice, of course, assumes a *terminus post quem* of 246, the year of Berenice’s marriage to Ptolemy and thus entry into Alexandria. Cameron alone has attacked this chronology, arguing that the poem must have been first composed in 279-274 and then later included in *Aetia* 3-4.<sup>88</sup> Clayman, however, has persuasively rebuffed Cameron’s arguments as uncogent,<sup>89</sup> and so we are free to assume that ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ was composed along with the rest of the collection of *Aetia* 3-4.

The first of Cydippe’s similarities to Berenice is nominal in the significant sense: Clayman astutely observes that the name Cydippe, meaning ‘Glory in Horses,’ rings indelibly of Berenice, ‘Bringer of Victory,’ a name famously shared with prize-winning race horses.<sup>90</sup> Cydippe is named in the elegy’s second line as Κυδίππη...παρθενίκη, and I would cautiously suggest that even the sound of παρθενίκη, falling as it does at line end, echoes the name Βερενίκη, tying the two women closely together. Be that as it may, Cydippe’s name invites the reader to perceive further similarities between her and Berenice as significant. Clayman goes even further and suggests that Callimachus may even have invented Cydippe’s name in order to

---

<sup>88</sup> Cameron (1995), 261-2.

<sup>89</sup> See her rejection of Cameron’s arguments at Clayman (2014b), 88-92.

<sup>90</sup> Callimachus also seems to play on Berenice’s name in the *Hymn to Demeter*, as discussed in Chapter 4.



fashion this link.<sup>91</sup> We must tread cautiously here, though; Callimachus claims that he is telling a story that he found in Xenomedes' history of Ceos, so he very well may have read Cydippe's name there. Regardless, the closeness of Cydippe's marital history to Berenice's make it likely that Callimachus' readers would have regarded her as forerunner for Berenice who was stranger than fiction, to say the least.

Let us briefly recall Cydippe's marital history: after swearing the oath by Artemis to marry Acontius, Artemis prevented her from being married to anyone else by afflicting her with sickness; at the beginning of fr. 75, she is in bed with a prepubescent boy in accordance with a Naxian fertility ritual, but she then falls ill thanks to Artemis so that she may not be married. Clayman argues persuasively that this narrative may be regarded as a 'mythologized and poeticized construction of Berenice's experience of marriage which amplifies and romanticizes it.'<sup>92</sup> As we saw in discussing the *Victoria Berenices*, Berenice's father Magas had betrothed her to Ptolemy III, but after his death her mother Apame married her instead to Demetrius the Fair, whom Berenice had killed. Berenice's action signaled that this marriage, too, was not meant to be; instead, she married Ptolemy, fulfilling what her father had designed for her, just as Cydippe was married to the man whom she had sworn to marry.

Further parallels corroborate Clayman's argument. For instance, when offering proof of Cydippe's beauty by referring to the many parents who offered ἔδνα for her to be their sons' bride, Callimachus specifies that it was 'many mothers' who were trying to arrange a marriage: πολλὰι Κυδίππην ὀλίγην ἔτι μητέρες υἱοῖς / ἐδῆσιν κέραων ἥτεον ἀντὶ βοῶν, fr. 67.9).

---

<sup>91</sup> Clayman (2014a), 90.

<sup>92</sup> Clayman (2014a), 97.

Garth Tissol has called attention to the surprising role that mothers play here instead of fathers as the brokers of their sons' marriages;<sup>93</sup> while these women's active involvement is not unprecedented – in Euripides' *Heracles* Megara recalls how she was arranging marriages for her sons to the daughters of prominent families (476-9) – it is still remarkable, and Vergil took note.<sup>94</sup> In light of Cydippe's other connections to Berenice, I suggest that these mothers may recall Berenice's mother Apame, who circumvented her dead husband's wishes for Berenice to marry Ptolemy and married her to Demetrius instead.

An additional detail about Cydippe's beauty which would link her closely to Berenice is preserved in the account of Acontius and Cydippe by the late-antique epistolographer Aristaenetus (1.10), who has long been recognized to have engaged with Callimachus' poem directly.<sup>95</sup> Concluding his description of Cydippe's beauty, Aristaenetus writes: τοῖς ὄμμασι Χάριτες οὐ τρεῖς καθ' Ἡσίοδον, ἀλλὰ δεκάδων περιχορεύει δεκάς ('In her eyes were dancing

---

<sup>93</sup> Tissol (1992), 264.

<sup>94</sup> In Rome women certainly played an active role in selecting wives: see Treggiari (1992), 138 for discussion of ancient sources and Horsfall (2003), 338 on Verg. *Aen.* 11.581 ad loc. But we cannot retroject Roman practice onto Callimachus' day and his portrayal of the epic past, so this evidence must be treated with caution.

<sup>95</sup> Aristaenetus' letters are now translated with commentary in Bing and Höschel (2014). Bing (2019) now examines Aristaenetus' approach to Callimachus, suggesting an exemplary instance on 43 where Aristaenetus expands Callimachus' description, 'offering a more comprehensive account, a universalizing taxonomy of one particular ethical posture, delivered, as it were, by the book.'

not three Graces, as according to Hesiod, but ten sets of ten,' Aristaen. 1.10.5-6). As Bing has recently reminded us, Aristaenetus does not reproduce Callimachus' every detail, but often amplifies it, and so we cannot simply assume that Callimachus also described one hundred Graces dancing in Cydippe's eyes.<sup>96</sup> Yet there are delicate traces which point us to this conclusion. Callimachus describes Cydippe's beauty in fr. 67.13-14 by claiming that no girl more beautiful than her 'set her delicate foot down in the chorus for sleeping Ariadne' (οὐδ' Ἀριήδης / [ἐξ χ]ορὸν εὐδούσης ἄβρὸν ἔθηκε πόδα). After this mention of dancing girls the papyrus is highly fragmentary. Nevertheless, Sell has noted that the remains of verses 20-1 echo Aristaenetus' description of Cydippe's beauty; of particular interest is ὄθμασιν ('?in eyes') line 21, which would echo Aristaenetus' description of the hundred Graces in Cydippe's eyes.<sup>97</sup> Pfeiffer thought that these eyes were Acontius',<sup>98</sup> but Sell makes a strong case in favor of Cydippe's eyes, since Musaeus, who also seems to have used Callimachus' 'Acontius and Cydippe,' describes his heroine Hero as having one hundred Graces in her eyes (Mus. 63-5).<sup>99</sup>

It has not yet been noted that, if Callimachus did indeed describe more than three Graces dancing in Cydippe's eyes, then he brought her in very close connection to his queen Berenice, whom he praised in a famous epigram as the fourth Grace:

τέσσαρες αἱ Χάριτες, ποτὶ γὰρ μία ταῖς τρίσι τήναις  
 ἄρτι ποτεπλάσθη κῆτι μύροισι νοτεῖ.  
 εὐαίων ἐν πᾶσιν ἀρίζαλος Βερενίκα,  
 ἅς ἄτερ οὐδ' αὐταὶ αἱ Χάριτες Χάριτες.

---

<sup>96</sup> Bing (2019), 43.

<sup>97</sup> Sell (1964), 371.

<sup>98</sup> Pfeiffer (1949), 1.73-4 ad loc.

<sup>99</sup> Sell (1964), 371, followed by Massimilla (2010), 339 ad loc. and Harder (2012), 2.506.

Four are the Graces: for one has been fashioned recently in addition to these and still is wet with scented unguents. Happy among all is Berenice, desirous of glory, without whom even the Graces themselves are not Graces.

In this epigram Berenice not only has amplified the Graces' company of three, but what is more she makes it so that they are no longer Graces without her. Callimachus' likely mention of more than three Graces dancing in Cydippe's eyes thus would cast her as an obvious model for Berenice's immense beauty. And the connection between these two ladies might have been quite obvious to the reader indeed. Petrovic and Petrovic have made a most attractive argument that epigram 51 Pf. be read as commemorating Callimachus' addition of *Aetia* 3-4, which begin and end with Berenice, to *Aetia* 1-2, which began with the Graces (fr. 3-7b Harder), so that the old 'Graces' *Aetia* is no longer the *Aetia* without the books of Berenice.<sup>100</sup> If they are correct that this epigram is linked to the publication of *Aetia* 3-4, then the reader of 'Acontius and Cydippe' could hardly failed to have noticed the comparison between the hundred Graces dancing in Cydippe's eyes and Berenice.

Just as Cydippe may be regarded as a foil for Berenice, so too Acontius evokes his poet, Callimachus, with whom he shares a number of parallels. The most obvious of these have long been noted: Acontius, as a boy (παῖς, fr. 67.2; cf. κουρίδιον 4) taught *technē* by the god Eros (αὐτὸς Ἔρως ἐδίδαξεν...τέχνην, 1-3), indelibly echoes Callimachus' self-presentation in the *Aetia* prologue. There the poet recounts how when he first put writing tablets on his knees (ὅτε πρῶτιστον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα / γούνασιν, fr. 1.21-2) Apollo instructed him in poetry (22-8). Among the god's precepts is the one Callimachus hurls against the Telchines, to judge poetry by τέχνη, not the Persian chain (αὔθι δὲ τέχνη / [κρίνετε,] μὴ σχοίνῳ Περσίδι τήν

---

<sup>100</sup> Petrovic and Petrovic (2003), 198-204.

σοφίην, 17-18). Moreover, Callimachus emphasizes that he was favored by the Muses as a boy: Μοῦσαι γὰρ ὅσους ἴδον ὄθματι παῖδας / μὴ λοξῶι, πολιοὺς οὐκ ἀπέθεντο φίλους ('For the Muses do not cast aside their friends, all those whom they did not look askance at as children, when they have turned grey,' 37-8). The Telchines similarly accuse him of writing verse as a child (ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἐλ[.....] / παῖς ἄτε, 5-6), a criticism he appropriates to his own credit. Thus Acontius' youth and his divine instruction in τέχνη, which turns out to be a trick of writing, prompt the reader to regard Acontius as bearing some relation to Callimachus.

While the importance of Acontius as a writer has been recognized, the similarities of his genealogy to Callimachus' and the close link it forges between them have not been. When Cydippe's father Ceyx finally goes to seek Apollo's advice on his daughter's marriage, the god tells him about his daughter's oath to Acontius, but consoles him, since Acontius is an excellent match for his daughter:

Κοδρείδης σύ γ' ἄνωθεν ὁ πενθερός, αὐτὰρ ὁ Κεῖος  
 γαμβρὸς Ἀρισταίου [Ζη]γὸς ἀφ' ἱερέων  
 Ἰκμίου οἷσι μέμ[η]λεν ἐπ' οὔρεος ἀμβώνεσσιν  
 πρηῦνεν χαλ[ε]πὴν Μαῖραν ἀνερχομένην,  
 αἰτεῖσθαι τὸ δ' ἄημα παρὰ Διὸς ὦι τε θαμεινοὶ  
 πλήσσονται λινέαις ὀρτυγες ἐν νεφέλαις. (fr. 75.32-7)

You, the father-in-law, are a descendent of Codrus, while the Cean son-in-law comes from the priests of Zeus Aristaeus, whose care it is upon the peaks of Mt. Icmius to soothe the harsh wind Maera when she rises, and to request from Zeus the wind with which quails thick and fast are struck against fine linen nets.

Acontius belongs to the famous Ceian family of Zeus Aristaeus' hereditary priests, and this lineage connects him to Callimachus' city of Cyrene, for Aristaeus was Cyrene's son with Apollo. Harder suggests that Acontius' Cyrenean heritage may endow him with programmatic

significance.<sup>101</sup> We can be more specific. Callimachus, too, belonged to a family of Cyrenean priests with a long history of service to Apollo, a tradition which Callimachus continued by composing his hymn for Cyrenean Apollo.<sup>102</sup> I would suggest that Callimachus in fact prompts his reader to connect Acontius to himself by describing Acontius' family religious service as a form of 'aetiology.' Apollo tells Ceyx that the priests of Aristaeus 'request' (αἰτεῖσθαι, fr. 75.36) Zeus to send a soothing wind. Scholars have long noted that Callimachus here provides an aetiology for the Etesian winds, which is aetiology in a different sense;<sup>103</sup> but he also plays here on the name of his poem of *Aetia*, to which Acontius' story belongs. The priests' concern with the winds, moreover, recalls Callimachus' own interest in winds as glimpsed in the title of his prose work *On Winds*; the nice touch about the winds catching quails in nets also suggests the kind of learning one might find in his *On Birds*, since why quails were found on Ceos was a matter of scholarly concern.<sup>104</sup> Acontius thus has both ties to Cyrene and to the priestly duties of aetiology, and these align him obviously with Callimachus.

Several scholars, however, have seen Acontius as a contrastive foil rather than an analogical model for Callimachus. Hutchinson sees the relationship between the two writers as 'complicated': on the one hand Acontius and Callimachus are both taught writing by a god and

---

<sup>101</sup> Harder (2012), 2.614 on fr. 75.32-7.

<sup>102</sup> On Callimachus' family ties to Cyrenean Apollo see Petrovic (2011), 284 with further bibliography.

<sup>103</sup> On Callimachus' implicit etymology see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 64; Harder (2012), 2.618 on 75.36 discusses the other attestations of the etymology in greater detail.

<sup>104</sup> Both works mentioned by Harder (2012), 2.620 on fr. 75.37.

well-versed in love's discontents; on the other Acontius' use of writing is, in Hutchinson's view, 'merely practical cunning' and 'unaesthetic,' whereas Callimachus' poem is hyper-sophisticated.<sup>105</sup> Yet Aristaenetus' account suggests that there was considerable aesthetic allure to Acontius' text. When Cydippe's nurse picks up the apple, she marvels at its wondrous size and marvelous color and lavishes praise on them to Cydippe. So even in this regard Callimachus and Acontius are strongly aligned. Rosenmeyer, agreeing that both men are sophisticated authors, still contrasts them on the grounds that Callimachus gains his readers' trust by appealing to the veracity of the story he found in Xenomedes, who was 'an old man devoted to truth' (πρέσβυς ἐτητυμίῃ μεμελημένος, fr. 75.76), whereas Acontius deceives his reader, Cydippe, by using the 'tricky malleability' inherent in written texts to persuade Cydippe 'to believe his "story", namely that he loves her.'<sup>106</sup> We might object, however, that Cydippe's belief in the truth of Acontius' feelings is never at stake and thus is not a fair criterion on which to distinguish these two writers.

Gutzwiller, instead, emphasizing their similarities, suggests that Acontius may be interpreted as a proto-Callimachean poet for Callimachus' practice of poetry. As she writes,

Since Callimachus begins the episode with the statement that Eros helped the clueless, lovelorn Acontius by teaching him 'art' (*technē*, fr. 67.3), we might read here Acontius' desire for Cydippe...as an emblem of the poet's own creative desires, likewise fulfilled through the exercise of art.<sup>107</sup>

On this reading Acontius is an analogy for the poet who writes art for art's sake. Acontius, however, does not use *technē* to fulfill an autotelic, artistic desire, but 'so that [he might be called by] this life-long name as married (ὄφρα λέγοι[το] / τοῦτο διὰ ζωῆς οὔνομα κουρίδιον, fr.

---

<sup>105</sup> Hutchinson (2003), 52.

<sup>106</sup> Rosenmeyer (1996), 11; (2001), 112.

<sup>107</sup> Gutzwiller (2007), 66.

67.3-4).<sup>108</sup> In fact, this is precisely the reason for which Callimachus wrote his *Victoria Berenices*. In fact, the very theme of the poet's ἔδνον which we observed in that poem reappears in the beginning of 'Acontius and Cydippe,' thus forging a close link between the two poems. Let us consider it in detail.

ii. Verbal and textual ἔδνα at the beginning of 'Acontius and Cydippe'

Like he does in the *Victoria Berenices*, Callimachus opens 'Acontius and Cydippe' by introducing a word that is key to the entire elegy, but nevertheless initially unclear in its meaning.<sup>109</sup> In the *Victoria* that word was ἔδνον; in 'Acontius and Cydippe' it is τέχνη. Let us consider the first four lines of the elegy:

αὐτὸς Ἔρως ἐδίδαξεν Ἀκόντιον, ὁππότε καλῇι  
 ἦιθετο Κυδίππῃ παῖς ἐπὶ παρθενικῇ,  
 τέχνην – οὐ γὰρ ὄγ' ἔσκε πολύκροτος – ὄφρα λέγο.. [  
 τοῦτο διὰ ζωῆς οὐνομα κουρίδιον. (fr. 67.1-4)

Eros himself taught Acontius – for he was not very clever – *technē* when he was burning as a boy for beautiful, virginal Cydippe, so that...this wedded name throughout life.<sup>110</sup>

While those who already know the story know what *technē* Eros taught Acontius, readers unfamiliar with the tale are left wondering what exactly is meant here, for τέχνη is an expansive

---

<sup>108</sup> I here print Lobel's conjecture *exempli gratia*; while scholars agree on the general sense of the phrase, restoring the text is problematic: see Harder (2012), 2.551-2 for discussion of the various conjectures, none of which are wholly convincing.

<sup>109</sup> See the analysis of Harder (2012), 2.549-50 on fr. 67.3 τέχνην.

<sup>110</sup> For evaluation of the sense of lines 3-4 and supplements posited, see Harder (2012), 2.551 ad loc.



concept ranging in meaning from specific skills to systems of knowledge. Callimachus further toys with his readers with the parenthesis οὐ γὰρ ὄγ' ἔσκε πολύκροτος ('for he was not very clever,' 3). Instead of explicating τέχνη, the γάρ-clause complicates it further still, for the adjective πολύκροτος, like τέχνη, is multivalent, so the reader must consider its possible meanings and earlier usage to understand the word's significance fully here. Scholars have demonstrated that two meanings of πολύκροτος are active here.<sup>111</sup> First, as Pfeiffer notes, πολύκροτον alludes to the beginning of the *Odyssey* since the word was a variant reading for πολύτροπον in the epic's first line (ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον..., 'Tell me, Muse, of the man of many turns...', *Od.* 1.1). In this alternative opening to the *Odyssey*, which was probably known to Callimachus, πολύκροτος was interpreted as meaning 'cunning' (cf. *Ov. Her.* 20.25).<sup>112</sup> But as Coletti and others have pointed out, πολύκροτος is also used to mean 'loud' or 'talkative,' as in the *Homeric Hymn to Pan* (37).<sup>113</sup> Harder states the *communis opinio* that Callimachus likely intended the adjective in both senses: on the one hand, Acontius was not 'cunning' like Odysseus and thus in need of Eros' instruction in *techne*; on the other, he was not 'loud' or 'talkative' and so used writing as a means to trick Cydippe, silently, into pronouncing aloud an oath that she would marry him.<sup>114</sup>

Since Pfeiffer scholars have cited a Hesiodic passage pertaining to Odysseus which supports the interpretation of πολύκροτος at *Odyssey* 1.1. In the *Catalogue of Women* Hesiod

---

<sup>111</sup> See Harder (2002), 192-3; (2012), 2,549-50 ad loc.

<sup>112</sup> Pfeiffer (1949), 71 ad loc.; Massimilla (2010), 331 ad loc.

<sup>113</sup> Coletti (1962), 299-301; Pardini (1991), 57-70.

<sup>114</sup> Harder (2012), 2.550-1 ad loc.; cf. Harder (2012), 192.

describes how Odysseus displayed his cunning during the wooing of Helen; as such, the passage bears important thematic similarities both to ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ and the *Victoria Berenices*.

All the best men in Greece, Hesiod tells us, competed in offering ἔδνα to Tyndareus for his daughter’s hand in marriage. All, that is, except Odysseus:

ἐκ δ’ Ἰθάκης ἐμνᾶτο Ὀδυσσεῖος ἱερὴ ἴς,  
υἱὸς Λαέρταο πολύκροτα μήδεα εἰδῶς.  
δῶρα μὲν οὐ ποτ’ ἔπεμπε τανισφύρου εἵνεκα κούρης·  
ἦιδεε γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ὅτι ξανθὸς Μενέλαος  
νικήσει, κτήνῳ γὰρ Ἀχαιῶν φέρτατος ἦεν·  
ἀγγελίην δ’ αἰεὶ Λακεδαίμονάδε προΐαλλεν  
Κάστορί θ’ ἵπποδάμῳ καὶ ἀεθλοφόρῳ Πολυδεύκει. (fr. 198.2-8 M-W)

And from Ithaca the holy strength of Odysseus wooed [Helen], Laertes’ son who knew cunning plans. He never sent gifts for the girl of slender ankles, for in his spirit he knew that golden-haired Menelaus would win, since he was the best of the Achaeans when it came to property. Instead he sent forth messages continually to Lacedaemon to both horse-taming Castor and prize-winning Polydeuces.

Here Hesiod tells us that Odysseus knew that he would never win Helen by offering Tyndareus material gifts, because Menelaus could out-give everyone in this respect. Instead Odysseus, πολύκροτα μήδεα εἰδῶς, sent messages to Helen’s brothers to win favor for himself, presumably by making them attractive promises so that they might persuade their father to choose him over the other suitors.

Hannelore Reinsch-Werner has argued that Callimachus’ Hesiodic allusion is humorously ironic, for the shrewd, dispassionate suitor Odysseus is a strong foil for the lovesick Acontius, conquered by Eros.<sup>115</sup> The allusion’s joking tone seems to be confirmed by the way underhanded way that Callimachus introduces it. Eros taught Acontius *technē* ‘because he was *not* very clever’ (οὐ γὰρ ἔσκε πολύκροτος, fr. 67.3); in other words, while Odysseus,

---

<sup>115</sup> Reinsch-Werner (1976), 106-8.

πολύκροτα μήδεα εἰδώς, knew a way to woo Helen, Acontius was not πολύκροτος and so needed Eros's instruction. But the allusion also throws Acontius' use of writing in sharp relief. Odysseus sends constant messages to Helen's brothers, presumably by messengers (ἀγγελίην δ' αἰεὶ...προΐαλλεν, fr. 198.7 M.-W.); Eros, by contrast, teaches Acontius to write upon an apple, and instead of communicating with Cydippe's male kin he writes to her directly. Both of these features tighten the connection of these ancient wooers to the writer Callimachus and his patron Berenice, whom he addressed directly as *nympha* in the *Victoria Berenices*.

### iii. 'Acontius and Cydippe' and the Perks of Marrying A Writer

To our modern ears, the point of this comparison between Acontius, writing words to win Cydippe as his bride, and Callimachus, offering her words to win her patronage, might seem hard to bear. Recent scholarship on 'Acontius and Cydippe' has emphasized the manipulative Acontius uses writing to entrap and bind Cydippe to himself.<sup>116</sup> Be that as it may, Callimachus himself emphasizes not only the suitability of the match, but the benefit that Cydippe receives from marrying Acontius. Acontius and Cydippe are 'both beautiful stars of the islands' (καλοὶ νησάων ἀστέρες ἀμφοτέροι, fr. 67.7) and both of regal families: Cydippe is the daughter of Prometheus and thus a direct descendant Codrus, the last king of Athens, while Acontius is the son of Euxantius, a son of Minos. When Apollo tells Cydippe's father Ceyx whom his daughter has sworn to marry, he reassures him because the marriage will benefit not only Acontius, but

---

<sup>116</sup> Rosenmeyer (1996), 13, uses Svenbro's reader-response theory in discussing Cydippe's 'textual entrapment'; Rynearson (2009), 355-7 compares Acontius' apple to an erotic binding-spell (*katadesmos*).

also himself and his daughter: ἀργύρωι οὐ μόλιβον γὰρ Ἀκόντιον, ἀλλὰ φαεινῶι / ἤλεκτρον χρυσῶι φημί σε μειξέμεναι ('For I declare that you will not mix Acontius as lead to silver, but as electrum to resplendent gold,' fr. 57.30-1). By likening the two young people to metals, Apollo explicitly raises the issue of the value of marriage for both parties, with a focus on Cydippe, to whom Acontius will be 'mixed' (μειξέμεναι, 31), a verb recalling not only the mixing of metals but also of people in sexual union. Apollo is emphatic that Acontius will not be like lead to Cydippe's silver; that is, he will not gain in value through his association with silver while diminishing her own by dulling her shine.<sup>117</sup> Rather, he will be ἤλεκτρον, which is either amber or electrum, an alloy of gold and silver, that is joined to her as gold, sparkling beside her and even enhancing her shine;<sup>118</sup> the play of light suggested by the combination of these metals suggests the fascination such precious metals and gems held for the Ptolemaic court as evidence by Posidippus' *Lithika*. Apollo thus flatteringly reassures Ceyx that his daughter will be superior in value as gold to her husband of *electron*, but that she will become more precious still through her union with him. This passage offers a powerful analogy for the union that Callimachus proposes to Berenice. Her social superiority is unquestioned, but his, though less precious, is still distinguished: he is a descendant of Battus, and his union to her as her wedded poet will only add to her luster.

---

<sup>117</sup> The text of line 30 in the papyrus is problematic. I follow Pfeiffer and Harder in reading Legrand's ἀργύρωι οὐ μόλιβον: see Harder (2012), 2.611 ad loc.

<sup>118</sup> Harder (2012), 2.612-13 ad loc. provides compelling evidence that both amber and gold and electrum and gold were combined in precious works of art, explaining the play of light that they produce. She concludes that both interpretations of the line are possible.

How will Callimachus add to Berenice's splendor? Let us consider how Acontius adds to Cydippe's. In the latter case, it is through the production of texts that celebrate her beauty and perpetuate her *kleos*. First, we are fortunate to possess a fragment from a scene that was highly influential on Latin elegy, in which Acontius goes off to the countryside (cf. fr. 72) to lament. By now Acontius has inscribed his apple and Cydippe has read it; they are not yet married, however, so Acontius continues to suffer. But he also continues to write: addressing the solitary trees, he exclaims: ἀλλ' ἐνὶ δῇ φλοιλοῖσι κεκομμένα τόσσα φέροιτε / γράμματα, Κυδίππην ὅσσ' ἐρέουσι καλήν ('but may you bear as many letters carved on your bark as shall say "Cydippe is beautiful,"' fr. 73). This moment marks an ironic reversal in Acontius' life. As Kenney has argued attractively, Acontius was himself a beautiful boy about whom his hopeful lovers must have written Ἀκόντιος καλός ('Acontius is beautiful') all over the city, but he rejected them; now feeling the pangs of love himself, he inscribes the beauty of his desired girl, Cydippe, on trees.<sup>119</sup> Acontius' καλή-inscription is all the more remarkable, Kenney notes, since graffiti about women tended to be derogatory rather than praiseworthy.<sup>120</sup> If the ideal wife, that is, was one not spoken about, Acontius makes Cydippe positively a bane.

But the praise of Cydippe's beauty is best considered not in relation to inscriptions from Classical Athens, but rather to the public personae of Hellenistic queens: Cydippe, after all, is in other respects a striking analogy for Berenice. Callimachus, like Acontius, took to writing to spread the beauty of his desired 'bride' Berenice for all to read. The epigram 'Four are the

---

<sup>119</sup> Kenney (1983), 49.

<sup>120</sup> Kenney (1983), 49, at n. 19 pointing to the examples of such abuse against women collected in Dover (1978), 113-14.

Graces' (51 Pf.) considered above is a perfect example of his project and indeed a fitting analogy for Acontius' inscription: it is a short poem that praises Berenice as the epitome of *charis*, all the while playing with the conventions of several inscriptional genres of epigram, one of which is the καλός-inscription practiced by Acontius.<sup>121</sup> The *Coma Berenices*, though a longer poem, offers another eroticized portrayal of the queen and plays with conventions of inscribed epigram, this time that of the speaking object of dedicatory epigram.<sup>122</sup> I would suggest then that Acontius' καλή-inscription upon the trees of the forest furnishes Callimachus a model within *Aetia* 3-4 for exactly the kind of poetic project he was engaged in to win the favor of his queen and hopeful 'bride.'

Acontius writes upon the trees when he is burning with love for Cydippe before she is his bride. But writing does not cease with their marriage. Marriage, rather, is just the beginning of Cydippe's textual memorialization:

ἐκ δὲ γάμου κείνοιο μέγ' οὔνομα μέλλε νέεσθαι·  
 δὴ γὰρ ἔθ' ὑμέτερον φύλον Ἀκοντιάδαι  
 πουλύ τι καὶ περίτιμον Ἰουλίδι ναιετάουσιν,  
 Κεῖτε, τεὸν δ' ἡμεῖς ἴμερον ἐκλύομεν  
 τόνδε παρ' ἀρχαίου Ξενομήδεος, ὅς ποτε πᾶσαν  
 νῆσον ἐνὶ μνήμηι κάτθετο μυθολόγῳ (fr. 75.50-55)

And out of that marriage a great name would travel; for in fact, Cean, your great and exceedingly honored tribe, the Acontiadae, still inhabit Ioulis, and we heard of this desire of yours from ancient Xenomedes, who once laid down the entire island in a mythological account...

---

<sup>121</sup> Petrovic and Petrovic (2003) explore the epigram's play with erotic, epideictic, dedicatory, and book epigram.

<sup>122</sup> On the *Coma*'s play with the genre of dedicatory epigram see Harder (1998), 98-9; Harder (2012), 2.797.

This passage directly follows Callimachus' description of Acontius' joy on first sleeping with his wife Cydippe. What comes from their marriage (ἐκ δὲ γάμου κείνοιο, 50) is not merely a child, but a 'great name' (μέγ' οὔνομα) which 'goes forth' (νέεσθαι, 50) widely in both space and time. The Acontiadae dwell widely in Ioulis where they are highly honored (πουλύ τι καὶ περίτιμον Ἰουλίδι ναιετάουσιν, 52); what is more, their eminence has extended from the past even into the present day of Callimachus' writing (δὴ γὰρ ἔθ', 51). Yet the Acontiads' survival is not enough to preserve the story of Acontius' apple and Cydippe's beauty. It is only thanks to 'ancient Xenomedes, who once laid down the entire island in a mythological account' (54-5), that Callimachus has learned the story and can perpetuate it in his own account. Young Acontius' inscribed words upon the tree did not, it seems, survive to the present to tell of Cydippe's beauty. They reach the present through their re-production and collection in Xenomedes' history.

Callimachus lays great stress upon Xenomedes' old age: he was πρέσβυς ἐτητυμίῃ μεμελημένος ('an old man devoted to truth,' fr. 75.76). It is thus possible that Xenomedes is, like Acontius, another analogy for Callimachus, this time Callimachus not as a young man, but as the old man of the *Aetia* prologue. In this respect we should pay attention to the similarities between Xenomedes' history of Ceos, as Callimachus summarizes it, and his own *Aetia*, for the texts intersect in intriguing ways. Xenomedes began with how the island got its old name Hydroussa ('Watery'), a story which involves a large lion chasing away Corycian nymphs from a cave, presumably wet, on Mt. Parnassus (ἄρχμενος ὡς νύμφησι[ν ἐ]νάιετο Κωρυκίησιν, / τὰς ἀπὸ Παρνησσοῦ λίς ἐδίωξε μέγας, 56-7). Xenomedes' beginning and Callimachus' description of it strongly recall the start of Callimachus' own new books of *Aetia* with the *Victoria*, where the νυμφή Berenice is compared to Heracles, who defeated the Nemean lion. Moreover, the movement of the Corycian nymphs in Xenomedes' tale from Mt. Parnassus could evoke the

transition from Callimachus' dialogue with the Muses on Parnassus in his dream in *Aetia* 1-2 to the new books of *Aetia* 3-4 which lacked such a connecting frame. Moving along in Xenomedes' history, we learn that it contained the gods' smiting of the impious Telchines (65-9), which cannot help but recall the *Aetia* prologue where Callimachus, too, does away with these sorcerers by banishing them and their criticism. Further, Callimachus' description of how Xenomedes included the Telchines in his writing tablets (ἐν δὲ γοήτας / Τελχῖνας.../...ἐνεθήκατο δέλτ[οις], 64-6) echoes his own recollection in the prologue, after banishing the Telchines, of how he first put writing tablets on his knees (ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα / ἱγούνασιν, fr. 1.21-2). As a final parallel between these two works and their authors, Callimachus devotes an entire line to Xenomedes' account of 'Poïessa, shrine of the Graces with beautiful tresses' (Ποιῆσαν Χαρίτων ἱδρυμ' εὐπλοκάμων, fr. 75.73). Callimachus began the *Aetia* by asking the Muses about the Graces' worship on Paros (fr. 3-7b Harder), and he ends *Aetia* 4 with the 'lock' (πλόκαμος) of Berenice, the fourth Grace (ep. 51 Pf.). Nor is this the *Lock*'s only link to Xenomedes' history. Callimachus begins the passage we are considering about Acontius and Cydippe by saying that 'out of that marriage a great name was to arise' (ἐκ δὲ γαμοῦ κείνοιο μέγ' οὔνομα μέλλε νέεσθαι, fr. 75.50). The *Lock of Berenice* similarly centers on Berenice's marriage to Ptolemy, which made her possess the great name of a queen.

Cydippe's fame, then, is perpetuated by two authors writing two very different kinds of texts. There is first Acontius, her young lover, who carves Κυδίππη καλή on the forest's trees in her honor; and there is old Xenomedes, who collects Acontius and Cydippe's textual story as a part of his larger text, thereby weaving them into the fabric of the whole. For Berenice, Callimachus plays both roles. Not only did he, like Acontius, write her individual poems – some short like epigram 51 Pf, others longer like the *Victoria* and the *Coma* – but he collected them,



like Xenomedes, in his old age, thereby anchoring her story in the variegated cultural history of the *oikoumene* given in the *Aetia*. If, then, the *Victoria Berenices* gives the impression that it alone is Berenice's ἔδνον, 'Acontius and Cydippe' shows how a single act of a poet's writing – like Acontius' apple – is just the beginning of a cycle of textual production that will anchor the praise of her beauty for all time.

We have now considered how 'Acontius and Cydippe' demonstrates the value that writers have to brides in the case of both Cydippe and, by analogy, Berenice. What fruits does the elegy suggest that Callimachus will reap from his marriage to Berenice? To answer this we shall now turn to the description of Acontius' wedding night, when Callimachus the narrator addresses his hero directly and tries to guess his joy:

οὐ σε δοκέω τημοῦτος, Ἀκόντιε, νυκτὸς ἐκείνης  
 ἀντί κε, τῇι μίτρης ἦψαο παρθενίης,  
 οὐ σφυρὸν Ἰφίκλειον ἐπιτρέχον ἀσταχύεσσιν  
 οὐδ' ἂ Κελαινίτης ἐκτεάτιστο Μίδης  
 δέξασθαι, ψήφου δ' ἂν ἐμῆς ἐπιμάρτυρες εἶεν  
 οἵτινες οὐ χαλεποῦ νήιδές εἰσι θεοῦ. (fr. 75.44-9)

I do not think that at that time, Acontius, you would have taken, in exchange for that night on which you touched her virgin girdle, the ankle of Iphiclus that ran across the ears of wheat, or the possessions that Midas of Celaenae acquired. May the witnesses of my vote be whoever are not ignorant of the harsh god (i.e. Eros).

Callimachus offers two foils for consummating his marriage to Cydippe: gaining the ankle of Iphicles or the wealth of Midas. It is noteworthy that both of these men have a superlative quality only at great cost in another respect. Iphiclus was famously fast (e.g. *Il.* 23.636; Hes. fr. 62) but sterile (Paus. 4.36.3; Apollod. 1.98-102); the story of his cure by the seer Melampus is first attested in a fragment of the fifth-century mythographer Pherecydes of Athens (*FGrH* 3 F 33) and is temptingly hinted at in a very fragmentary passage of the *Victoria Berenices* (fr. 54e.5-6

Harder).<sup>123</sup> Midas' superlative wealth, attested as early as Tyrtaeus (fr. 12.6), is famously coupled with his golden touch that threatens to prevent him from eating or drinking; while this part of the story is first attested only in Latin authors (e.g. Ov. *Met.* 11.90-145), that Callimachus knew it is suggested by coupling him with Iphiclus and his use of ἥψαο in verse 45 of Acontius touching Cydippe's girdle, perhaps recalling Midas' fatal touch.<sup>124</sup> Callimachus' point is that, while athletic victories and unsurpassed wealth were enviable marks of distinction, their costs were crippling. Far more valuable was his life-long marriage (διὰ ζῶης, fr. 67.3) to Cydippe, which would produce the 'great name' (μέγ' οὔνομα) of the Acontiads (fr. 75.50-2).

This passage, when read analogically, makes a powerful statement about the value of Berenice's favor at court, for in rejecting riches and athletic victories Callimachus makes a powerful claim about their value vis-à-vis the perks of royal favor. Just as Acontius would reject Midas' riches and Iphiclus' ankle for Cydippe's girdle, so too, we should infer, would he spurn the riches of a courtier like Callicrates of Samos or the athletic talent of a Sosibius in favor of Berenice's favor. In this light it is worth taking on the full meaning of Callimachus' euphemistic phrase μίτρης ἥψαο παρθενίης ('you touched her virgin girdle, fr. 75.45).<sup>125</sup> While μίτρα regularly means ζώνη in Hellenistic poetry, it was also the name for the Ptolemies' royal diadem tied around their heads; Callimachus refers to this at *Hymn to Delos* 166.<sup>126</sup> Cydippe's girdle thus

---

<sup>123</sup> For an analysis of this fragment see Harder (2012), 467-8 ad loc.

<sup>124</sup> Harder (2012), 2.628-9 ad loc. collects sources relating to Midas' wealth and his golden touch.

<sup>125</sup> On the euphemism see Harder (2012), 2.627 ad loc.

<sup>126</sup> On the diadem see Stephens (2005), 237-40.

evokes Berenice's diadem, and Acontius' joy upon taking his bride's girdle in his hands is sublimated into Callimachus' wish for his queen's royal favor.

Thus Callimachus in this passage, by analogy, constructs the social capital of an exclusive relationship of patronage as the most valuable form of capital within the field of court. Such an analogy must have been immensely pleasing to Berenice and the Ptolemies, for it reifies their status as the ultimate arbiters of cultural capital and its possessors: whomever they choose is the best, and their favor is the highest good one could have in the court's competition for status.

As we have seen then, the marriage of Acontius and Cydippe adds to the value of each as when *electron* is joined to shining gold. In conclusion, we should return to what might seem an uncomfortable implication of the analogy we have been considering between these characters and Callimachus and Berenice. Acontius famously uses writing to trick Cydippe into marrying him, and Cydippe, to rely on later tellings of the tale, blushes a deep red in shame after the words she has read; Aristaenetus makes a play on the words being 'unwilling' (ἄκων) which relates them to Acontius himself, the man who writes unwilling words. But would it not be foolhardy for Callimachus to suggest that he has ensnared his queen into choosing him and only him as her most cherished poet? On the contrary, I suggest that this powerplay is precisely the sort of charade that would have been well-received and applauded at court. The competition among many parties offering ἔδνα for Cydippe offers an analogy for Berenice as the beautiful object of everyone's desire; Cydippe's blush of modesty when she reads Acontius' ἔδνον-poem suggests Berenice's own exquisite modesty upon realizing her own desirability and the promise she has made to marry. She has nothing to fear, though, for the ἔδνον she has received unwittingly from her poet only promises to make her all the more beautiful, desirable, and famous. Like Acontius,

he offers the inexhaustible flow of poetry praising her beauty for all to read; and once she marries him their great name will travel widely and be celebrated in a ‘mythological account,’ which I have suggested by its parallels to Xenomedes’ history is the *Aetia* itself.

Nor are Cydippe and Berenice the only readers who have been captivated by texts that lay such obligations upon them. At the close of ‘Acontius and Cydippe,’ Callimachus recounts his role not as the tale’s writer, but as its reader in the history of Xenomedes. Scholars have long puzzled over the tone and purpose of this learned conclusion: while it used to be considered a footnote symptomatic of the *Aetia*’s scholarly character,<sup>127</sup> more recent readers have demonstrated that Callimachus uses this conclusion to showcase his virtuosity as a scholar-poet carefully selecting and manipulating his source material.<sup>128</sup> Both approaches nevertheless tend to consider Callimachus’ *précis* of Xenomedes an ‘appendix’<sup>129</sup> or ‘epilogue’<sup>130</sup> to the narrative, and thus somehow detachable from it. Fantuzzi and Hunter, however, have well noted that the conclusion gives an aetiology for how Callimachus came to write the elegy we have just read. In this way, the elegy is as much about the project of writing ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ as it is about

---

<sup>127</sup> See especially Pfeiffer (1968), 125 and Zanker (1987), 114.

<sup>128</sup> For a summary of approaches to the fragment’s conclusion, see Harder (2012), 2.633 on fr. 75.53-77. Harder (1990), 301-3 uses narratological tools to lay out the mechanics of Callimachus’ self-presentation as a scholar. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 63-5 discuss how the poet ‘advertises’ (64) Xenomedes’ riches and his judicious and virtuosic selection; the older remarks of Körte (1929), 120 on the artistic principles of the scholar-poet are still valid.

<sup>129</sup> See Körte (1929), 116 on this ‘appended catalogue.’

<sup>130</sup> Cameron (1995), 257; d’Alessio (1996), 486 n. 77.

Acontius and Cydippe.<sup>131</sup> I would like now to build upon their argument by demonstrating how closely Callimachus links his own act of reading Xenomedes to Cydippe's reading of Acontius' apple.

Here is the conclusion of 'Acontius and Cydippe,' which Callimachus addresses to Acontius:

εἶπε δέ, Κεῖε,  
ξυγκραθέντ' αὐταῖς ὁξὺν ἔρωτα σέθεν  
πρέσβυς ἐτητυμίῃ μεμελημένος, ἔνθεν ὁ παῖδός  
μῦθος ἐς ἡμετέρην ἔδραμε Καλλιόπην. (fr. 75.74-8)

And the old man devoted to truth, told, Cean, of your stinging love mixed in with these [towns of Ceos]; from there the child's story ran to our Calliope.

While Massimilla following Trypanis asserts that ὁ παῖδός μῦθος is 'Cydippe's story,'<sup>132</sup> I agree with Harder that the παῖς must be Acontius, who is the story's central character and whom Callimachus has addressed directly as Κεῖε in line 74.<sup>133</sup> Harder then argues that 'our Calliope' (ἡμετέρην...Καλλιόπην) is probably a metaphor for both Callimachus' poetry, and that the image of 'the boy's story' running (ἔδραμε) to the poet's Muse suggests the zeal with which Callimachus read Xenomedes' work and incorporated it into his own poem.<sup>134</sup> Although there

---

<sup>131</sup> Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 66; see also the narratological analysis of Lynn (1995), 234-8 of the elegy's end. In a similar way, Hutchinson (2003), 52 connects Callimachus' research to Ceyx' pursuit of the truth from Apollo.

<sup>132</sup> Massimilla (2010), 391 ad loc.; Trypanis (1958), 61.

<sup>133</sup> Harder (2012), 657 ad loc.

<sup>134</sup> Harder (2012), 2.657 ad loc.; for the use of the phrase 'well-read Muse' here see Hopkinson (1988), 110 ad loc. as well as Bing (1988), 27-8. Meyer (1993), 334 thinks τρέχω indicates

are parallels for the image of a story ‘running’ in both Euripides and Isyllus, it is striking. It is therefore intriguing that Aristaeetus describes Cydippe’s act of reading also as an act of running:

τοῖς ὄμμασι | περιθέουσα τὴν γραφὴν ἀνεγίνωσκεν ἔχουσιν ὦδε· “μὰ τὴν  
Ἄρτεμιν Ἀκοντίῳ γαμοῦμαι.” ἔτι διερχομένη τὸν ὄρκον εἰ | καὶ ἀκούσιόν τε  
καὶ νόθον τὸν ἐρωτικὸν λόγον ἀπέρριπεν | αἰδουμένη... (1.10.36-40)

**Running over** the inscription with her eyes she read it, with the following words: ‘By Artemis I will marry Acontius.’ While still **going through** the oath, though both unwilling and false, she threw the erotic speech away, ashamed...

The use of the verb περιθέω to refer to the eyes’ action while reading a text is not, to my knowledge, paralleled elsewhere in Greek literature. While the verb διέρχομαι in Heliodorus is used for reciting the words of something (e.g. τὸν ὕμνον οὐ διερχόμενος, 3.2.3), following upon περιθέουσα the motion it implies is strongly felt. I think it likely that the image of Cydippe’s running eyes is owed to Callimachus, and since it is at least possible it is worthwhile considering the significance. It seems now that just as Cydippe’s eyes ran over Acontius’ oath and she swore herself to him, Acontius’ story ran to Callimachus’ Muse, obliging him to write the tale down. This same captivating text then becomes part of the *Aetia*, which is Callimachus’ bride-price poem for Berenice. Why should she not gladly accept it and offer the life-long relationship of patronage which he asks for?

### III. Written in the Stars: The *Coma Berenices*

---

specifically oral transmission of the Xenomedes’ tale, but as Harder points out at 2.658 this is hard to square with Callimachus’ emphatic presentation of the historian’s work as written: see especially fr. 75.66 ἐνεθήκατο δέλτ[οις] (‘he placed in his tablets’).

Callimachus concludes *Aetia* 3-4, which course through all human history, by bringing us into the Ptolemaic present. The collection's final elegy is spoken, marvelously, by a lock of Berenice's hair, not on her head, but set as the newest constellation in the night sky, which we still call today by its Latin name, the *Coma Berenices*. As befits the final poem of the *Aetia*, the lock recounts the *aetion* of its catasterism. Soon after Berenice married Ptolemy III, the king departed for war in Syria, leaving his new bride alone. Praying for her husband's safe return, Berenice cut off and dedicated a lock of her hair to the gods, which soon afterwards Arsinoe-Aphrodite had the wind Zephyrus carry off to heaven, where the goddess bathed it and made it a new constellation. Far from celebrating its elevation from royal hair to divine constellation, however, the lock laments its eternal separation from Berenice and the fact that it will not enjoy along with her the joys of married life. Callimachus thus intertwines wedding song, lamentation, and divinization in a humorous and eminently memorable poem spoken from heaven itself.

Until the discovery of two significant Greek papyri in the early twentieth century, Callimachus' *Coma Berenices* was known only from the Latin translation of the poem by the poet Catullus, his poem 66. Callimachus' poem was considered by scholars then the epitome of court poetry *qua* superficial flattery: Callimachus as a court poet was obliged to praise his patrons, and his poem contains, in Wilamowitz' judgment, 'wit and not feeling.'<sup>135</sup> With the publication of substantial fragments of the poem preserved in *P.Oxy.* 2258 and *PSI* 1092, we

---

<sup>135</sup> Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1925), 1.198: 'Witz und nicht Gefühl hat das Gedicht eingegeben; höfische Schmeichelei steckt darin ...'; see also Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1924), 1.216-17; Couat (1931), 117.

have gained the ability to read Callimachus independently of Catullus' translation.<sup>136</sup> Catullus, as Peter Bing has amply demonstrated, was not producing a word-by-word, and so we must exercise extreme caution if we rely on Catullus 66 to inform us about what Callimachus wrote in the portions of the poem no longer extant.<sup>137</sup>

Since the early 1990s scholars have turned to consider the *Coma* from the vantage point of third-century BC Ptolemaic Alexandria. Two questions have dominated the conversation: what were the literary traditions on which Callimachus drew on in this most inventive poem, and what did the poem contribute to Ptolemaic ideology?<sup>138</sup> At stake in each question is Callimachus' role not merely in celebrating the divinization of Berenice's lock, but more fundamentally in shaping how broad audiences of readers received this unprecedented religious and political phenomenon. In this section I focus on how Callimachus promotes himself as a valuable agent of the lock's deification.<sup>139</sup> In particular I attend to how he positions himself and his poem vis-à-vis

---

<sup>136</sup> For the history of the text see Marinone (1984), 77-9.

<sup>137</sup> Bing (1997) = (2009), 65-82.

<sup>138</sup> On the literary texture of the *Coma* see especially Gutzwiller (1992); Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 86-8; Acosta-Hughes (2010), 62-75. For the ideological aspects of the poem, see Koenen (1993), 89-113; Selden (1998), 326-54; Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012), 195-6; Llewellyn-Jones and Winder (2011); van Oppen de Ruiter (2015), 71-115. West (1985) makes an astronomical argument about the role of the planet Venus.

<sup>139</sup> Differently, Gutzwiller (1992), 373 argues that Callimachus wrote the *Coma* in the voice of the lock in order to distance himself from seeming to believe in the lock's catasterism.

Callimachus, however, celebrated other Ptolemaic fictions, most notoriously Berenice's blood



the court astronomer Conon and the constellation he made of Berenice's hair, and I argue that he portrays his poem as giving Berenice the gift of the status of eternal bride. I also discuss the tantalizing possibility that Callimachus ended his *Coma*, and the *Aetia*, with a request for Berenice, his patron, to bestow her favor upon his literary work and thereby not only honor her poet, but also bring about her own deification through his work.

*i. Callimachus' 'Rape of the Lock'*

It takes a great deal of human effort to turn a lock of hair into a constellation that is still observed in the sky today. Scholars have tended to assume that the catasterism of Berenice's lock of hair demanded the cooperation of the entire court, and it has recently been proposed that Conon and Callimachus collaborated to present the new constellation at a court ceremony.<sup>140</sup> Yet ancient testimonia about the catasterism suggest that a different explanation may be in order. The two sources which discuss Conon's 'discovery' of Berenice's lock in the sky agree that he invented the constellation in order to win the favor of the new king, Ptolemy III Euergetes.<sup>141</sup> A distinguished place at court was, in this tradition, sufficiently alluring for an astronomer to elevate a new queen's hair to heaven. But Conon's wish to enter Ptolemy's good graces is especially intriguing because a reading of the *Coma Berenices* would lead us to a very different conclusion. In Callimachus' poem, the lock's attention is fully on its queen, Berenice; it is her

---

descent from the Sibling Gods in the *Victoria Berenices* (fr. 54.2 Harder), so it does not seem necessary to read personal deferral into Callimachus' choice of the lock as speaker.

<sup>140</sup> See most recently van Oppen de Ruiter (2015), 112.

<sup>141</sup> Hyginus 2.24 (*cupiens inire gratiam regis*); Σ Arat. 146 (Πτολεμαίωι χαριζόμενος).

favor, not Ptolemy's, that Callimachus seems to have been most intent on winning. How, then, do these two men seeking royal favor relate to one another? In this section, I argue that Callimachus presents his poem on Berenice's lock – the textual *Coma Berenices* – as, paradoxically, a more valuable gift to Berenice than Conon's constellation.

The *Coma Berenices*, spoken by Berenice's lock, begins not with the story of its dedication, but its discovery in the sky by Conon. Unfortunately we have only the poem's first line, preserved by the Milan *Diegeseis*, and lines 7-8,<sup>142</sup> preserved in the scholia to Aratus:

πάντα τὸν ἐν γραμμαῖσιν ἰδὼν ὅρον ἧ τε φέρονται  
 . . . . .  
 τῇ † με Κόνων ἔβλεψεν ἐν ἡέρι τὸν Βερενίκης  
 βόστρυχον ὃν κείνη πᾶσιν ἔθηκε θεοῖς. (fr. 110.1, 7-8)

Having seen the entire sky in the astronomical lines, and where are borne...  
 Conon spotted me in the sky, Berenice's lock which she dedicated to all the gods.

Relying on Catullus' Latin rendition (66.1-8) for the general sense of this passage, we may deduce that the first line describes the astronomer's gaze searching for the queen's missing lock, which he finally spots in lines 7-8. Pfeiffer has noted a palpable contrast between the phrase of the first line τὸν ἐν γραμμαῖσιν ἰδὼν ὅρον ('Having seen the entire sky in the astronomical lines') and the seventh's με Κόνων ἔβλεψεν ἐν ἡέρι ('Conon saw me in the sky').<sup>143</sup> In line 1, γραμμαί are the lines drawn on astronomical charts that either divide the sky into sections or,

---

<sup>142</sup> The couplet's designation as lines 7-8 of Callimachus' *Coma* is based on the assumption that Catullus 66.7-8, to which the Callimachean couplet corresponds, followed Callimachus.

<sup>143</sup> Pfeiffer (1949), 1.112 ad loc., followed by e.g. Massimilla (2010), 467 ad loc. and Harder (2012), 2.801-2 ad loc.

more relevant to the *Coma*, connect individual stars into constellations,<sup>144</sup> while the word ὄρος ('boundary'), in turn, is a metaphor for the universe that possesses a scientific ring.<sup>145</sup> Conon, then, is not gazing at the universe itself in the first line, but 'the universe among the astronomical lines,' that is, as represented on an astronomical chart. In line seven, however, Conon's gaze has turned to the heavens: με Κόνων ἔβλεπεν ἐν ἡέρι ('Conon saw me in the sky'). The first eight lines of the poem thus trace a movement away from star charts to stars, from astronomical text to reality.

These lines also invite a metapoetic interpretation, not to my knowledge yet discussed, which evokes the lock's 'translation' from constellation to poetic text. Let us consider the *Aetia*'s reader who has arrived at the final elegy, the *Coma*. Upon reading the *Coma*'s first words (πάντα τὸν ἐν γραμμαῖσιν ἰδὼν ὄρον), she might appreciate how neatly this phrase mirrors her own act of reading: she, too, has now gazed upon the 'limit' (ὄρος) of Callimachus' γράμματα, his 'text,'<sup>146</sup> the *Aetia*, for which Conon's γραμμαί are a foil. Then, when at last in line 7 the

---

<sup>144</sup> Pfeiffer (1949), 1.112 ad loc.

<sup>145</sup> Pfeiffer thought *horos* was a technical term, but Cassio (1973), 329 n.1, followed by Massimilla (2010), 467 ad loc.; Harder (2012), 2.802 ad loc. argues that the evidence Pfeiffer adduces in fact supports the conclusion that *horos* was a metaphor, not a technical term.

<sup>146</sup> Authors of literary epigram frequently use metaphors to describe the reader's journey through collections: see Höschele (2007) for the metaphor of the 'traveling reader.' For the use of γράμμα in the singular and plural to refer to a written work see LSJ s.v. 3.3; Callimachus, for example, refers to Plato's *Phaedo* as Πλάτωνος τὸ περὶ σώματος γράμμα (*Ep.* 23 Pf. = 53 G.-P.).

reader reaches the climactic main clause με Κόνων ἔβλεψεν ἐν ἡέρι τὸν Βερενίκης / βόστρυχον, she, too, like Conon has a moment of discovery: she finally ‘sees’ that the elegy she is reading is one spoken by Berenice’s lock of hair, made into a constellation speaking to her from the sky. The reader’s experience of discovering the *Coma* at the terminus of the *Aetia* is in this way analogous to Conon’s discovery of the lock in the heavens.

Selden and Höschele have discussed the thematic importance of displacement and ‘translation’ in the *Coma*,<sup>147</sup> from this reading of the beginning of the *Coma*, I would add that the most important ‘translation’ for Callimachus is his own rendering of Conon’s constellation into his own text. With this metapoetic gesture Callimachus dramatizes the lock’s translation not only from hair dedication to constellation, but from constellation to poetic text. It may have been Conon’s ingenious idea to find Berenice’s hair as a constellation in the sky, but Callimachus has now done his patron one better by anchoring this constellation firmly in his *Aetia* at its ὄρος, from where it may forever tell the story of its transformation from royal hair to royal constellation. And this story, of course, is Callimachus’ own contribution to Conon’s discovery.

Let us now consider the lock’s account of its fantastic catasterism:

ἄρτι [ν]εότμητόν με κόμαι ποθέεσκον ἀδε[λφεαί,	
καὶ πρόκατε γνωτὸς Μέμνονος Αἰθίοπος	
ἴετο κυκλώσας βαλιὰ πτερὰ θῆλυς ἀήτης,	
ἵππο[ς] ἰοζώνου Λοκρικὸς Ἀρσινόης,	
. [ ] ασε δὲ πνοιῇι με , δι’ ἡέρα δ’ ὑγρὸν ἐνείκας	55
Κύπριδος εἰς κόλ[πους] ἔθηκε	
αὐτή, μιν Ζεφυρῖτις ἐπιπροέ[ηκε(ν)	
.... Κ]ανωπίτου ναιέτις α[ἰγιαλοῦ.	
ὄφρα δὲ] μὴ νύμφης Μινωίδος ο[	
.....]ος ἀνθρώποις μοῦνον ἐπι[	60
φάεσ]ιν ἐν πολέεσσιν ἀρίθμιος ἀλλ[ὰ φαίνω]	
[καὶ Βερ]ενίκειος καλὸς ἐγὼ πλόκαμ[ος,]	

<sup>147</sup> Selden (1998), 328; Höschele (2009).

[ὔδασι] λουόμενόν με παρ' ἄθα[νάτους ἀνάγουσα]  
[Κύπρι]ς ἐν ἀρχαίοις ἄστρον [ἔθηκε νέον.] (fr. 110.51-64)

My sister locks were longing for me when I was newly shorn, and straightaway the brother of Aethiopian Memnon (i.e. Zephyrus) whirled his dappled wings and was speeding on, a soft breeze, the Locrian horse of violet-girdled Arsinoe, and...me with its breath, and carried me through the moist air and set me in the lap of Cypris. Zephyritis herself, the inhabitant of Canopus' shore, sent him...[And so that] the...of the bride, the daughter of Minos, might not alone for men be numbered among the many stars, but that I, [too], Berenice's beautiful lock, [might shine], [Cypris], [leading] me to the company of the immortals, [set] me, as a [new] constellation among the ancient ones, bathed [by the waters].

For the most part, scholarship on this passage has tried to answer historical questions about when the lock disappeared and more ideological questions about the significance of the journey it takes to heaven. But as Benjamin Acosta-Hughes has recently demonstrated, the lines' literary texture also bears strongly upon their ideological message. Discussing these lines' allusions to Sappho, he has made the compelling case that Callimachus adopts Sappho as his model for two major reasons: first, her poetry's erotic portrayals of women and comparison of them to goddesses provides Callimachus a model for his own portrayal of Berenice's lock's erotic apotheosis; second, Callimachus' appropriation of Sappho's poetry performs the Ptolemies' political control over the island of Lesbos, where Sappho once sung.<sup>148</sup> Thus Callimachus bears Berenice's lock to heaven by means of Sapphic song and at the same time appropriates Lesbos' poetic heritage as a cultural capital for Alexandria's new queen.

What I would like to offer, however, is an intratextual reading of these lines, by which Callimachus promotes himself as a poet as an agent of the lock's deification. The passage ends with the lock's climactic moment of catasterism: [ὔδασι] λουόμενόν με παρ' ἄθα[νάτους ἀνάγουσα] / [Κύπρι]ς ἐν ἀρχαίοις ἄστρον [ἔθηκε νέον.] ('[Cypris], [leading] me to the

---

<sup>148</sup> Acosta-Hughes (2010), 73.

company of the immortals, [set] me, as a [new] constellation among the ancient ones, bathed [by the waters],’ 63-4). The action of Cypris, i.e. Arsinoe-Aphrodite-Zephyritis, placing Berenice’s lock as a ‘new constellation among the ancient ones’<sup>149</sup> is analogous to Callimachus’ action of placing the *Coma* at the end of his *Aetia* as the newest poem among the old ones which the reader has already read.

In fact, these ‘ancient stars’ call to mind earlier stars and constellations that the reader has encountered in the *Aetia* itself. The most obvious of these are Acontius and Cydippe.

Callimachus introduced these characters as ‘both beautiful stars of the islands’ (καλοὶ νησάων ἀστέρες ἀμφότεροι, fr. 67.8), and already in that elegy Callimachus emphasized that their historian Xenomedes was ‘ancient’ (ἀρχαίου Ξενομήδεος, fr. 75.54). Looking back from the vantage point of the *Coma*, these lovers and Xenomedes shine forth as ‘ancient constellations’ to which Callimachus has added Berenice’s lock. In fact, the lock itself clearly echoes ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ when it declares ἀλλ[᾽ ἀφαιίνω] / [καὶ Βερ]ενίκειος καλὸς ἐγὼ πλόκαμ[ος] (‘but that I, too, Berenice’s beautiful lock, [might shine],’ fr. 110.61-2). Marinone has noted the simplicity of this line,<sup>150</sup> which is worth pursuing further. What makes this line simple is its use of the inscriptional καλός-formula ‘So-and-so is beautiful.’ This is the very same formula that Acontius describes himself carving into the trees while he is lovesick for Cydippe: ἀλλ’ ἐνὶ δῆ

---

<sup>149</sup> Vitelli’s supplement ἔθηκε νέον is based on Catullus 66.64 *nouum posuit* in the same metrical position and is corroborated by the use of this and similar expressions in Nonnus and the scholia to Aratus. Nonn. *D.*47.253-4; Σ Arat. 27, 73, etc. For these passages see Massimilla (2010), 492-3 ad loc.; Harder (2012), 2.838 ad loc.

<sup>150</sup> Marinone (1984), 217 ad loc.

φλοιοῖσι κεκομμένα τόσσα φέροιτε / γράμματα, Κυδίππην ὅσος ἑρέουσι καλήν ('but may you bear as many letters carved into your bark as will say 'Cydippe is beautiful,' fr. 73). As I discussed above, Acontius' inscriptions upon the trees were the first text of many publicizing and celebrating Cydippe's beauty. Berenice's lock's boast of its own beauty in the *Coma*, when read in context with 'Acontius and Cydippe,' both bespeaks Callimachus' inclusion of the *Coma* as a text in his *Aetia* and seems to promise that, just as Acontius' inscription was the first of many texts celebrating Cydippe, so too will the *Coma* just be the beginning of Callimachus' gifts to Berenice.

Another astronomical phenomenon from earlier in the *Aetia* concerns the Nemean lion. We have seen that the *Victoria Berenices*' inset narrative concerned Heracles' slaying of this beast. According to Hyginus, after Heracles defeated the beast Zeus turned it into the constellation Leo.<sup>151</sup> It so happens that Leo was one of the constellations next to which Conon placed Berenice's lock. Catullus describes the lock's position next to Leo in the line that follows the passage about the lock's catasterism we have been considering: *Virginis et saeui contingens namque Leonis / lumina* ('For touching the stars of Virgo and fierce Leo, Cat. 66.65-6). Callimachus' Greek is not extant here, so we cannot be sure that he too mentioned Leo by name, but it seems quite likely that he did, for scholars have shown that the constellation would have had great significance for Berenice. Leo was associated with Zeus Soter and considered the king of beasts;<sup>152</sup> moreover, in Egyptian terms Leo helps Isis to keep the force of Chaos and the god

---

<sup>151</sup> Hyginus 2.24.

<sup>152</sup> See van Oppen de Ruiter (2015), 95-6.

Seth at bay.<sup>153</sup> We may thus with some confidence assume that Callimachus mentioned Leo after the *Coma*'s deification. If this assumption is correct, then Callimachus makes a powerful ring structure which connects the *Coma* to the *Victoria Berenices* at the beginning of the new books *Aetia* 3-4. In the *Victoria*, Berenice as the victorious bride is compared to Heracles wearing the lion skin as a veil; then in the *Coma Berenices*, Callimachus describes the placement of Berenice's hair in the sky next to the savage lion whom her Ptolemaic ancestor and doublet killed. The lock's position next to Leo in this way emblemizes Berenice's victory over the beast from the beginning of the collection.

In sum, Arsinoe-Aphrodite-Zephyritis' placement of the lock as a 'new star among the old' enacts not only the lock's catasterism, but also its textualization and incorporation into Callimachus' *Aetia*. The lock's final resting place, as it were, is not the heavens, but Callimachus' literary scroll; Conon placed Berenice's hair in the sky, but Callimachus responded by taking Conon's catasterism one step farther, and making Berenice's lock a poem who speaks to us even now. In this way we do not need to assume that the members of the court had to be unified in their efforts to propagate a new dynastic cult. Rather, Callimachus suggests that competition between members of the court like himself and Conon played a vital role in successfully anchoring this religious innovation in various media.

*ii. The Coma's as the gift of immortality as a bride*

What made the *Coma Berenices* such an attractive conclusion for Callimachus as he organized his new books of *Aetia*? Parsons, of course, noted that the *Coma* complements the

---

<sup>153</sup> See on this Selden (1988), 344.



*Victoria* as another aetiological poem in praise of Berenice bookending *Aetia* 3-4 but did not explore any thematic similarities between the poems.<sup>154</sup> Richard Hunter subsequently hinted that ἔδνον in the *Victoria Berenices* might still retain marital connotations and so tentatively proposed reading νύμφα at the start of the *Coma*'s highly fragmentary line fr. 110.91, where the letters NY are preserved before a lacuna.<sup>155</sup> He notes that this would 'form a neat ring,' but does not explore what the effect of this ring would be. Whether or not we read νύμφα there, I believe it is precisely Callimachus' presentation of Berenice as a bride in the *Coma* that makes it a powerful finish to *Aetia* 3-4. Callimachus began *Aetia* 3-4 in the *Victoria* by offering his poetry as ἔδνον for Berenice as his νύμφα; in the *Coma*, he preserves her in his text as a bride forever.

Scholars have long remarked upon Callimachus' arresting use of νύμφα to designate queens long past their wedding days. Callimachus addresses Arsinoe as νύμφα in her *Ektheosis* (fr. 228.5) despite her having been married (three times!) and borne children, and we have seen how scholars have tried to tie his address of Berenice as νύμφα in the *Victoria* to her marriage to Ptolemy III. Parsons attempted to explain Callimachus' intent by writing that "the word [νύμφα] may mean 'wife' as well as 'bride'; and in any case, royal persons are notoriously slow to age. Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II could still qualify as νυμφίος and νύμφα, after six years of marriage (Theoc. 17.129, Callim. fr. 228.5)."<sup>156</sup> Mere royalty, however, does not confer eternal youth. Never to age is the prerogative of divinity: as Oedipus reminds Theseus, μόνοις οὐ γίγνεται / θεοῖσι γῆρας οὐδὲ κατθανεῖν ποτε ('for the gods alone does old age not come about, nor ever

---

<sup>154</sup> Parsons (1977), 50.

<sup>155</sup> Hunter (1998), 116 n. 9.

<sup>156</sup> Parsons (1977), 8; Clayman (2014a), 146.

to die', Soph. *OC* 607-8). The Ptolemies knew this association of agelessness and divinity well, as did their poets. The singer at Arsinoe's Adonia festival described by Theocritus lingers over Aphrodite's lover Adonis' youth, which merits an entire line (ὀκτωκαιδεκέτης ἢ ἐννεακαίδεχ' ὁ γαμβρός, 'the bridegroom, eighteen or nineteen years old', *Id.* 15.129) and whose soft lips and their newly-grown saffron hair receive further praise (130). The pair's wedding couch, too, is adorned with an image of eternal youth, for on it is sculpted Ganymede, Zeus's 'wine-pouring boy' (οἶνοχόον...παῖδα, 125) and ἐρώμενος, preserved in ageless beauty.

The Ptolemies would have been eager to clothe themselves in this divine youth, too, as a manifestation of their status as gods on earth. Their poets were happy to oblige. Callimachus' *Ektheosis* is highly fragmentary and so does not offer the portrayal we might like of Arsinoe the bride. We may, however, turn to Theocritus to see how he fashioned the Ptolemies as ever-young before Callimachus praised the married Berenice as his νύμφα. In *Idyll* 17 Theocritus describes the Olympian symposium, where Heracles rejoices beholding his descendants Alexander and Ptolemy I Soter 'since the son of Cronus removed old age from their limbs' (ὅττι σφεων Κρονίδης μελέων ἐξείλετο γῆρας, *Id.* 17.24). Alexander died young; Soter, however, did not, and Hunter suggests that Theocritus may be promulgating a court fiction of his Olympian rejuvenation.<sup>157</sup> Then near the end of the *Encomium* Theocritus portrays a perpetual rejuvenation taking place in the bedchamber of Philadelphus and Arsinoe II:

αὐτός τ' ἰφθίμα τ' ἄλοχος, τᾶς οὔτις ἀρείων  
 νυμφίον ἐν μεγάροισι γυνὰ περιβάλλετ' ἄγοστῳ,  
 ἐκ θυμοῦ στέργοισα κασίγνητόν τε πόσιν τε.

Both he and his mighty wife, than whom no better woman casts her arm around  
 her bridegroom in their halls, loving passionately both her sibling and her spouse.  
 (*Id.* 17.128-130)

---

<sup>157</sup> Hunter (2003), 119 ad *Id.* 17.24; pace Gow (1950), 2.330 ad loc.

By referring to Philadelphus as Arsinoe's νυμφίος (129) held in her arms, Theocritus makes it as if the queen's marital embrace turns back the clock and renews his status as groom on their marriage night.<sup>158</sup> It is no accident that this description of the royal marriage comes just before the *Encomium*'s close, where Theocritus explicitly hails Philadelphus as one of the ἡμιθεοί (136): Arsinoe's embrace has already freed his limbs from age.

If Zeus and Arsinoe are agents of deification, though, it is because Theocritus makes them so: as praise poet he plays a crucial role in deifying his patrons. Theocritus even seems to glance at his power to immortalize and rejuvenate in the lines just considered. Zeus, he says, removed old age from Heracles' descendants' μέλη, a word which can signify not only physical 'limbs', but also (lyric) 'songs'. It is tempting to see Theocritus proclaiming Zeus's grant of agelessness not only to the Ptolemies' bodies, but also to the poetry celebrating them, *Idyll* 17 included. Physical and literary agelessness go hand in hand.<sup>159</sup>

*Idyll* 18, the epithalamium for Helen and Menelaus sung by Helen's companions, makes the role of the poet and his readers in deification more explicit. The chorus, having proclaimed Helen now a wife (τὸ μὲν οἰκέτις ἤδη, *Id.* 18.38), describe how they will establish a cult for her the next morning,<sup>160</sup> when they will go to the racetrack to pluck flowers, wind them into garlands, and place them on a plane tree which will be inscribed ὥς παριῶν τις / ἀννείμη Δωριστί· 'σέβευ μ'· Ἑλένας φυτὸν εἰμι' ('so that someone passing by may read in Doric: "Revere me; I am Helen's tree"', *Id.* 18.47-48). Scholars have focused on the ritual whose *action*

---

<sup>158</sup> See Hunter (2003), 191-2 ad loc.

<sup>159</sup> Theocritus states this explicitly at *Id.* 16.34-56.

<sup>160</sup> See Hunter (1996), 160 n. 83 on ἥρι (*Id.* 18.39).

Theocritus offers, but far less on the *action* itself and Theocritus' interest in it.<sup>161</sup> It is noteworthy in this respect that the climax of the prospective cult foundation is the tree's inscription and its future reading by a passerby. In fact, all of the girls' actions preceding the inscription blush metapoetic. Plucking flowers and weaving garlands are established metaphors for poetic composition;<sup>162</sup> the sweet fragrance exuded by their garlands (ἀδὺ πνέοντας, 40) may remind us of Theocritus' finest metapoetic object, the goatherd's cup (κεκλυσμένον ἀδεί κηρῶ, 'sealed with sweet wax', *Id.* 1.27; ὥς καλὸν ὄσδει, 'how beautiful it smells', 149); and the oil libation (ἄλειφαρ, 45) to the tree they will inscribe (45-46) may evoke the use of cedar oil to preserve papyrus rolls, a practice to which Callimachus alludes in his prayer to the Charites at the *Aetia*'s beginning (fr. 7.13-14; cf. ἄλειφα ρέει, 'oil flows', fr. 7.12).<sup>163</sup> The girls' metapoetic offerings to Helen's tree thus emphasize that the inscription and the endless acts of reading it makes possible are the crucial agents of Helen's deification. The girls will offer garlands and oil tomorrow, but after that it is the inscription which will instruct readers to become Helen's worshippers. Theocritus by analogy promotes his own role as a writer and that of his readers in deification. By composing Helen's epithalamium as a text, he makes it possible for readers to reperform the epithalamium and merge their voices with that of the girls and their imagined passerby.

---

<sup>161</sup> For attempts to identify the ritual see Gow (1950), 2.358-9 ad *Id.* 18.43-8; Hunter (1996), 160-1. Hunter (1996). 157 sees the Spartan poem as politically-motivated Ptolemaic 'cultural rescue-archaeology.'

<sup>162</sup> See e.g. Gutzwiller (1998), 79 discussing Nossis' first epigram.

<sup>163</sup> See Petrovic & Petrovic (2002), 196-7.

Theocritus' readers thus enact the worship that Helen's girls envision; reading is an integral part of ritual.<sup>164</sup>

Theocritus also underscores his ability as a poet to preserve Helen as an ageless bride through his clever narrative handling of the cult foundation. Helen's companions sing about the cult that they will establish the next morning. As Theocritus' readers we know that the cult has been founded, but in our act of reading it is as if the morning never comes. Theocritus has thus elided the moment of the cult's foundation; instead, we worship Helen as if she were frozen in time on her wedding night. Griffiths has demonstrated that Theocritus fashions close parallels between Helen-Arsinoe II and Menelaus-Philadelphus, and suggested attractively that Theocritus wrote the poem for the royal wedding.<sup>165</sup> By so promising and effecting Helen's deification as a perpetual bride, Theocritus would offer an enviable gift for Arsinoe upon her marriage.

It is in this context that the *Coma Berenices*' function as the conclusion of *Aetia* 3-4 becomes clear. These new books begin, I have argued, with Callimachus' poetic proposal to Berenice, in which he offers her his poem as a bride-price (ἐδνον). In the *Victoria Berenices* Callimachus evokes a constellation of powerful brides, including a bridal Heracles, who serve as models for Berenice and in whose company Callimachus places her as the culmination. But

---

<sup>164</sup> Theocritus himself encourages this metapoetic and textual interpretation by describing the maidens' song's setting πρόσθε νεογράφτῳ θαλάμῳ ('near the newly-painted chamber,' *Id.* 18.3). The adjective, first attested here, in the context means 'newly-painted', but could also mean 'newly-written' referring to Theocritus' poem. For a similar metapoetic reading see Acosta-Hughes (2010), 31.

<sup>165</sup> Griffiths (1979), 86-91.

Callimachus' ἔδνον is not yet complete, for following the *Victoria Berenices* are two books of *Aetia*, one of whose focal points is marriage. In this chapter we have considered 'Acontius and Cydippe,' in which we have seen that Callimachus portrays Acontius, Cydippe, and Acontius' apple as an analogy for Callimachus, Berenice, and his own poetic ἔδνον which proffers Berenice, like Cydippe, everlasting fame through his written text that celebrates her beauty as a bride. *Aetia* 4 finally concludes with the *Coma Berenices*, which as a written text concluding Callimachus' *Aetia* preserves the voice he has created for the lock of hair that the newly married Berenice dedicated for the return of her groom Ptolemy III.

Like *Idyll* 18 for Helen, the *Coma* cleverly manipulates the temporality of marriage so as to preserve Berenice as eternally a νύμφα. Kathryn Gutzwiller has demonstrated that a primary model for Berenice's dedication of her hair for the safe return of her new husband Ptolemy is the custom of παρθένοι to dedicate a lock of hair before they transition into life as married women.<sup>166</sup> In the context of this tradition Berenice's sacrifice is unusual, since she had already married Ptolemy when she sacrificed the lock. Paradoxically, then, Berenice's hair sacrifice suggests that she is yet a virgin, although married. Callimachus supports this reading of the hair sacrifice in the following lines, in which the lock says that the pleasure that it gets from being honored as a constellation is not as great as the sadness it feels not to taste perfumes from Berenice's head:

οὐ<sub>1</sub> τὰδε<sub>1</sub> μοι τοσσὴνδε φείρει<sub>1</sub> χάρι<sub>1</sub>ν ὅσ[σο]ν ἐκείνης  
 ἀ]σχάλλω κορυφῆς οὐκέτι<sub>1</sub> θιζόμεν[ος  
 ἦς ἄπο, παρ[θ]ενίη μὲν ὅτ' ἦν ἔτι, πολλὰ πῆ<sub>1</sub>πωκα  
 λιτ<sub>1</sub>ιά, γυναικείων δ' οὐκ ἀπέλαυσα μύρων. (fr. 110.75-8)

These things [i.e. the honors of its catasterism] do not bring me pleasure as great as my distress that I will no longer touch that head from which, while she was still

---

<sup>166</sup> Gutzwiller (1992), 369-73.

virginal, I have drunk many plain unguents, but from which I did not enjoy the perfumes of married women.

Herter has persuasively argued that Callimachus in the last couplet contrasts the simple unguents (λιτρά) Berenice used as a virgin and the perfumes (μυρά) used by married women, which the lock did not get to enjoy (οὐκ ἀπέλαυσα).<sup>167</sup> Why the lock did not enjoy women's perfumes has been the matter of much debate: Pfeiffer has argued that the lock was cut off shortly after marriage and so did not get to enjoy the perfumes;<sup>168</sup> Koenen suggests that the lock is purposefully passing over the scented perfumes it actually enjoyed to portray Berenice's

---

<sup>167</sup> Herter ([1971] 1975), 417. On this interpretation, which I will label (1), πέπωκα occurs when Berenice was a virgin, but οὐκ ἀπέλαυσα occurs when she was married, i.e. 'the head from which while Berenice was a virgin I drank simple unguents, but from which I did not enjoy the perfumes of married women (when she was married).' Others, however, including Koenen (1993), 108 and Massimilla (2010), 501-2, argue that (2) πέπωκα and οὐκ ἀπέλαυσα both occur when Berenice was a virgin, i.e. 'the head from which while Berenice was a virgin I drank many simple unguents, but did not enjoy the perfumes of married women.' Courtney (2000), 50-1, however, has made the cogent argument that the placement of the particles μέν and δέ strongly supports (1), as παρθενίῃ μέν... γυναικείων δέ suggests a salient contrast between Berenice's periods of virginity and marriage. Massimilla's objection that μέν is often displaced in poetry is not very persuasive since (1) yields plausible sense.

<sup>168</sup> Pfeiffer (1949), 121 ad loc.: "Coma multum olei simplices, quo virgo utebatur, biberat, at cum brevi post nuptias abiuncta esset, unguentis, quibus Ber. nupta utebatur, frui non potuit."

He is followed by e.g. Courtney (2000), 50.

wedding as not yet complete until Ptolemy's return;<sup>169</sup> and Marinone, followed by Harder, argues instead that οὐκ ἀπέλαυσα means 'I did not get my fill' of married perfumes, i.e. the lock enjoyed some amount of μύρα, but not as much as it would have liked.<sup>170</sup> However we interpret the details, all for the most part agree that the lock presents itself as virginal, despite the fact that Berenice was married when she sacrificed it. Callimachus has made Berenice's lock of hair into a material text that is not merely an emblem of her virginity; it is part of her body that still speaks as a virgin on the brink of marriage, a νύμφα forever.

Circling back from the *Coma* to the *Victoria Berenices* at the beginning of *Aetia* 3, Callimachus' ἔδνον to Berenice attains new significance. What Callimachus offers Berenice when he greets her as νύμφα is the most enviable bride-price of all: the divine gift of being a forever bride. With the *Coma Berenices* he closes his books of *Aetia* gifted to her by not only returning to her marriage to Ptolemy, but by preserving and divinizing a lock of her hair which somehow remains forever young, virginal, marriageable. Just as we saw in Theocritus' epithalamium for Helen, it is then the *Coma*'s readers who renew Berenice's status as a νύμφα through their acts of recitation.

### iii. The Patron's Counter-Gift?

I have argued that Callimachus in the *Victoria Berenices* figures the patronage relationship he desires as akin to marriage, a life-long and exclusive exchange of *charis*. In connection with this metaphor of patronage as marriage, the ending of the *Coma Berenices* is

---

<sup>169</sup> Koenen (1993), 107-10, who notes the connection of perfumes with nuptial rites.

<sup>170</sup> Marinone (1982), 8, followed by Harder (2012), 846 ad loc.



most intriguing, for it seems that Callimachus may have concluded the poem by having the lock request Berenice for future gifts. The ending of the *Coma*, of course, is a notorious crux of classical scholarship, and so an overview of the scholarly problem is needed before moving forward.

After the lock in lines 77-8 laments the women's perfumes it did not enjoy from Berenice, in lines 79-88 of Catullus' Latin rendition the lock requests that all girls make it an offering of these oils before their marriages. These lines, however, are entirely absent from *P.Oxy.* 2258. The papyrus does then preserve traces of lines that seem to correspond to lines 89-94 in Catullus 66, in which the lock addresses Berenice herself and bids her to make her offerings of oil during a festival of Venus/Aphrodite. The Greek text of *P.Oxy.* 2258 then concludes with a final couplet (94a-94b Pf.) not in Catullus 66, in which the lock seems to bid farewell to Arsinoe, and perhaps also the royal couple. To explain the discrepancy between Greek and Latin texts, Pfeiffer made the influential hypothesis that there were two versions of Callimachus' *Coma*: the first, attested in *P.Oxy.* 2258, was composed for an original court performance of the poem soon after the lock's catasterism; the second, attested by Catullus 66, was a subsequent edition for the end of the *Aetia*.<sup>171</sup> Others, however, have explained the state of the evidence differently. Hollis has suggested that the pre-nuptial ritual stems from a different elegy by Callimachus on Berenice and that Catullus introduced it into his translation of the

---

<sup>171</sup> For discussion see Pfeiffer (1952), xxxvii, followed by Gutzwiller (1992), 381-2, adduces evidence for other similar rituals dating to the Ptolemaic period; Koenen (1993), 94; D'Alessio (1996), 2.530 n. 49.

As this brief survey should indicate, it is impossible to know with certainty how Callimachus' *Coma* ended. Since *POxy* 2258 lacks the pre-nuptial rite in Cat. 66.79-88, I exclude this passage from discussion to focus only on lines 89-94. Here are the remaining traces of the Greek text of Callimachus, followed by the Latin of Catullus and a translation of Catullus:

tu uero, regina, tuens cum sidera diuam  
placabis festis luminibus Uenerem,  
unguinis expertem ne siris esse tuam me,  
sed potius largis effice muneribus  
sidera cur iterent ‘utinam coma regia fiam,’

Cameron (1995), 105-6. As Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012), 231 emphasize, the notion of Pfeiffer and others that Callimachus added the pre-nuptial *aetion* to make the *Coma* aetiological enough for the *Aetia* is misconceived, for ‘the catasterism is the *aetion*.’

348

proximus Hydrochoi fulgeret Oarion! (Cat. 66.89-94)

But you, queen, when you look at the stars and will assuage divine Venus on her festal days, may you not allow me, your [lock], to be without a share of ointment, but rather bring it about by lavish gifts that the stars have reason to repeat ‘Would that I might become a royal lock!’, and Aquarius flash next to Orion!

Since there is no certainty that what we read in Catullus corresponds closely in substance to what Callimachus wrote, any conclusions we draw here can only be speculative.<sup>175</sup> Nevertheless I think it is worthwhile to consider how this ending would work in Callimachus’ *Coma* and also the *Aetia*. Here the lock, after lamenting its sadness at being deprived of Berenice’s scented oils now that she is married woman, turns to Berenice and requests her that, when she looks up to the stars during the festival days<sup>176</sup> of Arsinoe-Aphrodite (*Uenerem*, Cat. 66.90), she make it a ritual offering, too. What offering the lock requests has been muddled by the transmitted reading *sanguinis* of the Catullan archetype (V) at line 91. On this reading the lock requests a blood

---

<sup>175</sup> Du Quesnay (2012), 175-6, however, argues that there is one additional piece of evidence which supports the idea that Callimachus, like Catullus, in these lines addressed Berenice as she looks up to the stars (*tuens...sidera*, Cat. 66.89). The scholia on *POxy* 2258 to verses 65-8 (see Massimilla 2010, 151 ad loc.) cite several hexameter verses, attributed to a poet named Diophilus or Diophila, which describe the position of the *Coma Berenices* among its neighboring constellations. In the second of these (= *SH* 391.2) a woman(?) sets her eyes upon the starry Wagon: ὄμματ’ ἐπιστ[ῆ]σαν κ(α)τ’ ἄστ[ερ]όεσσιν Ἄμαξ[αν]. Du Quesnay says that this verse ‘strongly suggests that there was something in Callimachus similar to *tuens...sidera* (89). Without knowing more of the context of Diophilus/a’s poem and Callimachus’ text, this can only be an attractive suggestion.

<sup>176</sup> For the interpretation of *festis luminibus* as ‘festival days’ see Syndikus (1984), 2.223 n. 112.

sacrifice; Bentley, however, has made the ingenious and widely accepted conjecture *unguinis*, so that the lock's request is of 'scented oil.' Perfume is precisely what the lock has been deprived of on account of being shorn from Berenice's head (cf. γυναικείων...μύρων, fr. 110.78), and Koenen has noted that offerings of oil (ἐλαιόσπονδα) were associated not only with the cult of divinities, but also the dead.<sup>177</sup> They thus suit the lock who has 'died' and been mourned by its sister-locks only to be made immortal as a constellation. For these reasons I understand the lock's request as one for scented oils.<sup>178</sup>

This request closes the *Coma* on a strongly metapoetic note. Just as Conon's searching gaze over his astronomical charts at the poem's beginning (τὸν ἐν γραμμαῖσιν ἰδὼν ὄρον, fr. 110.1) calls attention to the reader's act of reading, so too the lock's image of Berenice looking towards the stars (*tuens...sidera*, Cat. 66.89) at the same time suggests her reading the textual *Coma Berenices*. The lock's prayer for Berenice to offer it scented oil now takes on new significance. As we saw in discussing *Idyll* 18, papyri were anointed with cedar oil to preserve them. The oil that the lock demands from Berenice may thus be understood in a double sense: it is not only a sacrificial offering that will perpetuate its worship, but also the means by which the textual *Coma Berenices* will be preserved. In this way, Callimachus – supposing, again, that this ending is his – portrays at the end of the *Coma* the gift that he expects in exchange from Berenice, his patron. He has offered her a poem that preserves her as an eternal bride; in return

---

<sup>177</sup> Koenen (1993), 110.

<sup>178</sup> Pfeiffer (1949), 123 ad loc. suggests that Callimachus might have written εἶαρ or ἔαρ, which is ambiguous and could have meant either blood or oil. If this were the case, then *sanguinis* may indeed be the correct reading at Cat. 66.91 as a result of Catullus' translation.

his *Coma* asks her to give it the gift of oil that will preserve it for all eternity. The favor that she will show his *Coma*, in turn, will perpetuate her own worship, for by offering the *Coma* this gift Berenice makes it possible for future readers to recite and perpetuate her image as an eternally youthful bride and goddess. Berenice's gift of favor to Callimachus' *Coma*, then, is a gift that will keep on giving, for by honoring his text she will preserve herself for all time.

#### IV. Conclusion

I began this chapter by noting that recent scholarship has discussed Hellenistic patronage as *philia*. What we have observed in *Aetia* 3-4 is something remarkably different: a poet posing as his queen's suitor. I have argued that Callimachus casts his *Victoria Berenices* at the *Aetia*'s beginning as a ἔδνον in the full sense of the word, a bride-price owed to Zeus and Nemea, whom he fashions as his victorious queen's new parents, in exchange for Berenice herself as his bride. This conceit figures Berenice as a much-desired bride whom many suitors offer gifts in hope of winning. Later in *Aetia* 3, 'Acontius and Cydippe' displays in an elaborate analogy the textual fame that awaits the bride who marries a suitor who offers her the gifts of written words, not material possessions. Callimachus closes the *Aetia* with the *Coma Berenices*, a poem spoken by Berenice's catasterized lock of hair. More than simply celebrating the constellation which Conon offered the queen, Callimachus foregrounds the superior value of his own gift to Berenice, the *Coma* turned into a text which preserves Berenice forever as a bride.

These three poems shed fascinating though fragmented light on the social dynamics of patronage at the Hellenistic courts and on how Callimachus, a poet, sought to leverage cultural capital to win distinction among a crowded field of courtiers. His metaphor of the *Victoria*

*Berenices* as a ἔδνον figures the competition among members of the court for Berenice's favor as akin to that of suitors in the Archaic period vying for a bride. Each offers the most valuable gifts that he has, and only one man will be chosen to be the bride's husband. Two implications of this metaphor are especially salient. First, by comparing his poem to a ἔδνον Callimachus assimilates it to an extremely valuable, *material* gift and thereby pits him not only against other poets, but also against courtiers who possessed vast financial resources from which they could offer bounteous ἔδνα of their own. Callimachus thus positions himself in the full company of the court, not just in a narrow field of poets. These men, moreover, were under constant pressure to give and to give as much as they could, for Berenice is an immensely desirable bride whom only one man can have. What Callimachus wants, if we follow his metaphor, is to be Berenice's chosen suitor, with every other man at court repudiated. In exchange for this, he offers her a gift that no other rival of his at court could offer: eternal fame and worship as an ageless Ptolemaic bride. Unlike possessions that will pass away, his ἔδνον lasts forever.



## Summary and Conclusion

The goal of this dissertation was to examine the social position of poets at the Hellenistic courts and the value of their poetry as a cultural capital. Focusing on the *Hymns* and *Aetia* 3-4 of Callimachus as paradigmatic texts, I have shown that Callimachus presents his poetry as a gift of cultural capital to his kings and queens which is invaluable to them as they pursue their political and religious aims. In exchange, his gift obliges his patrons to offer their own gifts of favor and a distinguished social status at court exalting him above the wide range of courtiers with whom he vied for favor, including military leaders, political dignitaries, scientists, athletes, and wealthy benefactors.

In the first chapter I sketched the social structure of the Hellenistic courts and the place of poets therein by analyzing an array of historical evidence through the lens of modern sociological theories. By applying Norbert Elias' approach to historical accounts I demonstrated that Hellenistic court society was a hierarchical social network surrounding the king in which one's status and access to the monarch corresponded to his favor. High-ranking courtiers were called *philoï*, 'friends,' and thus courtiership was performed as *philia*, i.e. a long-term relationship of 'friendship' maintained by the reciprocal exchange of gifts. Court gatherings including the king's symposium were hypercompetitive, with *philoï* jockeying for favor through the agonistic exchange of gifts. I then considered the evidence that poets, too, were fully-fledged members of this circle of *philoï* by pointing to the existence of poets explicitly termed *philoï* in historical sources and examining Theocritus' portrayal of Ptolemy II Philadelphus' patronage of poets in terms of a gift-exchange. Crucially, we saw how Theocritus leverages the gift-exchange of *philia* in his favor: he offers Ptolemy an irresistible poem that effects his deification, and in



keeping with the code of *philia* Ptolemy is obliged to offer him a correspondingly great gift in return.

In order to conceptualize how poets competed for status with courtiers whose gifts were more tangible than their own, including dedications, inventions, and victories, I introduced Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital and the struggle for distinction between members of the different fractions of the dominant class. I demonstrated these ideas' utility through an examination of Posidippus' competition with the admiral Callicrates of Samos in the dedicatory epigram AB 39, before offering a Bourdieusian analysis of the production, consumption, and evaluation of cultural capital in Ptolemaic Alexandria. The Ptolemies' own cultural productions and anecdotes about their relationship to scholars and other cultural figures demonstrate that they positioned themselves as the legitimate arbiters of cultural and other forms of capital. This position allowed them to judge the relative value of courtiers in different fields. I then analyzed Alexandria's two major social sites for the production and consumption of cultural capital, the Museum and the royal symposium. I compared the state meals provided to Museum members both to civic grants of *sitesis* and sacrificial portions bestowed upon victors and concluded that Museum members' state meals were a highly-prized symbolic capital that placed them on a par with commanders, athletes, and state benefactors. The cultural capital produced by poets and Museum scholars was consumed at the royal symposium, where I showed that poets wielded their cultural capital as a weapon against other courtiers who were all expected to be conversant in poetry.

I concluded the first chapter by presenting the evidence for Callimachus' membership in the Ptolemaic court and described the methodology for examining his poetry. His composition of poetry for members of the Ptolemaic house over several decades, Tzetzes' notice that he was a

court youth, and Strabo's description of him as τετιμημένος παρὰ τοῖς Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεῦσιν (17.3.22) all suggest that he was a high-ranking courtier and likely considered a *philos*. If the Athenian inscription naming a Callimachus as a donor to the *epidosis* in 248/7 is our Callimachus, then we have additional evidence that he was wealthy and internationally traveled and well-known; but we cannot press this inscription too far. Regardless, Callimachus' assured status at the Ptolemaic court makes him an ideal poet to study strategies of self-positioning in this milieu, and I demonstrated how his portrayal of the gift-exchange and valuation of cultural capital offers a key to his competition with other courtiers.

In the second chapter I examined the function of Callimachus' *Hymns* as a valuable cultural capital for the Ptolemies, focusing in particular on the first and second hymns to Zeus and Apollo. The *Hymns* are an artfully arranged collection of six hymns to traditional Greek divinities. While the majority view was that the *Hymns* were not written for performance, I reviewed recent arguments in favor of their performance at Ptolemaic royal symposia and religious festivals, adding in favor of the latter scenario that festivals offered poets the opportunity to win prestigious forms of symbolic capital, and that in the case of Callimachus these civic honors would have been valuable especially to his Ptolemaic patrons. Through an analysis of the divine epiphany in the hymn to Apollo, I argued that Callimachus, responding to the vogue of automation at court and the use made of automata in royal and religious festivals, presents his *Hymns* as a literary automaton which can travel the world and stage a performance of these splendid Ptolemaic religious celebrations far and wide. In this way Callimachus positions himself competitively vis-à-vis the engineers and donors of automata adorning their patrons' cults and celebrations.

I then showed that a valuable asset of the *Hymns* as a cultural capital is the analogy they forge between the Ptolemies and the Olympian gods. By examining the passages of the hymns to Zeus, Apollo, and Delos in which Callimachus introduces Ptolemaic kings, I showed that Callimachus does not identify the Ptolemies with the Olympians, but aligns them closely and in the hymn to Delos links them by shared attributes, namely the Gallic shields. I compared Callimachus' practice to the way in which the Ptolemies were aligned with the Olympian gods in cult. In particular I discussed Callicrates of Samos' dedication of a statue pair of the *Theoi Adelphoi* at Olympia in obvious spatial dialogue with the temples of Zeus and Hera, as well as the phenomenon of divinizing the Ptolemies as *synnaoi theoi* of Olympian and Egyptian gods, a practice attested in historical sources and reflected in contemporary poetry, including Theocritus' *Idylls* 15 and 17 and Callimachus' epigram on Berenice as the fourth Grace (51 Pf.). In these cases the Ptolemies are divinized by being aligned with pre-existing gods. This alignment results significantly in a two-way assimilation, in which the Ptolemies take on attributes of the Olympians, but the Olympians are also reimagined in Ptolemaic terms.

In light of this bidirectional assimilation of Ptolemies and Olympians in cult, I demonstrated that the Olympian gods in Callimachus' *Hymns* may be read as analogies for the Ptolemies. As a result, I proposed that the court society Callimachus represents on Olympus not only reflects features of the Ptolemies' own court society, but also offers a legitimizing 'charter myth' for their innovative exercise of power at court. I undertook a detailed comparison of the physical and social field of court which Zeus establishes in the first hymn with the Ptolemaic court. Zeus's δῖππος, for example, not only recalls the Ptolemies' primacy in chariot-racing, but also echoes Alexander's appropriation of the Persian Great King's δῖππος as his seat of power at court. In this way Callimachus offers divine Greek precedent for what was otherwise an

unprecedented, un-Greek display of power. I showed that Callimachus carves out a significant position for himself at the Ptolemies' court by running Zeus's accession to Olympus together with Ptolemy I Soter's acquisition of Egypt. By lampooning the ancient myth of Zeus's Olympian accession by lot, he rejects by analogy contemporary claims that Ptolemy was allotted Egypt rather than winning it because of his undisputed primacy amongst Alexander's successors. By expressing his own claims that he would tell stories 'that persuade the listener's ear' (*Hymns* 1.65), Callimachus suggests his willingness and ability to promote his patrons' desired public image. His poetry, therefore, is a cultural capital eminently valuable to his patrons in their struggle for primacy in the *oikoumene*.

I found the same process of analogy at work in the second hymn to Apollo which celebrates the god's epiphany of Cyrene. By comparing the fruits of Apollo's patronage in the hymn to those of Ptolemaic patronage as reflected in numismatic, papyrological, and historical evidence, I demonstrated that Callimachus fashions a thoroughgoing analogy between them. The purpose of this analogy, I suggested, is to offer Apollo's patronage of Cyrene as a positive model for the Ptolemaic patronage of Cyrene brought about by the marriage of Ptolemy III to the Cyrenean princess Berenice II. Callimachus thus positions himself as a valuable cultural ambassador, as it were, for the Ptolemaic court. I then discussed the hymn's famous *sphragis* in which Apollo, at the moment of accepting and approving Callimachus' gift, kicks away Phthonos, who criticizes Callimachus' hymn on account of its short length. I compare the whispering critic Phthonos to the court flatterers attested in Hellenistic anecdotes and Plutarch's treatise *On How to Distinguish a Flatterer from a Friend* and argue that Callimachus offers this scene as an analogy for the Ptolemaic king's rejection of Callimachus' critics at court as

flatterers. Callimachus thereby legitimizes the Ptolemaic king's position as legitimate arbiter of cultural capital, and secures his own distinguished position at his side.

In the third chapter I examined Callimachus' self-presentation in the third and fourth hymns as an invaluable agent of deification both of the Olympian gods and of the Ptolemies. The collection's third hymn to Artemis describes the goddess' development to power and the deification of the Ptolemies' ancestor, Heracles. I first compared the series of exchanges by which Artemis rises to courtly prominence on Olympus to the negotiations, rituals, and high-status social engagements a new member of the Ptolemaic house would perform to gain a place among the reigning gods. Then, I demonstrated that Callimachus' emphasis on Heracles' gluttony, so comic to the Olympians, makes room in their company for his patrons' Ptolemaic *tryphe*. As Bing and Uhrmeister have shown, Callimachus presents his hymn as a chariot of unending song on which she rises to Olympus. Building on their argument I concluded that what Callimachus demands in exchange for his gift that keeps on giving is a privileged and preferential relationship of *philia* with the goddess he has taken to Olympus.

In this chapter I also discussed the hymn to Delos, in which Callimachus offers his gift from the Muses to Delos in recompense for the goddess' gift of praise to Apollo. I pointed out close parallels between the language Callimachus uses in the proem to describe Delos' praise of Apollo and that of the Nicouria Decree, which recorded the resolution of the League of Islanders to praise Ptolemy I Soter as a god. I concluded that in this hymn Callimachus collapses Delos' mythic and recent political history and positions himself as a poet of the Museum offering Delos the gift of Ptolemaic cultural capital owed to her as a result of her divinization of Apollo. In return for his hymn, Callimachus positions himself as deserving of praise from not only Delos, perhaps in the form of an honorary inscription, but also Ptolemy II Philadelphus, whom

Callimachus praises in an extended prophecy delivered by the unborn Apollo. Callimachus thus positions himself as a crucial intermediary between the Ptolemies and the wider world and assumes a crucial role in facilitating the anchoring of the Ptolemies' deification in cult.

In the fourth chapter I discussed how the final pair of hymns to Athena and Demeter delineate the courtly prerogatives of the Olympian and Ptolemaic divinities and the terrible punishments that awaited even friends who would transgress them. The crisis at the center of the hymn to Athena, namely the blinding of Teiresias, is precipitated by his violation of the Cronian Law, that no divinity may be seen unless s/he wills it. I showed that this law is parallel to the central prohibition of court societies in Greek imagination, attributed to the Median king Deioces, that the king be seen by no one; I thus concluded that Callimachus has provided this non-Greek custom a divine Greek precedent. The fact that even Teiresias, the son of Athena's court favorite Chariclo, is held to the letter of the law suggests that monarchs as well as courtiers are bound to it. Nevertheless, Athena bestows magnificent gifts upon Teiresias as are due to him as the son of her dearest *hetaira*. I argued that Callimachus portrays the long-lived seer Teiresias, prophet at the service of great kings, as an analogy for himself as the Ptolemies' court poet. I concluded this chapter by examining the hymn to Demeter in light of Ptolemaic feasting and *tryphe*. I argued that Erysichthon's wish to cut down wood from Demeter's grove for a dining room in which to feast his friends ceaselessly sets him up as a rival to the divine Ptolemaic kings who worshipped Demeter and hosted unending banquets; his punishment with insatiable hunger exposes his unworthiness of this divine privilege by consuming all of his family's resources and reducing him to a beggar at the crossroads. I concluded that Callimachus thus provides a divine parallel for the principle that *tryphe*, expressed by feasting, was a privilege reserved for the Ptolemies alone.

These three chapters on the *Hymns* reveal a far different Callimachus than the one scholars usually imagine. Instead of a bookish author concerned only with a privileged few, I have shown that Callimachus composed his *Hymns* to perform a political and religious function of the utmost importance: anchoring his Ptolemaic patrons' court society in Olympian practice and presenting his Olympian analogy to audiences both within the Alexandrian court and throughout the *oikoumene*. By responding to his patrons' pressing need of effective public image-making, Callimachus entered the competition along with the ambassadors, commanders, scientists, and artists who populated the Ptolemies' court, all vying with each other to fulfil this need in their own domains. In exchange for his cultural capital, Callimachus suggests several types of appropriate counter-gifts, all of which position him above this broad range of courtiers. In the hymn to Delos he expresses his hope for public honors both from Delos and from Ptolemy; elsewhere he suggests he is owed the most valuable gift of all in court societies, namely his divine patrons' favor, their preferential friendship, and a position at their side. With these requests Callimachus bolsters the structure of the very court society his patrons established, for he extols their friendship as the most valuable capital of all.

In the final chapter I analyzed how Callimachus positions himself towards his patron Berenice II in *Aetia* 3-4, two books framed by elegies in her honor. In so doing I uncovered an unexpected metaphor of the queen's patronage not as a bond of friendship, but as one of marriage. Discussing the meaning of ἔδνον at the beginning of the *Victoria Berenices*, I argued that Callimachus harnesses a Pindaric metaphor of the epinician poem as a 'bride-price' to pose as a suitor in competition for Berenice's hand in marriage. A series of allusions to bridal figures, including Heracles γαμούμενος, throughout the extant fragments of the poem support this interpretation and suggest that Berenice should accept her poet's ἔδνον and reciprocate by

offering him her *charis* as a bride. I then discussed the resonance of the *Victoria*'s bridal metaphor in 'Acontius and Cydippe' and the *Coma Berenices*. I first demonstrated that Acontius' marriage to Cydippe offers analogies for the textual gifts that Callimachus promises Berenice should she reciprocate his ἔδνον. This gift finally comes in the last poem of the *Aetia*, the *Coma Berenices* on the catasterized lock of Berenice's hair sacrificed for her new husband's safe return from war. The lock's paradoxical state of virginity preserves an image of Berenice forever as a young bride; by translating the lock from a constellation in the sky into a poem at the end of his *Aetia*, Callimachus invests his books of *Aetia*, given to Berenice as his ἔδνον, with the ability to renew her beauty forever. In return, Callimachus demands her exclusive, life-long favor exalting him above all the other courtiers seeking her patronage.

In sum, the picture of Callimachus that emerges from the preceding analyses differs vastly from the common view of Hellenistic poets. Callimachus and his peers have long tended to be seen as members of inward-facing, rivalrous groups of intellectuals vying for priority amongst themselves. On my reading of the *Hymns* and *Aetia* 3-4, however, we may conclude that Callimachus had his eyes set on a larger, more pressing struggle for distinction in the Ptolemaic court society writ large. By positioning his poetry as a gift more valuable than the victories of admirals and athletes, the inventions of engineers and astronomers, the political connections of ambassadors, and the monuments of artists and donors, Callimachus vies not merely to be crowned best of poets, but to be judged by his kings and queens the most precious and indispensable of courtiers and to enjoy the perks of status that accompanied the royal embrace of their friendship and favor.

This analysis of Callimachus' work offers us a richer understanding not only of the value of Hellenistic court poetry as a cultural capital, but also of the social prominence of poets and the



dynamics of cultural patronage at court. There has been a tendency at times to accept the immense sums that the Ptolemies and their rivals poured into the production of poetry at face value, treating poets as mere status symbols without examining carefully the content of their work. Specialists of Hellenistic poetry have now demonstrated that these poets' work engages with the weightiest political, social, and religious issues of its day, yet it is still too often assumed that this poetry was restricted to the narrowest of audiences and had little resonance beyond the court. In my analyses of both the *Hymns* and *Aetia* 3-4 we have seen that Callimachus positions himself as a fashioner of his patrons' public image. His works have value to the Ptolemies owing to their effect outside the court; it is then within the court that he reaps the social profits of distinction and continued favor he is owed. Callimachus' life and livelihood revolved around the Ptolemaic court, which we have seen was a field crowded with men of every trade, all vying for the same social capital of favor. To win royal friendship, one had to be a valuable friend to have; Callimachus therefore positioned his poetry as a gift that no other *philos* could offer.

## Works Cited

- Acosta-Hughes, B. 2002. *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*. Berkeley.
- . 2010. *Arion's Lyre: Archaic Lyric into Hellenistic Poetry*. Princeton.
- . 2019. 'A Lost Pavane for a Dead Princess: Call. Fr. 228 Pf.' In Klooster et al. (2019), 5-25.
- Acosta-Hughes, B. and Cusset, C. 2012. 'Callimaque face aux Hymnes Homériques.' In R. Bouchon, P. Brillet-Dubois, and N. Le Meur-Weissman, eds. *Hymnes de la Grèce antique: Entre littérature et histoire*, 123-33. Lyon.
- Acosta-Hughes, B., Kosmetatou, E., and Baumbach, M., eds. 2004. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves. Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309)*. Washington, DC.
- Acosta-Hughes, B., Lehnus, L., and Stephens, S., eds. 2011. *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*. Leiden.
- Acosta-Hughes, B. and Stephens, S. A. 2012. *Callimachus in Context: From Plato to the Augustan Poets*. Cambridge.
- Adamson, J. 1999. 'The Making of the Ancien-Régime Court.' In J. Adamson, ed. *The Princely Courts of Europe, 1500-1750*, 7-42. London.
- Ager, S. L. 2017. 'Symbol and Ceremony: Royal Weddings in the Hellenistic Age.' In Erskine, Llewellyn-Jones, and Wallace (2017), 165-88.
- Aguirre, M. 2010. 'Erinyes as Creatures of Darkness.' In M. Christopoulos, E. D. Karakantza, and O. A. Levaniouk, eds. *Light and Darkness in Ancient Greek Myth and Religion*, 133-41. Lanham.

- Albert, W. 1988. *Das mimetische Gedicht in der Antike*. Frankfurt.
- Allen, W. S. 1968. *Vox Graeca: The Pronunciation of Classical Greek*. Cambridge.
- Ambühl, A. 2004. 'Entertaining Theseus and Heracles: The *Hecale* and the *Victoria Berenices* as a Diptych.' In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (2004), 23-47.
- . 2005. *Kinder und junge Helden: Innovative Aspekte des Umgangs mit der literarischen Tradition bei Kallimachos (Hellenistica Groningana 9)*. Leuven.
- Asheri, D., Lloyd, A., and Corcella, A. 2007. *A Commentary on Herodotus. Books I-IV*. Eds. O. Murray and A. Moreno. Oxford.
- Asper, M. 1997. *Onomata allotria: Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos*. Stuttgart.
- . 2001. 'Gruppen und Dichter: Zu Programmatik und Adressat in den *Aitien* des Kallimachos.' *A&A* 47: 84-116.
- Austin, M. M. 1981. *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*. Cambridge.
- Bagnall, R. S. 1976. *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt*. Leiden.
- Barbantani, S. 2007. 'The Glory of the Spear: A Powerful Symbol in Hellenistic Poetry and Art. The Case of Neoptolemus "of Tlos" (and Other Ptolemaic Epigrams).' *SCO* 53: 67-138.
- . 2011. 'Callimachus on Kings and Kingship.' In Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus, and Stephens (2011), 178-200.
- . 2012. 'Hellenistic Epinician.' *BICS Supplement* 112: 37-55.
- Basta Donzelli, G. 1984. 'Arsinoe simile ad Elen (Theocritus *Id.* 15,110).' *Hermes* 112: 306-16.
- Baumbach, M. and Bär, S., eds. 2012. eds. *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Epyllion and*

- its Reception*. Leiden-Boston.
- Baumbach, M. and Trampedach, K. 2004. “‘Winged Words’: Poetry and Divination in Posidippus’ *Oionoskopika*.’ In Acosta-Hughes, Kosmetatou, and Baumbach (2004), 123-60.
- Bearzot, C. 2011. ‘Royal Biography in the Hellenistic Age.’ In G. Marasco, ed. *Political Autobiographies and Memoir in Antiquity: A Brill Companion*, 37-85. Leiden.
- Bergk, T. 1886. *Kleine philologische Schriften*. Halle.
- van Berkel, T. A. 2012. ‘The Economics of Friendship: Changing Conceptions of Reciprocity in Classical Athens.’ Ph.D. dissertation, Leiden.
- Berrey, M. 2017. *Hellenistic Science at Court*. Berlin-Boston.
- Bickerman, E. J. 1938. *Institutions des Séleucides*. Paris.
- Billows, R. A. 2000. ‘Polybius and Alexander Historiography.’ In A. B. Bosworth and E. J. Baynham, eds. *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*, 286-306. Oxford.
- Bing, P. 1984. ‘Callimachus’ Cows: A Riddling Recusatio.’ *ZPE* 54: 1-8.
- . 1988. *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*. Göttingen.
- . 1995. ‘*Ergänzungsspiel* in the Epigrams of Callimachus.’ *A&A* 41: 115-31.
- . 1996. ‘Callimachus and the *Hymn to Demeter*.’ *SyllClass* 6: 29-42.
- . 1999. ‘Reconstructing Berenike’s Lock.’ In G. W. Most, ed. *Collecting Fragments: Fragmente Sammeln (Aporemata 1)*, 78-94. Göttingen.
- . 2000. ‘Text or Performance/Text and Performance: Alan Cameron’s *Callimachus and His Critics*.’ In R. Pretagostini, ed. *La letteratura ellenistica: Problemi e prospettive di*

- recerca. Atti de colloquio internazionale, Università di Roma 'Tor Vergata', 29-30 Aprile 1997*, 139-48. Rome.
- . 2002/3. 'Posidippus and the Admiral: Kallikrates of Samos in the Milan Papyrus.' *GRBS* 5: 243-66.
- . 2005. 'The Politics and Poetics of Geography in the Milan Posidippus, Section One: On Stones (AB 1-20).' In Gutzwiller (2005), 119-40.
- . 2009. *The Scroll and the Marble. Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry*. Ann Arbor.
- . 2019. 'Thanks Again to Aristaenetus: The Tale of Phrygius and Pieria in Callimachus' *Aetia* (Frs. 80-83b Harder) Through the Eyes of a Late-Antique Epistolographer.' In Klooster et al. (2019), 27-49.
- Bing, P. and Höschele, R. 2014. *Aristaenetus, Erotic Letters: Introduced, Translated and Annotated*. Atlanta.
- Bing, P. and Uhrmeister, V. 1994. 'The Unity of Callimachus' Hymn to Artemis.' *JHS* 114: 19-34.
- Bingen, J., ed. 1952. *Papyrus Revenue Laws*. Göttingen.
- . 1978. *Le papyrus Revenue-Laws: Tradition grecque et adaptation hellénistique*. Opladen.
- Bishop, T. 1998. 'The Gingerbread Host: Tradition and Novelty in the Jacobean Masque.' In D. Bevington and P. Holbrook, eds. *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*, 88-120. Cambridge.
- Blok, J., and van 't Wout, E. 2018. 'Table Arrangements: *Sitêsis* as a Polis Institution (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 131).' In van den Eijnde, Blok, and Strootman (2018), 181-204.

- Blomqvist, J. 1990. 'The Last Line of Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*.' *Eranos* 88: 17-24.
- Blundell, M. W. 1989. *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies: A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics*. Cambridge.
- Bornmann, F. 1968. *Callimachi Hymnus in Dianam: Introduzione, testo critico e commento*. Florence.
- Bosak-Schroeder, C. 2016. 'The Religious Life of Greek Automata.' *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 17: 123-36.
- Bourdieu, P. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Trans. R. Nice. Cambridge, MA.
- . 1986. 'The Forms of Capital.' In J. Richardson, ed. *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, 241-58. New York.
- . 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Trans. R. Johnson. New York.
- Briant, P. 1991. 'Chasses royales macédoniennes et chasses royales perses: Le thème de la chasse au lion sur la chasse de Vergina.' *DHA* 17: 211-55.
- Brooke, C. N. L. and Mynors, R. A. B., eds. 1983. *Walter Map. De Nugis Curialium. On Courtiers' Trifles*. Oxford.
- Brumbaugh, M. 2019. *The New Politics of Olympus: Kingship in Kallimachos' Hymns*. Oxford.
- Bulloch, A. W., ed. 1985. *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Cambridge.
- . 2006. 'The Order and Structure of Callimachus' *Aetia* 3.' *CQ* 56: 496-508.
- . 2010. 'Hymns and Encomia.' In Clauss and Cuypers (2010), 166-80.
- Bundy, E. L. 1972. 'The "Quarrel" Between Kallimachos and Apollonios" Part I: The Epilogue

- of Kallimachos's *Hymn to Apollo*.' *CSCA* 4: 39-94.
- Buraselis, K. 2013. 'Ptolemaic Grain, Seaways and Power.' In K. Buraselis, M. Stefanou, and D. J. Thompson, eds. *The Ptolemies, the Sea and the Nile: Studies in Waterborne Power*, 97-107. Cambridge.
- . 2017. 'In the Mirror of *Hetairai*: Tracing Aspects of the Interaction Between Polis Life and Court Life in the Early Hellenistic Age.' In Erskine, Llewellyn-Jones, and Wallace (2017), 213-30.
- Cahen, E. 1929. *Callimaque et son œuvre poétique*. Paris.
- , ed. 1930. *Les hymnes de Calimaque*. Paris.
- , ed. 1940. *Callimaque: Hymnes, Épigrammes, Fragments*. Paris.
- Calame, C. 1993. 'Legendary Narration and Poetic Procedure in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*.' In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (1993), 37-57.
- Cameron, A. 1995. *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton.
- Caneva, S. G. 2014. 'Courtly Love, Stars and Power: The Queen in Third-Century Royal Couples, Through Poetry and Epigraphic Texts.' In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (2014), 25-57.
- Carbon, J.-M. 2018. 'A Network of Hearths: Honors, Sacrificial Shares, and "Traveling Meat."' In van den Eijnde, Blok, and Strootman (2018), 340-75.
- Carey, C. 1981. *A Commentary on Fives Odes of Pindar: Pythian 2, Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8*. New York.
- Carney, E. D. 2002. 'Hunting and the Macedonian Elite: Sharing the Rivalry of the Chase.' In D. Ogden, ed. *The Hellenistic World: New Perspectives*, 59-80. London.
- . 2006. *Olympias: Mother of Alexander the Great*. London.

- . 2013. *Arsinoë of Egypt and Macedon: A Royal Life*. Oxford.
- Carrière, J. 1969. 'Philadelphie ou Sotêr? A propos d'un hymne de Callimaque'. *StudClas* 11: 85-93.
- Carson, A. 1982. 'Wedding at Noon in Pindar's *Ninth Pythian*.' *GRBS* 23: 121-8.
- Casali, S. 2006. 'The Making of the Shield: Inspiration and Repression in the *Aeneid*.' *GR* 53: 185-204.
- Cassio, A. 1973. 'L'incipit della *Chioma Callimachea* in Virgilio.' *RFIC* 101: 329-32.
- Chamoux, F. 2003. *Hellenistic Civilization*. Trans. M. Roussel. Malden, MA (originally published 1981).
- Chaniotis, A. 1988. *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften: Epigraphische Beiträge zur griechischen Historiographie*. Stuttgart.
- . 1997. 'Theatricality Beyond the Theater: Staging Public Life in the Hellenistic World.' In B. le Guen, ed. *De la scène aux gradins, Pallas* 47: 219-59.
- . 2003. 'The Divinity of Hellenistic Rulers.' In A. Erskine, ed. *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, 431-45. Malden, MA.
- . 2007. review of Hazzard (2000). *CW* 100: 175-6.
- . 2011. 'The Ithyphallic Hymn for Demetrios Poliorketes and Hellenistic Religious Mentality.' In P. P. Iossif, A. S. Chankowski, and C. C. Lorber, eds. *More than Men, Less than Gods: Studies on Royal Cult and Imperial Worship. Proceedings of the International Colloquium Organized by the Belgian School of Athens (November 1-2, 2007)*, 157-95. Leuven.
- Cheshire, K. 2008. 'Kicking ΦΘΟΝΟΣ: Apollo and His Chorus in Callimachus *Hymn* 2.' *CP* 103: 354-73.



- . 2014. 'Callimachus' *Hymn* 5 and an Alexandrian Audience.' In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (2014), 59-84.
- Clarysse, W. 2000. 'The Ptolemies Visiting the Egyptian Chora.' In L. Mooren, ed. *Politics, Administration and Society in the Hellenistic and Roman World: Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Bertinoro, 19-24 July 1997*, 29-53. Leuven.
- Clauss, J. J. 1986. 'Lies and Allusions: The Addressee and Date of Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*.' *CA* 2: 155-70.
- Clauss, J. J. and Cuypers, M., eds. 2010. *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*. Malden.
- Clayman, D. L. 2014a. *Berenice II and the Golden Age of Ptolemaic Egypt*. Oxford.
- . 2014b. 'Historical Contexts for Two *Aitia* from Book III: "Acontius & Cydippe" (Frr. 67-75 Pf.) and "Phrygius & Pieria" (Frr. 80-83 Pf.).' In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (2014), 85-102.
- Coco, L., ed. 1988. *Callimaco: Epigrammi*. Manduria.
- Coletti, M. L. 1962. 'Aconzio e Cidippe in Callimaco e in Ovidio.' *RCCM* 4: 294-303.
- Couat, A. 1931. *Alexandrian Poetry Under the First Three Ptolemies 324 to 222 B. C.* London.
- Courtney, E. 2000. 'Problems in Two Translations.' *Prom.* 26: 47-51.
- Criscuolo, L. 2003. 'Agoni e politica alla corte di Alessandria: Riflessioni su alcuni epigrammi di Posidippo.' *Chiron* 33: 311-33.
- Cuypers, M. 2004. 'Prince and Principle: The Philosophy of Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*.' In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (2004), 95-115.
- D'Alessio, G. B., ed. 1996. *Callimaco: Opere*. Milan.
- Daux, G. 1922. 'Inscriptions de Delphes.' *BCH* 18: 226-70.
- Davies, J. K. 2005. 'The Economic Consequences of Hellenistic Palaces.' In Z. H. Archibald, J.

- K. Davies, and V. Gabrielsen, eds. *Making, Moving and Managing: The New World of Ancient Economies, 323-31 BC*, 117-35. Oxford.
- Day, J. W. 2000. 'Epigram and Reader: Generic Force as (Re-)Activation of Ritual.' In Depew and Obbink (2000), 37-57.
- . 2010. *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication: Representation and Reperformance*. Cambridge.
- Della Corte, F. 1951. *Due Studi Catulliani*. Genoa.
- Depew, M. 1993. 'Mimesis and Aetiology in Callimachus' *Hymns*.' In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (1993) 57-77.
- . 1994. 'POxy 2509 and Callimachus' *Lavacrum Palladis*: αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς κούρη μέγαλοιο.' *CQ* 44: 410-26.
- . 1998. 'Delian Hymns and Callimachean Allusion.' *HSCP* 98: 155-82.
- . 2000. 'Enacted and Represented Dedications: Genre and Greek Hymn.' In Depew and Obbink (2000), 59-79.
- . 2002. 'Gender, Power, and Poetics in Callimachus' Book of *Hymns*.' In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (2004), 117-37.
- Depew, M. and Obbink, D., eds. 2000. *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*. Cambridge, MA.
- Dillery, J. 2015. *Clio's Other Sons: Berossus & Manetho*. Ann Arbor.
- Dinshaw, C. 2012. *How Soon Is Now? Medieval Texts, Amateur Readers, and the Queerness of Time*. Durham, NC.
- Dougherty, C. 1993. *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece*. Oxford.
- Dover, K. J. 1978. *Greek Homosexuality*. Cambridge, MA.

- Drachmann, A. B., ed. 1910. *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina: Vol. II. Scholia in Pythionicas*. Leipzig.
- Drachmann, A. G. 1948. *Ktesibios, Philon und Heron*. Copenhagen.
- Duindam, J. 1994. *Myths of Power: Norbert Elias and the Early Modern European Court*. Amsterdam.
- Du Quesnay, I. 2012. 'Three Problems in Catullus 66.' In I. Du Quesnay and T. Woodman, eds. *Catullus: Poems, Books, Readers*, 153-83. Cambridge.
- Easterling, P. 2007. 'Looking for *Omphale*.' In V. Jennings and A. Katsaros, eds. *The World of Ion of Chios*, 282-92. Leiden-Boston.
- Edwards, M. W. 1991. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume V: Books 17-20*. Cambridge.
- Edwards, R. 2007. 'Walter Map: Authorship and the Space of Writing.' *New Literary History* 38: 273-92.
- Eidinow, E. and Kindt, J., eds. 2015. *The Oxford Handbook to Ancient Greek Religion*. Oxford.
- van den Eijnde, F., Blok, J. J., Strootman, R., eds. 2018. *Feasting and Polis Institutions*. Leiden.
- Elias, N. 1983. *The Court Society*. Trans E. Jephcott. New York (originally published 1969).
- Elton, G. 1983. 'Tudor Government: The Points of Contact III. The Court.' In G. Elton, ed. *Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government*, 38-57. Cambridge.
- Ehrlich, B. 1894. *De Callimachi Hymnis Quaestiones Chronologicae*. Wrocław.
- Errington, R. M. 1969. 'Bias in Ptolemy's History of Alexander.' *CQ* 19: 233-42.
- Erskine, A., Llewellyn-Jones, L., and Wallace, S., eds. 2017. *The Hellenistic Court: Monarchic Power and Elite Society from Alexander to Cleopatra*. Swansea.
- Fantuzzi, M. 2011. 'Speaking with Authority: Polyphony in Callimachus' *Hymns*.' In Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus, and Stephens (2011), 428-53.

- Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Faraone, C. 1987. 'Hephaestus the Magician and Near Eastern Parallels for Alcinous' Watchdogs.' *GRBS* 28: 257-80.
- Faucher, T. 2018. 'L'or des Ptolémées: L'exploitation de l'or dans le désert Oriental.' In J.-P. Brun, T. Faucher, B. Redon, and S. Sidebotham, eds. *Le désert oriental d'Égypte durant la période gréco-romaine: bilans archéologiques*. Paris.  
<<http://books.openedition.org/cdf/5143>>.
- Faulkner, A. 2011. 'Fast, Famine, and Feast: Food for Thought in Callimachus' *Hymn to Demeter*.' *HSCP* 106: 75-95.
- . 2013. 'Et in Arcadia Diana: An Encounter with Pan in Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis*.' *CP* 108: 223-34.
- Finley, M. I. 1955. 'Marriage, Sale and Gift in the Homeric World.' *RIDA* (3rd ser.) 2: 167-94.
- . 1965. *The World of Odysseus*. New York.
- . 1981. *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece*. New York.
- Fountoulakis, A. 2017. 'When Dionysus Goes to the East: On the Dissemination of Greek Drama Beyond Athens.' In A. Fountoulakis, A. Markantonatos, and G. Vasilaros, eds. *Theatre World: Critical Perspectives on Greek Tragedy and Comedy. Studies in Honour of Georgia Xanthakis-Karamanos*, 75-118. Berlin.
- Fraser, P. M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols. Oxford.
- Fuhrer, T. 1992. *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos*. Basel-Kassel.
- Furley, W. D. and Bremer, J. M. 2001. *Greek Hymns*. 2 vols. Tübingen.
- Gabathuler, M. 1937. *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter*. Borna-Leipzig.

- Gentili, B. 1988. *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece. From Homer to the Fifth Century*.  
Trans. A. T. Cole. Baltimore-London.
- Gentili, B. et al., eds. 1995. *Pindaro: Le Pitiche*. Verona.
- Gercke, A. 1887. 'Alexandrinische Studien.' *RhM* 42: 262-75, 590-626.
- Gerhke, H.-J. 2003. *Geschichte des Hellenismus*. Munich.
- Ghisellini, E. 1999. *Atene e la corte tolemaica: L'ara con dodektheon nel Museo Greco-Romana di Alessandria*. Rome.
- Giangrande, G. 1968. 'Das Dichten des Kallimachos im mittleren und hohen Alter.' *Hermes* 96: 710-25.
- Gill, C., Postlethwaite, N., and Seaford, R., eds. 1998. *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*. Oxford.
- Girone, M. 1998. *Iamata: Guarigioni miracolose di Asclepio in testi epigrafici*. Bari.
- Giuseppetti, M. 2013. *L'isola esile: Studi a Inno a Delo di Callimaco*. Rome.
- Gow, A. S. F., ed. 1950. *Theocritus*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- Gow, A. S. F. and Page, D. L., eds. 1965. *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- Graf, F. 2015. 'Healing.' In Eidinow and Kindt (2015), 505-18.
- Gregory, C. A. 1982. *Gifts and Commodities*. London.
- Grenfell, B. P. and Mahaffy, J. P. 1896. *The Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus*. Oxford.
- Griffith, M. 1983. *Aeschylus: Prometheus Bound*. Cambridge.
- Griffiths, F. T. 1979. *Theocritus at Court*. Leiden.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. 1991. *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre*. Madison.
- . 1992. 'Callimachus' Lock of Berenice: Fantasy, Romance, and Propaganda.' *AJP* 113: 359-85.

- . 1998. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. Berkeley.
- , ed. 2005. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Oxford.
- . 2007. *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature*. Malden.
- Habicht, C. 1958. 'Die herrschende Gesellschaft in den hellenistischen Monarchien.' *Vierteljahresschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 45: 1-16.
- . 1999. *Athens from Alexander to Antony*. Trans. D. L. Schneider. Cambridge, MA.
- Hadjitoffi, F. 2008. 'Callimachus' Sexy Athena: The Hymn to Athena and the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite.' *MD* 60: 9-37.
- Hammond, N. G. L. 1990. 'Royal Pages, Personal Pages, and Boys Trained in the Macedonian Manner During the Period of the Temenid Monarchy.' *Historia* 39: 261-90.
- Harder, M. A. 1990. 'Untrodden Paths: Where Do They Lead?' *HSCP* 93: 287-309.
- . 1992. 'Insubstantial Voices: Some Observations on the Hymns of Callimachus.' *CQ* 42: 384-94.
- . 1998. 'Generic Games in Callimachus' *Aetia*.' In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (1998), 95-113.
- . 2002. 'Intertextuality in Callimachus' *Aetia*.' In Montanari and Lehnus (2002), 189-233.
- , ed. 2012. *Callimachus: Aetia*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., Wakker, G. C., eds. 1993. *Callimachus (Hellenistica Groningana 1)*. Groningen.
- , eds. 1998. *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry (Hellenistica Groningana 3)*. Groningen.
- , eds. 2004. *Callimachus II (Hellenistica Groningana 7)*. Leuven-Paris-Dudley.
- , eds. 2014. *Hellenistic Poetry in Context (Hellenistica Groningana 20)*. Leuven-Paris-Walpole.

- Haslam, M. W. 1993. 'Callimachus' *Hymns*.' In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (1993), 111-25.
- Hatzopoulos, M. B. and Loukopoulou, L. D. 1981. *Philip of Macedon*. London.
- Hauben, H. 2004. 'A Phoenician King in the Service of the Ptolemies: Philocles of Sidon Revisited.' *AncSoc* 34: 27-44.
- . 2010. 'Rhodes, the League of Islanders, and the Cult of Ptolemy I Soter.' In A. Tamis, C. J. Mackie, and S. G. Byrne, eds. *Φιλαθήναιος: Studies in Honour of Michael J. Osborne*, 103-21. Athens.
- Hazzard, R. A. 2000. *Imagination of a Monarchy: Studies in Ptolemaic Propaganda*. Toronto.
- Hecht, C. 2017. *Zwischen Athen und Alexandria: Dichter und Künstler beim makedonischen König Archelaos*. Wiesbaden.
- Heckel, W. 1986. 'Somatophylakia: A Macedonian *Cursus Honorum*.' *Phoenix* 40: 279-94.
- Heinen, H. 1983. "Die Tryphe des Ptolemaios VIII. Euergetes II: Beobachtungen zum ptolemäischen Herrscherideal und zu einer römischen Gesandtschaft in Ägypten (140/39 v. Chr.)." In H. Heinen, ed. *Althistorische Studien, H. Bengtson zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht von Kollegen und Schülern*, 115-28. Stuttgart.
- Helm, P. R. 1981. 'Herodotus' *Medikos Logos* and Median History.' *Iran* 19: 85-90.
- Henrichs, A. 1993. 'Gods in Action: The Poetics of Divine Performance in the *Hymns* of Callimachus.' In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (1993), 127-48.
- Herda, A. 2006. *Der Apollon-Delphinios-Kult in Milet und die Neujahrsprozession nach Didyma: Ein neuer Kommentar der sog. Molpoi-Satzung*. Mainz.
- Herman, G. 1987. *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*. Cambridge.
- . 1997. 'The Court Society of the Hellenistic Age.' In P. Cartledge, P. Garnsey, and E. Gruen, eds. *Hellenistic Constructs. Essays in Culture, History, and Historiography*, 199-

211. Berkeley.
- Herter, H. 1929. 'Kallimachos und Homer: Ein Beitrag zur Interpretation des Hymnos auf Artemis.' *Xenia Bonnensia*, 50-105. Bonn.
- . 1971. 'Die Haaröle der Berenike.' In H.-H. Eulner et al., eds. *Medizingeschichte in unserer Zeit: Festgabe für Edith Heischkel und Walter Artelt zum 65. Geburtstag*, 54-68. Stuttgart.
- . 1975. *Kleine Schriften*. Ed. E. Vogt. Munich.
- Herzog, R. 1931. *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Medizin und der Religion*. Leipzig.
- Hesberg, H. von. 1987. *Mechanische Kunstwerke und ihre Bedeutung für die höfische Kunst des frühen Hellenismus. Marburger Winckelmann-Programm*.
- Heubeck, A. et al., eds. 1988. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Volume I. Introduction and Books I-VIII*. Oxford.
- Heyworth, S. 2004. 'Looking into the River: Literary History and Interpretation in Callimachus' Hymns 5 and 6.' In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (2004), 139-60.
- Hoepfner, W. 1971. *Zwei Ptolemaierbauten: Das Ptolemaierweihgeschenk in Olympia und ein Bauvorhaben in Alexandria*. Berlin.
- Hoffman, D. C. 2008. 'Concerning *Eikos*: Social Expectation and Verisimilitude in Early Attic Rhetoric.' *Rhetorica* 26: 1-29.
- Hölbl, G. 2001. *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*. Trans. T. Saavedra. London.
- Hollis, A. S. 1992. 'The Nuptial Rite in Catullus 66 and Callimachus' Poetry for Berenice.' *ZPE* 91: 21-8.
- Hopkinson, N., ed. 1984. *Callimachus: Hymn to Demeter*. Cambridge.



- . 1988. *A Hellenistic Anthology*. Cambridge.
- Horsfall, N. 2003. *Virgil, Aeneid 11: A Commentary*. Leiden.
- Höschele, R. 2007. 'The Traveling Reader: Journeys Through Ancient Epigram Books.' *TAPA* 137: 333-69.
- . 2009. 'Catullus' Callimachean Hair-itage and the Erotics of Translation.' *RFIC* 137: 118-52.
- Hünemörder, C. 2001. 'Quitte.' *Der neue Pauly* 10: 727.
- Hunter, R. 1996. *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*. Cambridge.
- . 1998. 'Before and After Epic: Theocritus (?), *Idyll* 25.' In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (1998), 115-32.
- , ed. 2003. *Theocritus: Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*. Berkeley.
- . 2011. 'The Gods of Callimachus.' In Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus, and Stephens (2011), 245-63.
- Hunter, R. L., Fuhrer, T. 2002. 'Imaginary Gods? Poetic Theology in the *Hymns* of Callimachus.' In Montanari and Lehnus (2002), 143-87.
- Hutchinson, G. O. 1988. *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford.
- . 2003. 'The *Aetia*: Callimachus' Poem of Knowledge.' *ZPE* 145: 47-59.
- Jacoby, F., ed. 1923-58. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*. Leiden.
- James, M. R., ed. 1914. *De Nugis Curialium*. Cambridge.
- Jameson, M. 2001. 'Rind: III. Griechenland.' *Der neue Pauly* 10: 1015-17.
- Kampakoglou, A. 2013. 'Victory, Mythology and the Poetics of Intercultural Praise in Callimachus' *Victoria Berenices*.' *Trends in Classics* 5: 111-43.
- . 2019. *Studies in the Reception of Pindar in Ptolemaic Poetry*. Berlin-Boston.

- Kenney, E. J. 1983. 'Vergil and the Elegiac Sensibility.' *ICS* 8: 44-59.
- Kerkhecker, A. 1997. 'Μουσέων ἐν τάλάρῳ: Dichter und Dichtung am Ptolemäerhof.' *A&A* 43: 124-44.
- Kidd, D., ed. 1998. *Aratus: Phaenomena*. Cambridge.
- Kidder, K. forthcoming. 'What Angers Demeter Also Angers Dionysus: Demeter and Dionysus as Ptolemaic Queen and King in Callimachus' *Hymn to Demeter*.' In J. J. H. Klooster, M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Women and Power in Hellenistic Poetry (Hellenistica Groningana)*. Leuven-Paris-Bristol, CT.
- Kirichenko, A. 2012. 'Nothing to Do with Zeus? The Old and the New in Callimachus' First *Hymn*.' In M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Gods and Religion in Hellenistic Poetry (Hellenistica Groningana 16)*, 181-202. Leuven.
- Kirkpatrick, J. and Dunn, F. 2002. 'Heracles, Cercopes, and Paracomedies.' *TAPA* 132: 29-61.
- Klooster, J. 2011. *Poetry as Window and Mirror: Positioning the Poet in Hellenistic Poetry*. Leiden.
- Klooster, J. J. H., Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C., eds. 2019. *Callimachus Revisited: New Perspectives in Callimachean Scholarship (Hellenistica Groningana 24)*, Leuven-Paris-Bristol, CT.
- Knight, V. 1993. 'Landscape and the Gods in Callimachus *Hymns* (with Particular Reference to *Hymn 3*).' In F. Cairns, ed. *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 7, 201-11. Leeds.
- Koenen, L. 1977. *Eine agonistische Inschrift aus Ägypten und frühptolemäische Königsfeste*. Meisenheim.
- . 1993. 'The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure.' In A. Bulloch, E. S. Gruen, A. A.

- Long, and A. Stewart, eds. *Images & Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*, 25-116. Berkeley.
- Köhnken, A. 1981. 'Apollo's Retort to Envy's Criticism (Two Questions of Relevance in Callimachus, *Hymn* 2, 105ff.).' *AJP* 102: 411-22.
- Konstan, D. 1997. *Friendship in the Classical World*. Cambridge.
- Körte, A. 1929. *Hellenistic Poetry*. New York.
- Koster, W. J. W., ed. 1975. *Prolegomena de comoedia: Scholia in Acharnenses, Equites, Nubes*. Vol. 1a. Groningen.
- Kroll, W. 1924. *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*. Stuttgart.
- Kruedener, J. von. 1973. *Die Rolle des Hofes im Absolutismus*. Stuttgart.
- Kuiper, K. 1896. *Studia Callimachea*. Volume 1, *De hymnorum I-IV dictione epica*. Leiden.
- Kurke, L. 1991. *The Traffic in Praise. Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca.
- Kyrieleis, H. 1975. *Bildnisse der Ptolemäer*. Berlin.
- Kwapisz, J. 2013. *The Greek Figure Poems*. Leuven.
- . 2014. 'Kraters, Myrtle and Hellenistic Poetry.' In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (2014), 195-215.
- Lacey, W. K. 1966. 'Homeric ΕΔΝΑ and Penelope's ΚΥΠΙΟΣ.' *JHS* 86: 55-68.
- Lang, P. 2009. 'Goats and the Sacred Disease in Callimachus' *Acontius and Cydippe*.' *CP* 104: 85-90.
- Laronde, A. 1987. *Cyrène et la Libye hellénistique: Libykai historiai de l'époque républicaine au principat d'Auguste*. Paris.
- Lausberg, M. 1982. *Das Einzeldistichon: Studien zum antiken Epigramm*. München.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. 1981. *The Lives of the Greek Poets*. London.

- Legrand, P.-E. 1901. 'Problèmes alexandrins I: Pourquoi furent composés les hymnes de Callimaque.' *REA* 3: 281-312.
- Lewis, N. 1963. 'The Non-Scholar Members of the Alexandrian Museum.' *Mnemosyne* 16: 257-61.
- Le Rider, G. and de Callataÿ, F. 2006. *Les Séleucides et les Ptolémées: L'héritage monétaire et financier d'Alexandre le Grand*. Monaco.
- Lianou, M. 2010. 'The Role of the Argeadai in the Legitimation of the Ptolemaic Dynasty: Rhetoric and Practice.' In E. D. Carney and D. Ogden, eds. *Philip II and Alexander the Great: Father and Son, Lives and Afterlives*, 123-33. Oxford.
- Llewellyn-Jones, L. 2003. *Aphrodite's Tortoise: The Veiled Woman of Ancient Greece*. Swansea.
- . 2013. *King and Court in Ancient Persia 559 to 331 BCE*. Edinburgh.
- Llewellyn-Jones, L. and Winder, S. 2011. 'A Key to Berenike's Lock? The Hathoric Model of Queenship in Early Ptolemaic Egypt.' In A. Erskine and L. Llewellyn-Jones, eds. *Creating a Hellenistic World*, 247-69. Swansea.
- Lobel, E., ed. 1952. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Volume 20. London.
- Luck, G. 1967. 'Witz und Sentiment im griechischen Epigramm.' In B. Gentili et al., eds. *L'épigramme grecque*, 387-411. Geneva.
- Lynn, J. K. 1995. 'Narrators and Narrative in Callimachus.' Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia.
- Mair, A. W. and Mair, G. R. 1921. *Callimachus and Lycophron. Aratus*. London.
- Manning, J. G. 2010. *The Last Pharaohs: Egypt Under the Ptolemies, 305-30 BC*. Princeton.
- Marinone, N. 1982. 'I profumi di Berenice da Callimaco a Catullo.' *Prom.* 8: 1-20.
- . 1984. *Berenice da Callimaco a Catullo*. Rome.

- . 1990. 'Berenice e le fanciulle di Lesbo.' *Paideia* 45: 293-9.
- Marshall, C. and van Willigenburg, S. 2004. 'Judging Athenian Dramatic Competitions.' *JHS* 124: 90-107.
- Massimila, G., ed. 2010. *Aetia: Libro terzo e quarto. Callimaco*. Pisa-Rome.
- Mauss, M. 1967. *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Trans. I. Cunnison. New York (originally published 1925).
- McCarter, S. A. 2012. 'The Forging of a God: Venus, the Shield of Aeneas, and Callimachus's "Hymn to Artemis."' *TAPA* 142: 355-81.
- McKay, K. J. 1962a. *The Poet at Play: Kallimachos, The Bath of Pallas*. Leiden.
- . 1962b. *Erysichthon: A Callimachean Comedy*. Leiden.
- . 1967. 'Door Magic and the Epiphany Hymn.' *CQ* 17: 184-94.
- McKechie, P. 2018. 'The Greek Wars: The Fight for Egypt.' In McKechie and Cromwell (2018), 27-45.
- McKechie, P. and Cromwell, J. A., eds. 2018. *Ptolemy I and the Transformation of Egypt, 404-282 BCE*. Leiden-Boston.
- McLennan, G. R., ed. 1977. *Callimachus: Hymn to Zeus. Introduction and Commentary*. Rome.
- Mehl, A. 2003. 'Gedanken zur "herrschenden Gesellschaft" und zu den Untertanen im Seleukidenreich.' *Historia* 52: 147-60.
- Meillier, C. 1979. *Callimaque et son temps*. Lille.
- Meineke, A. 1839. *Fragmenta comicorum graecorum: Volumen I. Historiam criticam comicorum graecorum continens*. Berlin.
- Meißner, B. 2000. 'Hofmann und Herrscher: Was es für die Griechen hieß, Freund eines Königs zu sein.' *AKG* 82: 1-36.

- Meritt, B. D. and Traill, J. S. 1974. *The Athenian Agora: Volume XV. Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors*. Princeton.
- Meyer, D. 1993. “‘Nichts Unbezeugtes singe ich’”: Die fictive Darstellung der Wissenschaftstradierung bei Kallimachos.’ In W. Kullman and J. Althoff, eds. *Vermittlung und Tradierung von Wissen in der griechischen Kultur*, 317-36. Tübingen.
- . 2005. *Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen: Das inschriftliche Epigramm und seine Rezeption bei Kallimachos*. Stuttgart.
- Miller, M. 1953. ‘Greek Kinship Terminology.’ *JHS* 73: 46-52.
- Mineur, W. H., ed. 1984. *Callimachus: Hymn to Delos. Introduction and Commentary*. Leiden.
- Mitchell, L. G. 1997. *Greeks Bearing Gifts: The Public Use of Private Relationships in the Greek World, 435–323 BC*. Cambridge.
- Montanari, F. and Lehnus, L., eds. 2002. *Callimaque: Septs exposés suivis de discussions*. (*Entretiens sur l’Antiquité Classique* 48). Vandoeuvres-Geneva.
- Moore, M. B. 2004. ‘Horse Care as Depicted on Greek Vases Before 400 B.C.’ *MMJ* 39: 35-67.
- Mooren, L. 1975. *The Aulic Titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt: Introduction and Prosopography*. Brussels.
- Mørkholm, O. 1991. *Early Hellenistic Coinage: From the Accession of Alexander to the Peace of Apamea (336-188 B.C.)*. Eds. P. Grierson and U. Westermark. Cambridge.
- Morris, I. 1986. ‘The Use and Abuse of Homer.’ *CA* 5: 81-138.
- Morrison, A. D. 2005. ‘Sexual Ambiguity and the Identity of the Narrator in Callimachus’ *Hymn to Athena*.’ *BICS* 48: 27-46.
- . 2011. ‘Callimachus’ Muses.’ In Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus, and Stephens (2011), 329-48.
- Mueller, K. 2006. *Settlements of the Ptolemies: City Foundations and New Settlement in the*

- Hellenistic World*. Leuven.
- Müller, C. W. 1987. *Erysichthon: Der Mythos als narrative Metapher im Demeterhymnos des Kallimachos*. Mainz.
- Müller, S. 2009. *Das hellenistische Königspaar in der medialen Repräsentation: Ptolemaios II. und Arsinoe II*. Berlin.
- Murray, J. 2004. 'The Metamorphoses of Erysichthon: Callimachus, Apollonius, and Ovid.' In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (2004), 207-41.
- . 2012. 'Burned After Reading: The So-Called List of the Alexandrian Librarians in *P.Oxy. X 1241*.' *Aitia* 2. <<https://journals.openedition.org/aitia/544>>
- Murray, O. 1996. 'Hellenistic Royal Symposia.' In P. Bilde et al., eds. *Aspects of Hellenistic Kingship*, 15-27. Aarhus.
- . 2008. 'Ptolemaic Royal Patronage.' In P. McKechnie and P. Guillaume, eds. *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World*, 7-24. Leiden-Boston.
- Nadig, P. 2007. *Zwischen König und Karikatur: Das Bild Ptolemaios' VIII. im Spannungsfeld der Überlieferung*. Munich.
- Nawotka, K. 2017. *The Alexander Romance by Ps.-Callisthenes: A Historical Commentary*. Leiden-Boston.
- Nelson, T. J. forthcoming a. 'Early Hellenistic Epic.' In M. Perale et al., eds. *Hellenistic Poetry Before Callimachus*. Cambridge.
- . forthcoming b. 'The Coma Stratonices: Hair Encomia, Queenly Power, and Ptolemaic-Seleucid Rivalry.' In J. J. H. Klooster et al, eds. *Women and Power in Hellenistic Poetry (Hellenistica Groningana)*.
- Nicholson, N. 2000. 'Pederastic Poets and Adult Patrons in Late Archaic Lyric.' *CW* 93: 235-

- Nisetich, F. 2005. 'The Pleasures of Epigram: "New and "Old" Posidippus.' *IJCT* 12: 245-68.
- Nishimura-Jensen, J. M. 2000. 'Unstable Geographies: The Moving Landscape in Apollonius' *Argonautica* and Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos*.' *TAPA* 130: 287-317.
- Nock, A. D. 1930. 'ΣΥΝΝΑΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ.' *HSCP* 41: 1-62.
- Oakley, J. H. and Sinos, R. H. 1993. *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*. Madison.
- Oliver, G. J. 2002. 'Callimachus the Poet and Benefactor of the Athenians.' *ZPE* 140: 6-8.
- Olson, S. D., ed. 2006. *Athenaeus: The Learned Banqueters. Books III.106e-V*. Cambridge, MA.
- van Oppen de Ruiter, B. F. 2013. 'Lagus and Arsinoe: An Exploration of Legendary Royal Bastardy.' *Historia* 62: 80-107.
- . 2015. *Berenice II Euergetis: Essays in Early Hellenistic Queenship*. New York.
- Osborne, M. J. 1981. 'Entertainment in the Prytaneion in Athens.' *ZPE* 41: 153-70.
- Page, D. L., ed. 1981. *Further Greek Epigrams: Epigrams Before AD 50 from the Greek Anthology and Other Sources, Not Included in 'Hellenistic Epigrams' or 'The Garland of Philip*.' Cambridge.
- Pardini, A. 1991. 'Aconzio non era πολύκροτος.' *SIFC* 3.9: 57-70.
- Parker, R. 1998. 'Pleasing Thighs: Reciprocity in Greek Religion.' In Gill, Postlethwaite, and Seaford (1998), 105-25.
- Parry, J. and Bloch, M. 1989. 'Introduction: Money and the Morality of Exchange.' In J. Parry and M. Bloch, eds. *Money and the Morality of Exchange*, 1-32. Cambridge.
- Parsons, P. J. 1977. 'Callimachus: Victoria Berenices.' *ZPE* 25: 1-51.
- . 2011. 'Callimachus and his *Koinai*.' In Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus, and Stephens (2011), 134-52.



- Paschidis, P. 2008. *Between City and King: Prosopographical Studies on the Intermediaries Between the Cities of the Greek Mainland and the Aegean and the Royal Courts in the Hellenistic Period (322–190 BC)*. Athens.
- Perpillou-Thomas, F. 1993. *Fêtes d'Égypte ptolémaïque et romaine d'après la documentation papyrologique grecque*. Leuven.
- Perysinakis, I. N. 1991. 'Penelope's ΕΕΔΝΑ Again.' *CQ* 41: 297-302.
- Petrovic, I. 2007. *Von den Toren des Hades zu den Hallen des Olymp: Artemiskult bei Theokrit und Kallimachos*. Leiden-Boston.
- . 2011. 'Callimachus and Contemporary Religion.' In Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus, and Stephens (2011), 264-87.
- . 2012. 'Rhapsodic Hymns and Epyllia.' In Baumbach and Bär (2012), 149-176.
- . 2015. 'Deification—Gods or Men?' In Eidinow and Kindt (2015), 429-43.
- . 2016. 'Gods in Callimachus' *Hymns*.' In J. J. Clauss, M. Cuypers, and A. Kahane, eds. *The Gods of Greek Hexameter Poetry: From the Archaic Age to Late Antiquity and Beyond*, 164-79. Stuttgart.
- . 2017. 'Callimachus, Theocritus and Ptolemaic Court Etiquette.' In Erskine, Llewellyn-Jones, and Wallace (2017), 143-63.
- . 2019. 'Poetry for the New Goddess: A Gift That Keeps On Giving.' In Klooster et al. (2019), 285-304.
- Petrovic, I. and Petrovic, A. 2003. 'Stop and Smell the Statues: Callimachus' Epigram 51Pf. Reconsidered (Four Times).' *MD* 51: 179-208.
- Petsas, P. M. 1978. *Pella, Alexander the Great's Capital*. Thessaloniki.
- Pfeiffer, R., ed. 1949. *Callimachus: Volumen I. Fragmenta*. Oxford.

- , ed. 1952. *Callimachus: Volumen 2. Hymni et Epigrammata*. Oxford.
- . 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship. From the Beginning to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford.
- Pfeiffer, S. 2008. *Herrscher- und Dynastiekulte im Ptolemäerreich: Systematik und Einordnung der Kultformen*. Munich.
- . 2016. 'The Ptolemies: Hellenistic Kingship in Egypt.' *Oxford Handbooks Online*. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935390.013.23
- Plantinga, M. 2004. 'A Parade of Learning: Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis* (Lines 170-268).' In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (2004), 257-77.
- Platt, V. S. 2011. *Facing the Gods: Epiphany and Representation in Graeco-Roman Art, Literature and Religion*. Cambridge.
- . 2015. 'Epiphanies.' In Eidinow and Kindt (2015), 491-504.
- Polanyi, K. 1968. *Primitive, Archaic, and Modern Economies: Essays of Karl Polanyi*. Ed. G. Dalton. New York.
- Pomeroy, S. B. 1984. *Women in Hellenistic Egypt: From Alexander to Cleopatra*. New York.
- Préaux, C. 1978. *Le monde hellénistique: La Grèce et l'Orient (323-146 avant J.-C.)*. 2 vols. Paris.
- Pretagostini, R., ed. 1993. *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica, Scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili*. 3rd vol. Rome.
- Prioux, E. 2009. 'Fards et cosmétiques dans les sources littéraires antiques.' In *Le bain et le miroir: Soins de beauté et cosmétiques de l'Antiquité à la Renaissance*, 35-40. Paris.
- . 2011. 'Callimachus' Queens.' In Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus, and Stephens (2011), 201-24.
- Prioux, E. and Trinquier, J. 2015. 'L'autruche d'Arsinoé et le lion de Bérénice: Des usages de la

- faune dans la representation des premières reines lagides.’ In P. Linant de Bellefonds et al., eds. *D’Alexandre à Auguste: Dynamiques de la création dans les arts visuels et la poésie*, 31-56. Rennes.
- Puelma, M. 1984. ‘Die *Aitien* des Kallimachos als Vorbild der römischen Amores-Elegie 1 & 2.’ *MH* 39: 221-46, 285-304.
- Pulley, S. 1997. *Prayer in Greek Religion*. Oxford.
- Putnam, M. C. J. 1960. ‘Catullus 66.75-88.’ *CP* 55: 223-8.
- Race, W. H. 1982. ‘Aspects of Rhetoric and Form in Greek Hymns.’ *GRBS* 23: 5-14.
- Ranum, O. 1984. review of Elias (1983). *Theory and Society* 13: 880-2.
- Rautenbach, S. 1984. ‘Cyclopes: I.’ *AClass* 27: 41-55.
- Reden, S. von. 1995. *Exchange in Ancient Greece*. London.
- . 2007. *Money in Ptolemaic Egypt: From the Macedonian Conquest to the End of the Third Century BC*. Cambridge.
- Redon, B. 2018. ‘La prise en main du désert Oriental par les Lagides: Nouvelles données archéologiques.’ In J.-P. Brun et al., eds. *Le désert oriental d’Égypte durant la période gréco-romaine: bilans archéologiques*. Paris. <[http:// books.openedition.org/cdf/5142](http://books.openedition.org/cdf/5142)>
- Reinsch-Werner, H. 1976. *Callimachus Hesiodicus: Die Rezeption der hesiodischen Dichtung durch Kallimachos von Kyrene*. Berlin.
- Reitzenstein, R. 1893. *Epigramm und Skolion: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der alexandrinischen Dichtung*. Giessen.
- Renburg, G. H. 2017. *Where Dreams May Come: Incubation Sanctuaries in the Greco-Roman World*. 2 vols. Leiden.
- Rengakos, A. 1993. *Der Homertext und die hellenistischen Dichter*. Stuttgart.

- Rhodes, P. J., ed. 1993. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford.
- Rice, E. E. 1983. *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphos*. Oxford.
- Richardson, N. J., ed. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford.
- Richter, O. 1871. *Kallimachos' Hymnen auf Zeus und Apollo: Zwei Momenten im Leben des Ptolemaeus Philadelphus*. Guben.
- Richter, G. M. A. 1966. *The Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans, and Romans*. Oxford.
- Robert, J. and Robert, L. 1955. 'Bulletin épigraphique.' *REG* 68: 185-298.
- Rodríguez-Salgado, M. J. 1991. 'The Court of Philip II of Spain.' In R. G. Asch and A. M. Birke, eds. *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, c. 1450-1650*, 206-44. London-Oxford.
- Roisman, J. 1984. 'Ptolemy and His Rivals in His History of Alexander the Great.' *CQ* 34: 373-85.
- Rosenmeyer, P. A. 1996. 'Love Letters in Callimachus, Ovid and Aristaenetus or the Sad Fate of a Mailorder Bride.' *MD* 36: 9-31.
- . 2001. *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: The Letter in Greek Literature*. Cambridge.
- Rostovtzeff, M. 1941. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. 3 vols. Oxford.
- Rutherford, I. 2001. *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*. Oxford.
- . 2009. 'Aristodama and the Aetolians: An Itinerant Poetess and her Agenda.' In R. Hunter and I. Rutherford, eds. *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism*, 237-48. Cambridge.
- Rynearson, N. 2009. 'A Callimachean Case of Lovesickness: Magic, Disease, and Desire in *Aetia* Fr. 67-75 Pf.' *AJP* 130: 341-65.

- Sahlins, M. 1972. *Stone Age Economics*. London.
- Savalli-Lestrade, I. 1998. *Les philoi royaux dans l'Asie hellénistique*. Geneva.
- . 2017. 'ΒΙΟΣ ΑΥΛΙΚΟΣ: The Multiple Ways of Life of Courtiers in the Hellenistic Age.' In Erskine, Llewellyn-Jones, and Wallace (2017), 101-20.
- Schmidt, W., ed. 1899. *Heronis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt omnia*. Leipzig.
- Schmiel, R. C. 'Callimachus' Hymn to Delos: Structure and Theme.' *Mnemosyne* 40: 45-55.
- Schmitz, T. A. 2012. 'Herakles in Bits and Pieces: *Id. 25* in the *Corpus Theocriteum*.' In Baumbach and Bär (2012), 259-82.
- Schultheß, O. 1927. 'Σίτησις.' *RE* 2nd ser. 3.1.388-91.
- Schwinge, E.-R. 1986. *Künstlichkeit von Kunst (Zetemata 84)*. Munich.
- Seiler, M. A. 1997. Ποίησις Ποιήσεως: *Alexandrinische Dichtung κατὰ λεπτὸν in strukturaler und humanethologischer Deutung: Kall. fr. 254-268 C SH; Theokr. 1, 32-54; Theokr. 7; Theokr. 11; ,Theokr. ' 25*. Stuttgart-Leipzig.
- Selden, D. L. 1998. 'Alibis.' *ClAnt* 17: 289-412.
- Sell, H. 1964. 'Kallimachos fr. 67, 20 f.' *RhM* 107: 370-1.
- Sens, A. 2015. 'Hedylus (4 and 5 Gow-Page) and Callimachean Aesthetics.' *Mnemosyne* 68: 40-52.
- Sherwin-White, S. and Kuhrt, A. 1993. *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*. Berkeley.
- Slings, S. R. 2004. 'The *Hymn to Delos* as a Partial Allegory of Callimachus' Poetry.' In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (2004), 279-98.
- Sluiter, I. 2017. 'Anchoring Innovation: A Classical Research Agenda.' *European Review* 25: 20-38.

- Snodgrass, A. M. 1974. 'An Historical Homeric Society?' *JHS* 74: 114-25.
- Sommerstein, A. H., ed. 1981. *The Comedies of Aristophanes: Vol 2. Knights*. London.
- Spanoudakis, K., ed. 2002. *Philitas of Cos*. Leiden.
- Staden, H. von. 1989. *Herophilus: The Art of Medicine in Early Alexandria. Edition, Translation, and Essays*. Cambridge.
- Starkey, D. 1987. 'Court History in Perspective.' In D. Starkey, ed. *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, 1-24. London.
- Stephens, S. 2003. *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Berkeley.
- . 2004. 'For You, Arsinoe...' In Acosta-Hughes, Kosmetatou, and Baumbach (2004), 161-76.
- . 2005. 'Battle of the Books.' In Gutzwiller (2005), 229-48.
- . 2010. 'Ptolemaic Alexandria.' In Clauss and Cuypers (2010), 46-61.
- . 2011. 'Introduction.' In Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus, and Stephens (2011), 1-19.
- , ed. 2015. *Callimachus: Hymns*. Oxford.
- Strauss Clay, J. 1989. *The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns*. Princeton.
- Strootman, R. 2007. 'The Hellenistic Royal Court: Court Culture, Ceremonial and Ideology in Greece, Egypt and the Near East, 336-30 BCE.' PhD dissertation, Utrecht.
- . 2010. 'Literature and the Kings.' In Clauss and Cuypers (2010), 30-45.
- . 2014. *Courts and Elites in the Hellenistic Empires: The Near East After the Achaemenids, c. 300 to 30 BCE*. Edinburgh.
- . 2017. *The Birdcage of the Muses: Patronage of the Arts and Sciences at the Ptolemaic Imperial Court, 205-222 BCE*. Leuven.

- . 2018. 'The Return of the King: Civic Feasting and the Entanglement of City and Empire in Hellenistic Greece.' In van den Eijnde, Blok, and Strootman (2018), 273-96.
- Svoronos, J. 1904. *Ta Nomismata tou Kratous ton Ptolemaion*. Athens.
- Syndikus, H. P. 1984. *Catull: Ein Interpretation*. 3 vols. Darmstadt.
- Thompson, D. J. 1988. *Memphis Under the Ptolemies*. Princeton.
- . 2005. 'Posidippus, Poet of the Ptolemies.' In Gutzwiller (2005), 269-83.
- . 2018. 'Ptolemy I in Egypt: Continuity and Change.' In McKechnie and Cromwell (2018), 6-26.
- Tissol, G. 1992. 'An Allusion to Callimachus' *Aetia* 3 in Vergil's *Aeneid* 11.' *HSCP* 94: 263-8.
- Tondriau, J. L. 1946. 'Les thiasés dionysiaques royaux de la cour ptolémaïque.' *Chronique d'Égypte* 41: 149-71.
- Traill, D. A. 2008. 'Callimachus' Singing Sea (*Hymn* 2.106).' *CP* 93: 215-22.
- Treggiari, S. 1991. *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges From the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian*. Oxford.
- Tripodi, B. 1998. *Cacce reali macedoni: Tra Alessandro I e Filippo V*. Messina.
- Trypanis, C. A. 1958. *Callimachus, Aetia, Iambi, Lyric Poems, Hecale, Minor Epic and Elegiac Poems, Fragments of Epigrams, Fragments of Uncertain Location*. London.
- Ukleja, K. 2005. *Der Delos-Hymnos des Kallimachos innerhalb seines Hymnensextetts*. Münster.
- Vamvouri Ruffy, M. 2004. *La fabrique du divin: Les Hymnes de Callimaque à la lumière des Hymnes homériques et des Hymnes épigraphiques*. Liège.
- Vestheim, G. 2000. 'Meaning and Structure in Callimachus' Hymns to Artemis and Delos.' *SO* 75: 62-79.

- Visser, E. 1938. *Götter und Kulte im Ptolemäischen Alexandrien*. Amsterdam.
- Vollkommer, R. 1988. 'Die früheste Darstellung der Omphale?' *Annales d'histoire de l'art et d'archéologie* 10: 27-37.
- Vössing, K. 2004. *Mensa regia: Das Bankett beim hellenistischen König und beim römischen Kaiser*. Leipzig.
- Weber, G. 1992. 'Poesie und Poeten an den Höfen vorhellenistischer Monarchen: συνῆσαν δὲ ἄρα καὶ τότε βασιλεῦσι ποιηταί (Paus. 1, 2, 3).' *Klio* 74: 25-77.
- . 1993. *Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft: Die Rezeption von Zeitgeschichte am Hof der ersten drei Ptolemäern*. Stuttgart.
- . 1997. 'Interaktion, Repräsentation und Herrschaft: Der Königshof im Hellenismus.' In A. Winterling, ed. *Zwischen 'Haus' und 'Staat': Antike Höfe im Vergleich*, 27-71. Munich.
- . 2011. 'Poet and Court.' In Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus, and Stephens (2011), 224-44.
- Wecowski, M. 2014. *The Rise of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet*. Oxford.
- van Wees, H. 1998. 'The Law of Gratitude: Reciprocity in Anthropological Theory.' In Gill, Postlethwaite, and Seaford (1998), 13-49.
- Wessels, A. and Stähli, A. 2015. 'Anathematika.' In B. Seidensticker, A. Stähli, and A. Wessels, eds. *Der Neue Poseidipp: Text – Übersetzung – Kommentar. Griechisch und deutsch*, 155-82. Berlin.
- West, S. 1985. 'Venus Observed? A Note on Callimachus, Fr. 110.' *CQ* 35: 61-6.
- Wikander, C. 2002. 'Dynasty: The Environment of Hellenistic Monarchs.' In K. Ascani et al, eds. *Studies Presented to J. E. Skydsgaard*, 185-91. Rome.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von. 1924. *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*. 2 vols. Berlin.



———. 1925. *Reden und Vorträge*. Berlin.

Wilhelm, A. 1929. 'Zu griechischen Ehrenbeschlüssen und Briefen.' *JöAI* 24: 162-97.

Wilken, U. 1922. *Urkunder der Ptolemäerzeit*. 2 vols. Berlin-Leipzig.

Williams, F., ed. 1978. *Callimachus: Hymn to Apollo. A Commentary*. Oxford.

Wilson, P. 2010. 'The Man and the Music (and the Choregos?).' In O. Taplin and R. Wyles, eds.  
*The Pronomos Vase and its Context*, 181-212. Oxford.

Worthington, I. 2016. *Ptolemy I: King and Pharaoh of Egypt*. Oxford.

Zanker, G. 1987. *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry? A Literature and its Audience*. Beckenham-  
Kent.

Ziegler, K. 1937. 'Kallimachos und die Frauen.' *Antike* 13: 20-42.