THE INITIATION OF CULT FOR ROYAL MACEDONIAN WOMEN

ELIZABETH CARNEY

DESPITE THE FACT THAT PRIVATE, civic, and dynastic cults began by the late fourth century to be directed at women associated with royal men, cults of royal women earlier than those of Arsinoe Philadelphus in the 270s have been either ignored or mentioned only in passing. Comparatively little analysis of the reasons for the existence of female cult has been attempted.[1] In order to remedy this omission, I shall focus in this paper on the origin, motivation, and function of cult for women in the fourth and very early third centuries B.C.E. This, then, is a paper about the recognition of the power of various individual women.

Although my discussion has obvious relevance to the understanding of cults devoted to royal women later in the Hellenistic period, my task in this paper is limited to tracing the early development of cult of women at the end of the Argead dynasty and in the period of the Diadochi, linking it to what is known about early Ptolemaic cult of royal women, and considering the reasons for the initiation of female cult.[2] In pursuing this task, I have, on the whole, made certain assumptions about the general nature of ruler cult in the Hellenic world, assumptions based on the work of earlier scholars.

This manuscript is a revised version (reflecting very recent scholarship) of a section of my monograph *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia,* published in 2000 by the University of Oklahoma Press. My thanks to Bob Milns, Suzanne Dixon, Marleen Flory, and Kathryn Gutzwiller for their comments on earlier oral versions of this article, and to Peter Green and the anonymous reader for *Classical Philology.*

1. There are superficial discussions by Cerfaux and Tondriau 1957, 194–201; Tondriau 1948a, 12–33, 1948b, 1–15, 1948c, 1–15; 1956, 15–22. Pomeroy 1984, 28–40 is much more useful, but her focus is on the Ptolemies and so earlier precedents are not generally discussed. Now, however, see Mirón Pérez 1998a and 1998b. After this article was accepted for publication, Dr. D. M. Mirón Pérez kindly sent me copies of her articles, and I have tried to incorporate her arguments into this discussion. Our findings are quite similar in some respects, but, whereas I see connections between assimilations of royal wives and courtesans and the development of city and dynastic cult, she tends to disassociate them and to emphasize the role of earlier myth in the ideology of cult.

2. There are no current studies of the role of women in the monarchies of any of the three major Hellenistic dynasties, with the exception of Carney 2000. Macurdy 1932, which covers women in all three dynasties, is excellent, but biographical in its focus and now dated. See also Vatin 1970, 57–114 and the brief, general, but recent discussion of Savalli-Lestrade 1994, 415–32. Certainly there are no general studies of the cults of royal women in these dynasties, but for Egypt, see Pomeroy 1984. One could take Robert 1966, 192–210 as a kind of paradigm, based on the Lagid example of Arsinoe Philadelphus, of one kind of cult for royal women.

Classical Philology 95 (2000): 21–43

Let me briefly sketch my views on this subject. The Greeks did not always draw a firm line between the human and the divine, although they usually understood them as distinct categories.[3] After all, ruler cult was unlikely to develop in a culture that did see the human and divine as entirely separate. It was a Homeric commonplace to term a warrior ἰσόθεος (equal to the gods, godlike). Similarly, women like Briseis or Cassandra might be said to be ἰκέλη (like, resembling) golden Aphrodite (*Il.* 19.282, 24.699).[4] The myth of Heracles, a mortal made immortal, demonstrated that a mortal might raise him or herself to divinity by means of unusual achievement. Whereas Heracles was the exceptional human hero who became a god, female mortals, heroines, much more frequently achieved divine status.[5] Literature nagged Greeks to remember the distinction between human and divine (e.g., Pind. *Isthm.* 5.14). They needed reminding: the gods were like people, except that they had more power, much more power.

Central to Greek cult was the recognition of the reality of this power. As Price has argued, ruler cults were about the recognition of the power, often the beneficial or protective power, of a human being over an individual or a city.[6] They provided a way to integrate this power into existing institutions, a way to express the relationship between rulers and cities or individuals, and to control or modulate it.[7] The first cult for a human being established during that person's lifetime came during the career of Lysander.[8] Philip II flirted with divine cult and suggested his parity to the

3. Contra Price 1984a, 79–95, 1984b, xi, 7–38, whose views are currently more dominant. See also Burkert 1985, 205 ("The wall which separates them is impermeable. . . ."). Among scholars of Macedonian history, Badian has most adamantly insisted that a strong line was drawn between people and gods (see, most recently, Badian 1996, 14–15). Many scholars continue, however, to understand Greek religious views, even early on, as distinguishing between human and divine but not insisting on an impenetrable boundary between the two categories. Lane Fox 1974, 439 describes it as an "open frontier"; Vermeule 1979, 126–27, following Nock 1944, 141–73, points out that the supposedly impassable barrier was, during the Archaic period, frequently crossed by those achieving or losing divine status. See also Lyons 1997, 5–6. Among Macedonian historians, Fredricksmeyer 1979 (see n. 9 below) takes a similar view. It seems clear that many Greeks, over centuries, saw distinctions in status and recognized these distinctions in cult practice, but it is much less clear that these status distinctions were immutable.

4. Loraux 1992, 20 insists that to compare young women to goddesses is "to characterize them as quintessentially beautiful." She observes, citing *Il.* 14.153–87, when Hera prepares to seduce Zeus, that "beauty is essentially a manifestation of power." Her remarks would, therefore, imply that such comparisons are a recognition of power.

5. See discussion and reference in Lyons 1997, 5–6.

6. Mirón Pérez 1998b, 229–30 discusses a fascinating example of this phenomenon at work. Eurydice, daughter of Antipater and wife of Ptolemy I, long gone from her Macedonian homeland, returned when her son Ptolemy Ceraunus briefly ruled Macedonia (c. 281–79) and was given control of Cassandrea. The people of Cassandrea, a city founded by Eurydice's brother Cassander, initiated (under the influence of a certain Apollodorus) the Eurydicea, a festival in honor of Eurydice because she had somehow restored the freedom of the city (Polyaenus *Strat.* 6.7.2). The festival, if historical, does not demonstrate the existence of a cult for Eurydice, but, as Mirón Pérez acutely observes, later city cults were often motivated by appreciation for similar benefactions. In the death throes of the Argead dynasty, when royal women were in greater supply than royal men, women often symbolized legitimacy and dynastic continuity; after the demise of the Argead dynasty, and particularly in the chaotic virtual interregnum between the sudden end of the Antipatrid dynasty and the reestablishment of the Antigonids in Macedonia, Eurydice, the daughter of the long-dead Antipater and sister of Cassander, must have seemed to the citizens of Cassandrea a symbol of the authority of old order, and yet a representative of the new, her son.

7. Price 1984b, 27–30.

8. Contra Badian 1981, 27–71; see Flower 1988, 124–34.

Olympians, but it is not certain that he received cult in his lifetime.[9] His son Alexander went further: first he asserted divine sonship instead of mere divine ancestry, and finally, in the last years of his life, cults began to be dedicated to him. After Alexander, cults instituted by Greek cities to the Successors developed. Later, dynastic cults administered by the kings themselves became commonplace, although not in Macedonia proper.

Of course, the development of ruler cult is usually described in stages, as I have just done. The difficulty with such descriptions is that they imply the existence of clear distinctions between various points along a linear path. Such distinctions are convenient, but artificial. They are particularly unsuited to visual images, yet images are, I shall argue, critical to the development of cult. Assumptions about the motivation of image makers have little evidentiary basis. We have not come to terms with the essential ambiguity of physical images and recognized that their power derives from their ambiguity. Linear categorization should be used cautiously when considering the ways in which Greek peoples connected human and divine nature.

In contrast to the comparative dearth of work that has been done on female cult, a great abundance of work has been done on male ruler cult. The quantity of scholarship on the deification of male rulers in the Graeco-Roman world[10] derives from the recognition that ruler cult was a critical Graeco-Roman institution, but it also testifies to our near inability to comprehend this institution. Our understanding of ruler cult will always be limited. The single god of the desert and the religions that worship him stand between us and those who put up altars and gave sacrifices and festivals in the name of Antigonus or dedicated votives to Arsinoe Aphrodite. It matters little whether an individual still believes in these religions. They continue to define even unbelief. Not one of us would think that a self-proclaimed atheist or agnostic was expressing contempt for the gifts of golden Aphrodite or the truth of Apollo's oracles.

Our understanding of the nature of religious experience itself is so shaped by the nature of Judaeo-Christian experience that we have had great difficulty recognizing as at all religious any belief or practice that departs very far from our Judaeo-Christian norm. Defining a religion in terms of personal belief is an idea that we have imposed on a culture to which it is alien. Because of this imposition, ruler cult has not been understood as religion at all, but politics, even though this distinction is ours and not that of antiquity.[11] Recent disdain for ritual tends to make us ignore its power.

The difficulties I have noted are compounded when one looks at cult for women. Female cult developed in the same period in which male ruler

9. See Borza 1990, 249–50 for a succinct discussion of the problem. In recent years, Fredricksmeyer 1979 has been the main proponent of the idea that Philip planned for divine honors and even dynastic cult, and Badian 1981 has argued that no good evidence demonstrates lifetime cult for Philip and that even cults for Alexander were established only late in his reign (see Borza 1990, 249–50 and Badian 1996 for discussion and references). As Borza 1990, 250 observes, whatever the date of various cults, Philip and Alexander were clearly changing the nature of Macedonian monarchy in a manner that involved association with divinity.

10. The major general works: Habicht 1970; Cerfaux and Tondriau 1957; Taeger 1957.

11. Price 1984a, 79–95, 1984b, xi, 7–38.

cult did and in similar, although not identical, fashion.[12] Indeed, the same monument, the Philippeum, is critical to understanding both.[13] Pausanias (5.20.9–10) recounts that at Olympia, within the sacred area of the Altis (which was apparently extended to include it[14]), was a round building called the Philippeum, constructed by Philip[15] after his defeat of the Greeks at Chaeronea in 338. Inside, in Pausanias' day, in the second century C.E., were three statues of ivory and gold (chryselephantine) of Philip II, Alexander the Great, and Philip's father, Amyntas. Pausanias notes (Paus. 5.17.4) that two other chryselephantine statues, of Olympias and of Philip's mother, Eurydice,[16] once also stood there, but had been transferred to the nearby Heraeum by the time Pausanias visited the site. It would be interesting to know when and why the two female statues were moved. The action seems to suggest that their presence, unlike that of the male statues, was deemed somehow inappropriate by someone, at some subsequent period.[17]

The statues stood on an elaborately carved, semicircular base that faced the door and was centered on it. Since the women's statues were no longer on the base, Pausanias is unlikely to have known what their placement had been. He described them last because they were no longer in the building. Philip's image may have been in the middle, opposite the door, the images of his father and son on either side of him, and the female statues may have stood at each end.[18] All previous chryselephantine statues were cult images.

12. Contra Hammond 1994, 184, who suggested that Eurydice, mother of Philip II, received posthumous cult. His evidence is not convincing—a splendid tomb that may not be hers (see Borza 1990, 308–9), and his own theory that the female statue found near two of the statue bases at Vergina that Eurydice dedicated to Eucleia was actually one of Eurydice herself.

13. The following section significantly expands on points I made more briefly in Carney 1995, 380–81. See also Mirón Pérez 1998b, 223–24, who does not refer to my earlier discussion of the Philippeum, but reaches somewhat similar conclusions. For recent general discussion of and reference to the Philippeum, see Miller 1973, 189–218; Fredricksmeyer 1979, 52–56; Badian 1981, 71. See also Gardner 1925, 128–36; Wiesner 1939, 105–7; Zschietzschmann 1944, 24–52; Drees 1968, 121–23; Mallwitz 1972, 128–33.

14. Gardner 1925, 136.

15. Pausanias 5.20.10 has usually been understood to mean that the building was constructed *by* Philip, but Badian 1981, 71 is not certain. If the building had been built for rather than by Philip, one would expect Pausanias to name the donor. Wikander 1996, 186, who briefly refers to the significance of the inclusion of women in the Philippeum, dates the building rather late in Alexander's reign (c. 326) and, wrongly I believe, seems to attribute its dynastic ideology to Alexander rather than to Philip.

16. Pausanias 5.17. 4 refers to her as the daughter or wife of Arrhidaeus, whereas Philip's mother was the daughter of Sirras and the wife of Amyntas. (Paus. 5.20.10 simply calls her Eurydice.) It is usually assumed that this was simply a textual error.

17. See Drees 1968, 113. Gardner 1925, 213 suggests a late date. Mirón Pérez 1998b, 223 speculates that the move could have been intended as an honor, meant to associate the female statues with Hera and with the statues of gods and heroes that had been placed in her temple, but considers the possibility that the move was intended both to destroy the dynastic image Philip had created and to disconnect the women of the royal family from political power. I find the latter suggestion more plausible; if it is correct, then the statues may have been moved in the late fourth or early third century, when Olympias had many surviving enemies and when many Greeks and Macedonians may have wanted to de-emphasize Argead dynastic claims.

18. Mirón Pérez 1998b, 218–19 imagines a similar placement. Zschietzschmann 1944, 52 suggests that Alexander may have stood in the middle. He notes (p. 51, n.1) that the remaining stones of the statue base suggest that the central figure held either a scepter or a lance and, convinced that the women would have been placed next to their respective husbands, he concludes that Alexander rather than Philip must have been in the middle. I consider his argument unpersuasive: it would be odd to call the building the Philippeum and place an image of Alexander at the focal point.

The purpose of the Philippeum, the nature of the building, and the intent of its presumed builder have been much disputed. This uncertainty about its meaning is not accidental. The Philippeum is not only an ambiguous monument, but a monument to ambiguity, a subtle piece of imagery from Philip, a master of the creation and manipulation of public image. Philip decided to have the Philippeum built after Chaeronea. Any role Alexander had in its construction was nominal since the building is likely to have been completed no later than Alexander's departure for Asia in 334.[19] The monument's emphasis on dynastic rather than individual power suits Philip's priorities better than it does those of his son. The presence of the statue of Olympias is unremarkable and cannot be used to date the building.[20]

The Philippeum looked like a temple and was placed where one would expect a temple to be. It contained statues that looked like cult statues, yet there is no evidence for divine cult. It was not a temple. It was not a treasury (the other treasuries contained no cult images and were not placed within the Altis). Its shape resembled that of ἡρῷα (temples or chapels of a hero) but there is no evidence for heroic honors. It was not a ἡῷον. We know what it was not but cannot be sure what it was, and that is the point. What was it then? Philip offered those who visited the Panhellenic shrine a way to think about the power he had come to exercise. The Philippeum did not assert that this power was divine, but it implied that it might be and suggested that this power was, anyway, *like* the power of the gods. It paralleled his decision to have his own statue appear with that of the twelve Olympians (Diod. 16.92.5), but the Philippeum differed from that famous public gesture in an important way because it was a dynastic monument. Five godlike statues once stood there, not one. By implication, not only Philip, but each of the other four members of the dynasty, was ἰσόθεος. The picture that Philip presented of himself at his daughter Cleopatra's wedding as a thirteenth god, or a man on a par with the twelve Olympians, was a picture for the immediate future. At Olympia, Philip chose to express his power in familial rather than individual terms because he intended Greek understanding of Macedonian power to be long-term and dynastic. The Philippeum stated or pictured things the way they were, in the terms Philip wanted them understood.[21]

19. Miller 1973, 191.

20. Fredricksmeyer 1979, 53 rightly rejects the view of Badian 1981, 71 that the presence of the image of Olympias signifies that the structure cannot have been completed in the last years of Philip's reign. Such a view depends on false assumptions about the nature of Macedonian royal marriage in general and that of Philip and Olympias in particular. See further Carney 1992.

21. See Borza 1990, 250 for a similar analysis of the function of the Philippeum, but one that emphasizes its implications about the nature of Macedonian monarchy in general, rather than the importance of the inclusion of women or its dynastic implications. Wikander 1996, 186, unaware of Carney 1995, makes a similar point about the distinction between Philip's inclusion of himself with the statues of the gods and his inclusion of royal women in the Philippeum. Wikander, however, believes that understanding women as part of the dynasty was a new development, apparently assuming that the rigid public/private distinctions of the polis world applied to Macedonian monarchy as well. The career of Eurydice, mother of Philip, makes it obvious that women had a dynastic role much earlier than Wikander believes. See further Mortensen 1992, 156–71 and Carney 2000.

It is important that the two women's statues were there. Philip included them in his public presentation of dynastic power. They were part of, not apart from, βασιλεία (rule, kingship).[22] Both Olympias and Eurydice played prominent and controversial roles in Greek affairs. Their inclusion was part of Philip's statement of the facts of power. They were part of the power the Greeks needed to understand, and that is why Philip placed their statues there. It is critical that these too are chryselephantine statues. Philip's coy hints at divine status extended to the women of the clan.

These lavish images of two royal women were among the first public images of individual women in Greece. That statues were long primarily associated with men is suggested by the word ἀνδριάς (meaning statue), derived from the word for a male human being, even though it was sometimes applied to the image of a woman (e.g., Phryne in Ath. 591b). While no study of the development of female portraiture in Greek art exists, general discussions of Greek portraiture suggest that portraiture of women paralleled the development of portraiture for men, but on a much reduced scale because of the much smaller public role of women.[23] Portraits of women, however, tended to be much more generalized than those of men and harder to distinguish from images of deities.[24] The development of portraiture parallels the development of cult for mortals.

The statues of Olympias and Eurydice were probably the very first in mainland Greece to commemorate women for what was, in effect, a political role.[25] Images of women had, of course, appeared on grave stelai and, earlier yet, there were the korai, but none of these were genuine portraits.[26] An Athenian priestess named Lysimache had a portrait statue, dating to the very late fifth or early fourth century (Plin. *H.N.* 34.76), roughly the period when dedications of honorific statues to priestesses seem to have become common,[27] and statuettes and statues of κανηφόροι (bearers of sacred baskets in ritual processions) once existed, although whether they were genuine portraits may be doubted.[28] A golden statue of the famous ἑταίρα (courte-

22. See Carney 1995, 367–91 for a lengthy discussion of this point.

23. Richter 1965, 1:3–5; Breckenridge 1968, 81–142; Havelock 1971, 19–20; Pollitt 1986, 59–65. See also Ridgway's study (1987, 399–409) of women in Greek art.

24. Smith 1988, 48. Lyons 1997, 5–6, noting that some deny that Greeks distinguished between heroines and goddesses (a denial she rejects), does point out that, as we have already seen, more heroines than heroes were deified. I wonder if the difficulty in distinguishing female human and female divine in terms of image does not mirror this situation, perhaps reflecting a sense that this was a more permeable barrier. Similarly, as we shall see, more women than men seem to have been assimilated to divinities, primarily to Aphrodite.

25. A possible exception could be a statue of Artemisia, part of a monument at Sparta commemorating the Persian war dead; see discussion and references in Rice 1993, 248–49.

26. Pollitt 1986, 59 defines a portrait as the "intentional representation of a person containing a sufficient number of specific features to make the representation recognizable to others." For the possibility that korai were dedicated as priestly images of, for example, Ἀρρηφόροι, see discussion and references in Kron 1996, p. 144, n. 36. Even if this possibility were true, such statues would hardly meet Pollitt's definition.

27. Kron 1996, p. 142, n. 25. On Lysimache's statue, Breckenridge 1968, 100; Ridgway 1987, 405; Kron 1996, 143–44. Kron 1996, 140–41 points out that Greek priestesses generally possessed legal and social privileges that the ordinary citizen woman did not and that many priesthoods were hereditary in aristocratic clans. To some degree, then, priestesses honored with statues were, like subsequent royal women, exceptional women who moved between public and private roles.

28. See discussion and references in Roccos 1995, p. 645, esp. n. 37.

san) Phryne was dedicated at Delphi; it stood between the images of Philip II and Archidamus, king of Sparta (Ath. 591 b–c; Paus. 10.14.4; Plut. *Mor.* 753f).[29] That the statue was gold, or at least looked golden, may suggest that Phryne, who tradition says was Praxiteles' model for Cnidian Aphrodite (Ath. 591a; Plin. *H.N.* 36.5.4), was alluding to a godlike status, perhaps even to the proverbially golden Aphrodite.[30] Also in the mid-fourth century, among the statues of initiates to the Eleusinian mysteries in the Athenian agora, appeared those of a husband and wife.[31] In Caria, on the coast of Asia Minor, a satrapy ruled by a dynasty that practiced brother-sister marriage, public images of the women of the dynasty began to appear about the middle of the fourth century.[32]

In Macedonia proper, there is no good evidence for statues of royal women prior to those in the Philippeum at Olympia.[33] The statues that Eurydice, mother of Philip II, dedicated to Eucleia at Vergina were probably statues of the goddess, not of Eurydice herself, but another statue base found near Palatitsia may once have supported a portrait statue of Eurydice. If so, it would have been no earlier than the Philippeum.[34] Neither the female heads found on top of an archaic grave at Vergina[35] nor the small ivory heads from Tomb II at Vergina appear to be portraits.[36] Indeed, with the exception of the statue base for an image of Thessalonice, half-sister of Alexander and wife of Cassander, from the Roman period,[37] there is as yet no certain evidence for the existence of statues of royal women in Macedonia in the centuries after the death of Philip.[38]

29. On Phryne, see Raubitschek 1941, 893–907 and Havelock 1995, 42–47; on her statue, see Ridgway 1987, p. 91, esp. n. 43.

30. On Aphrodite's goldenness and its association with beauty, see Friedrich 1978, 77–78. See Scott 1931, 101–23 and Gordon 1979, 13 on the connection between use of gold and silver in statuary and the Greek conception of divinity, which was so often associated with brightness, "gleamingness." Gordon suggests that the use of costly material for divine statues was a way around the somewhat limiting nature of the anthropomorphic images of the gods. See below on the association of the cult of ἑταῖραι with Aphrodite. See Havelock 1995, 3, 42, 133 on the difficulty ancients had in distinguishing between Phryne, her statue, and Aphrodite. Elsewhere Phryne is considered a ministrant of Aphrodite (Ath. 590 e–f).

31. Ridgway 1987, p. 405, n. 35. Earlier statues of women had appeared in tombs and sanctuaries, but, as Pollitt 1986, 59 remarks, the agora was a quasi-sacred area. Nonetheless, statues of women continued to be more common in sanctuaries than in agoras.

32. Ridgway 1987, pp. 91–92, nn. 45 and 46. See Van Bremen 1996, 180–86 on the gradual development, after the rise of the Hellenistic kings, of civic statues for female benefactors, and for a discussion (12–13) of whether this development was modeled on the benefactions of royal women.

33. Le Bohec's conclusion (1993, 238) that the female statues in the Philippeum represented "tradition . . . chez les Macédoniens," remains unsubstantiated, although possible.

34. Saatsoglou-Paliadeli 1993, 1339–71 suggests that a third statue base, giving only Eurydice's name and patronymic, was the base of a portrait statue. She also believes that the statue formed part of a dynastic group, identical to that of the Philippeum, and that this group was once placed in what some have considered the ἡρῷον associated with the Great Tumulus.

35. Ginouvès 1994, 38 thinks both male and female heads were chthonic deities. While the two male heads show some individual traits, the two female heads are very general and nearly identical.

36. Although Andronicos (1984, 129–31) considered at least some of the small heads portraits, including, perhaps, Olympias, even he stepped back from a certain identification of Alexander's mother, and Smith's doubts that any of the heads are female, let alone portraits (1988, 62–63) are persuasive.

37. The statue base, inscribed with the name of Thessalonice, a patronymic, and the title βασίλισσα (*IG* 10.2.1, no. 277) is dated to the second or third century C.E. Vickers 1972, p. 166, n. 1, mentions a female statue found in her eponymous city that he believed might have represented either her or merely Tyche.

38. Le Bohec 1993, 239 suggested that Antigonus Gonatas would have included statues of his ancestresses among those of his ancestors in his dynastic monument at Delos. The narrow public presentation of monarchy in Antigonid times, a topic I shall pursue at length elsewhere, would not necessitate their inclusion.

The inclusion of the women in the statue group was probably shocking at the time the Philippeum was built, both because public images of women were so rare and because their presence demonstrated how different from the world of the polis was the δυναστεία (power, lordship, sovereignty) of a family. The triumph of the royal clan over the city state was made concrete or, rather, chryselephantine. Greeks often objected to monarchy because of the role royal women played, or were supposed to play, in it. Philip's household had been the source of much scandal (Plut. *Mor.* 179c). The Philippeum, however, made no apologies; it flaunted the importance of royal women.

The relationship between image and cult is complex and critical.[39] Greek writers often referred to the statue as the person (e.g., Pausanias at both 5.17.4 and 5.20.10 speaks not of statues of Olympias, etc., but of Olympias or Amyntas, and uses the term εἰκών [image] only when he must refer to the material of which the image is made), and Greek practice often failed to make a firm distinction between the image and that of which it was an image, a phenomenon particularly observable about cult statues.[40] Ancient writers often associated both the size of a statue and the material of its fabrication with divinity. Yet I do not believe, as some do,[41] that when we try to understand the power that statues like those in the Philippeum exercised over those who saw them, the multiplicity of images in our own culture blinds us to their impact.

Such views exaggerate the differences between our perceptions and those of the people of the ancient world by arbitrarily attributing to us a degree of sophistication about physical images that many of us demonstrably do not possess. Although the erection of portrait statues is now comparatively rare, people today continue to transform monuments, even those without images of human figures, from mere representations to the thing itself.[42] The behavior of those who visit the Viet Nam War memorial in Washington, D.C. demonstrates a process not unlike that which made one refer not to a statue of Aphrodite but to Aphrodite. The base of the monument is strewn with personal mementos, offerings, and notes. One writes letters of remembrance to people, not to inscribed walls.

Similarly, today we are not immune to the impact of statues. The force of a life-size or somewhat larger image of a human figure is considerable. Indeed, much of the current power of the Viet Nam memorial derives from the personal engagement of those viewing it with the events and people it commemorates. The memorial groups of human figures, more recently added to the original wall of names commemorating those who died in the war and now generally considered less compelling, may become more com-

39. The discussion in this section has been influenced by the fundamental work of Gordon 1979, 5–34.

40. Clerc 1915; Gordon 1979, 7–10; Kassel 1983, 1–12; Freedberg 1989, 28–48.

41. Pollitt 1986, 19; Smith 1988, 15.

42. I can offer a personal example of the continuation of this phenomenon. My own university recently erected a piece of statuary intended to commemorate those of our graduates who had died during the second World War. For months after the monument was unveiled, small non-commercial bouquets of wild flowers were regularly placed at its base.

pelling as the viewer's distance from these events increases. In fact, these figures were added because of popular pressure for the inclusion of human figures. Anyone who has ever excused herself or himself to a store mannequin, come to feel uneasy in some indefinable way in an exhibit of modern sculpture that includes groups of human figures riding a bus or eating in a restaurant, or realized after sitting on a park bench near a statue that somehow one feels part of a group including the statue can at least begin to understand the role of statues in ancient culture.

Nor are we as indifferent to the size or material of statues as some seem to assume. The statue of Abraham Lincoln at his memorial in Washington, D.C. commands attention, yet it is hard to imagine a smaller version having the same effect. A walk through a museum displaying sizable gold images of human beings—I think, for instance, of the size and reaction of the crowds viewing the golden mask in the Tutankhamun exhibit displayed at the Metropolitan Museum in New York in the late 1970s—will tell you that most people are still overawed by life-size or larger golden images of the human form.

The links between visible wealth (of which gold remains the most universal example) and power, the sense of the viewer's loss of power, the awe generated by a larger-than-life-size human figure, and, above all, the oddly primitive power of any human-sized replication of the human figure on human beings, these are all things we may experience as well as the Greeks, if less intensely. More difficult to replicate is the setting in which statues once appeared. For the Philippeum, one must imagine those five large statues, raised enough above ordinary eye level to force the viewer to look upward,[43] seen in a half-light from the two windows on either side of the door, gleaming with gold, pale with ivory, images (at least several of them) of living individuals, and yet displayed like those of the gods.

Any life-size statue of a human figure, both because of its size and the distinction that had caused it to be set up, may have alluded to the capacity of human beings to equal the gods through their achievements.[44] Pausanias (1.40.2) distinguished an ἄγαλμα, an image that received cult, from an εἰκών, one that did not. The distinction, sometimes verbally blurred, was drawn on the basis of the treatment of the image, not the way it looked, and that treatment could change over time.[45] When images of individual

43. Cult statues were often, although not always, larger than life-size. As Gordon 1979, 14 observes, size is not a trivial issue; larger-than-life-size statues indicated the "otherness," the non-humanness of the gods. It is impossible to tell exactly how large the images in the Philippeum were. Zschietzschmann 1944, p. 51, n. 1 supposes that the statues in the Philippeum were not larger than life-size, apparently because of the comparatively modest size of the statue base, substantial parts of which survive. (Each of the separate supporting bases measures roughly .8 meters across.) Whereas Gardner 1925, 133 lists the height of the base as 1.92 meters, a height that would certainly have forced the viewer to look upwards at quite an angle and hardly implies that the statues it supported were small, Schleif 1944, 21, esp. pl. 17, seems to suggest a height of about .914 meters. Even this lower height, granted the comparatively small size of the building, would have forced the viewer to look sharply upward and could surely have supported life-size or nearly life-size figures.

44. Gordon 1979, 14.

45. Nock 1930, 53–54. Nock cites an example from Egypt of an εἰκών receiving cult. Smith 1988, 15–16 notes that our understanding of this distinction depends on inscriptions. Ἄγαλμα continued to apply only to cult statues, but εἰκών could be used of either cult or honorific statues.

women, royal and otherwise, began to be found among statues in public places around the Greek world, Greeks must have had to make a considerable adjustment.[46]

Having attempted to recognize the critical role of statues in the early stages of cult, I shall now return to my task of establishing the early development of cult for women. The next evidence we have about women and cult relates to one of the women depicted in the Philippeum, Olympias, mother of Alexander the Great. Plutarch (*Alex.* 3.2) cites Eratosthenes for the idea that Olympias herself first told Alexander of his divine sonship and other sources for the view that she rejected the notion. Despite this dubious anecdotal material, Alexander's belief in his divine sonship was clearly his own. Olympias was not with him at Siwah. Moreover, she risked more by implying that anyone other than Philip was Alexander's father than did Alexander, at least after his victories.

Alexander may have intended to deify Olympias after her death. Curtius has Alexander state this intention as part of a speech made after his wound among the Malli (9.6.26). Curtius also refers to this intention when summing up Alexander's character after his death (10.5.30). No other source mentions this possibility. Curtius' statements could easily have been anachronistic, derived from Roman practice about some Roman empresses but there is nothing innately implausible about the two passages. Alexander had already claimed that Zeus Ammon was his father and was soon to receive divine honors himself. A deified mother would seem an appropriate match for a divine father.[47]

Better, more contemporary evidence survives for cult worship for a woman during the last years of Alexander's reign. The evidence has to do with Alexander's controversial treasurer Harpalus and involves his idiosyncratic and perhaps bizarre relationships with ἑταῖραι, not royal women. If elements similar to those in the stories about Harpalus and cult for women did not recur in other places, about other women, one would tend to attribute these stories to his erratic character (or perhaps to hostile tradition about him).[48]

Most of this information about Harpalus, cult, ἑταῖραι, and royal women comes from a long passage in Athenaeus that preserves fragments of several roughly contemporary writers and seems to refer to circa 324 (Ath. 595a–596b).[49] Athenaeus cites Theopompus' *Letter to Alexander* for complaints

46. Because of the absence of evidence for Macedonia proper and because of the scarcity of identified images of royal women from anywhere in the Hellenistic world (Smith 1988, 43–48), I shall not attempt to trace the development of this custom further. Images of royal males on Macedonian coins were a rarity and none survive of royal women, but in Ptolemaic Egypt, royal women did appear on coins as early as 309 (Kahrstedt 1910, 261–314 and Koch 1923, 67–106).

47. Macurdy 1932, 34; Hammond 1980, 473–76 accepted the truth of Curtius' statements, but not on plausible grounds. Curtius' assertion could, nonetheless, be correct.

48. Jaschinski 1981, 23, argues that Harpalus' treatment of the courtesans, including cult, would have been read as treason, particularly because he had these women treated like queens. The implication seems to be that he was using these notorious ἑταῖραι as part of his public image as counter-king at Babylon.

49. The dating depends on Athenaeus' reference to a satyr play called the *Agen*, performed at Alexander's court sometime between 326 and summer of 324. On the dating, see discussion and references in Flower 1997, p. 260, n. 19.

about Harpalus' splendid funerary monuments at Athens and Babylon to an ἑταίρα named Pythionice. She had died in Babylon, and Theopompus says Harpalus had constructed for her a ἱερόν (temple), a τέμενος (sacred precinct), and a βωμός (altar) under the name of Pythionice Aphrodite (Ath. 595 a–c).[50] Thus, Harpalus' private cult to Pythionice apparently was, like that Alexander supposedly contemplated for Olympias, posthumous. Athenaeus then quotes a passage from Philemon's *Babylonians,* which, in reference to Pythionice and Harpalus, seems to term the courtesan βασίλισσα (royal woman) of Babylon (Ath. 595 c–d).

Athenaeus turns again to Theopompus for the information that Harpalus put up a bronze image of Glycera (an ἑταίρα Harpalus brought out after the death of Pythionice), had her live in the royal residence with him at Tarsus, permitted her to receive προσκύνησις (obeisance) from the people, to be hailed as βασίλισσα, and to receive other gifts which, in Theopompus' view, would have been suitable for Alexander's mother or wife.[51] Athenaeus then remarks that similar tales were preserved in another play produced after Harpalus had fled from Alexander (595d–596b).

While the cult Harpalus established was clearly only his own doing,[52] he was the first of many to associate a mortal woman with Aphrodite in cult. Some of these women, as we shall see, were, like Glycera, ἑταῖραι, but some were royal women. The juxtaposition of the role of the ἑταίρα with that of royal women that is demonstrated in the Athenaeus passages seems shocking to us, and yet it too will reappear.

Both royal men and royal women began to receive cult in their lifetimes before either men or women used a royal title. Phila, wife of Demetrius Poliorcetes received cult at Athens around 307, about the time her husband and father-in-law did.[53] Once more the evidence is preserved in Athenaeus. Athenaeus reports that in a play of Alexis, a character drinks a toast with a libation to the θεοὶ σωτῆρες (the savior gods), Antigonus and Demetrius,

50. Paus. 1.37.5 also speaks of an especially large and beautiful tomb of Pythionice in Attica. Flower 1997, 269 suggests that the tomb was also the temple. Lane Fox 1974, 439, 545 and 1986, 118, followed by Flower 1997, 258–62 believes that this passage offers proof that Alexander received lifetime divine honors since he understands Ath. 595c, τὰς σὰς τιμὰς προπηλακίζειν ἐπιχειρῶν to refer to the insulting of honors Alexander has received (see Flower 1997, p. 259, n. 16). Since Pythionice had cult honors, Lane Fox and Flower conclude that the passage refers to these cult honors.

51. Flower 1997, 261 argues that this passage means that Olympias and Roxane could appropriately receive both προσκύνησις and the title βασίλισσα, Roxane as wife of the king of Asia and Olympias as the mother of a god. I am not persuaded by this argument, particularly because of Alexander's past failed attempt to impose the performance of προσκύνησις on his Greek and Macedonian courtiers and because of evidence that Olympias did not use a title (see Carney 1991, 158). I have no doubt that the anecdote dates to the period of Harpalus but that does not mean that it is true; he was an extremely controversial figure (see Carney 1991, p. 167, n. 27).

52. The suggestion of Flower 1997, 260 that the Athenians may have had a civic cult for her and that this cult may have been a model for those Athenian cults to Demetrius Poliorcetes' courtesans as Lamia or Leaenea Aphrodite (see below) is implausible. The change in mind-set and cult practice in Greek cities after the death of Alexander was dramatic. Moreover, Harpalus' role in Athens was hardly parallel to that of Demetrius.

53. Cerfaux and Tondriau 1957, 173–84; Habicht 1970, 260–62; Scott 1928, 137–66 and 217–39; Ferguson 1911, 107–43. The first cult directed to any of Alexander's Successors, the city cult for Antigonus and Demetrius at Scepsis, dates to 311 (*OGI* 6).

and to Phila Aphrodite (Ath. 254a).[54] Athenaeus says his source was Dionysius, son of Tryphon, for the information that Adimantus of Lampsacus set up a building with an ἄγαλμα of Phila Aphrodite at Thria in Attica and that the place was called the Philaeum after Phila, wife of Demetrius (Ath. 255c). Adimantus' cult may have been private, but the context of Athenaeus' description of the cult to Phila Aphrodite referred to in the toast, a long passage lamenting the decline of the Athenian populace into toadying subservience to powerful men, strongly suggests that he is referring to a city cult to Phila.

The Athenians also put up temples to two ἑταῖραι of Demetrius, shrines to Leaenea Aphrodite and Lamia Aphrodite, according to Democharis (Ath. 253 a), and the Thebans also built a ναός (temple) to Aphrodite Lamia, hoping, according to Polemon, to flatter Demetrius (Ath. 253b). Since Athenaeus says that the Thebans and Athenians instituted these cults, one must conclude that all these cults to Demetrius' ἑταῖραι were civic. Dating the cults of these ἑταῖραι is more difficult than dating that of Phila because of the lack of apparent chronological context in the passage. They could have been established in the same period as Phila's or they could have begun somewhat later, circa 304–303, when Demetrius' activities in the Parthenon with some of these same ἑταῖραι were particularly notorious (Plut. *Demetr.* 23–24).

The Athenians instituted cults to Demetrius and sometimes to his father in gratefulness for Demetrius' salvation of Athens. Cult for Demetrius and his father took various forms in various periods, sometimes associating the men with major gods, as with Phila and the ἑταῖραι, and sometimes not. The cult of Antigonus and Demetrius was (if we make use of Price's interpretation) a way for the Athenians to recognize and integrate the power of the Antigonids into the existing polis structure, a way of conceptualizing their power. This interpretation would also explain the apparent civic cult for Phila. Before the advent of the Macedonian kings, women had not had public power in Greek cities, but now they did, and this power too had to be integrated.[55]

A certain Stratonice received a τέμενος from the Delians around 300 (*IG* 11.4.415). She was probably the daughter of Poliorcetes,[56] married about this time to Seleucus Nicator, and long a patron at Delos and the recipient of cult elsewhere (e.g., a civic cult at Smyrna, as Aphrodite Stratonice, *OGI* 228, 229; *SIG* 575, 990). Her daughter Phila, wife of Antigonus Gonatas,

54. The date of Phila's cult is somewhat less certain than that of her husband and father-in-law, but the information cited in Athenaeus implies a period between 307 and 305: the toast associates her identification with the cult of the θεοὶ σωτῆρες and thus with the period between Demetrius' salvation of Athens and his departure for his victorious campaign against Ptolemy. The Alexis quotation also suggests a date no later than 305. It is usually assumed that the temple and ἄγαλμα date to the same period. Scott 1928, 152–53; Ferguson 1911, p. 114, n. 7; Cerfaux and Tondriau 1957, 176; Green 1990, 49.

55. Fraser 1972, 1:246 says that it is likely that the Ptolemaic assimilations of royal women to divinities created a more genuine feeling of the effective divinity of queens and ruling houses than direct worship of individuals did. See below on why ἑταῖραι as well as royal wives were included in cult and why both kinds of women were associated with Aphrodite.

56. See Habicht 1970, 61. Billows 1990, p. 235, n.118, however, suggests that the inscription may, instead, refer to Antigonus' mother.

also received a civic cult, at Samos.[57] In traditional Macedonia proper, there was no dynastic cult for male or female Antigonids, although city cults for kings did exist (e.g., Cassander's at Cassandrea: *SIG* 332).[58] Currently no evidence demonstrates the existence of civic cult in Macedonia for a royal woman.[59]

In Egypt, the Ptolemies, rather than simply receiving cult from Greek cities, began to generate their own, ultimately a dynastic cult involving Alexander and all the Ptolemaic rulers. Berenice, wife of Ptolemy I, received cult with her husband as one of the θεοὶ σωτῆρες;[60] she may have received cult in association with Aphrodite in her lifetime, and was associated with the goddess after her death.[61] Her daughter Arsinoe received cult in her own lifetime as one of the θεοὶ ἀδελφοί (sibling gods) and may have had an individual cult in her lifetime as well.[62] Arsinoe was associated with Aphrodite,[63] as were many later Ptolemaic queens. In Egypt, of course, connections between royal women and Aphrodite in cult often, although not always, involved connection to Isis as well.[64] In Ptolemaic Egypt we once more find cult for a royal wife and for an ἑταίρα (courtesan), and that both cults associated the women with Aphrodite. The Alexandrians established a ναός and ἱερά for Bilistiche, an ἑταίρα of Ptolemy Philadelphus, as Aphrodite Bilistiche, apparently in her lifetime (Plut. *Mor.* 753e–f).[65]

Thus my survey of the initial development of cultic honors for women in the Greek world suggests that it began at the end of the fourth century

57. See Le Bohec 1993, p. 237, n. 64 for discussion and references.

58. There were cults for Lysimachus at Priene, Samothrace, and Cassandrea, all set up in the 280s: see Walbank 1984, p. 92, n. 105.

59. Obviously, it is possible that evidence for such cults may one day appear. Thessalonice, for instance, may have received cult in the city named after her.

60. See Fraser 1972, 1:367–68, 373.

61. See Gutzwiller 1992, pp. 363–65, esp. n. 20, on the evidence for Berenice I's lifetime identification with Aphrodite. The evidence includes an epigram stressing the resemblance between Berenice (it is not clear, although likely, that the Berenice referred to is Berenice I: see Cameron 1990, 294–95) and Aphrodite (*Anth.Pal.* 12.77) as well as Theoc. *Id.* 17.51–52, which says that Aphrodite saved Berenice from the afterworld and placed her in the same temple with the goddess. Gutzwiller 1992, p. 365, n. 20, concedes that Arsinoe II may have "projected" her own connection to Aphrodite back to her mother. See discussions in Tondriau 1948b, 2–3 and 1948a, 14; Fraser 1972, 1:197; and below.

62. Gryzbek 1990, 103–12 now dates the death of Arsinoe Philadelphus to 268 instead of the date previously generally accepted, 270. If his date is accepted (Gutzwiller 1992, 365), then her individual cult as Arsinoe Philadelphus would also have been established in her lifetime. Arsinoe's cult in association with Aphrodite at Zephyrium (see n. 63 below) may also have begun in her lifetime; so Neumer-Pfau 1982, 57; Gutzwiller 1992, 365.

63. Callicrates erected a shrine to her as Arsinoe-Aphrodite Zephyritis. Arsinoe patronized the Adonia (Theoc. *Id.* 15.22–24; Fraser 1972, 1:197, 239–40; Pomeroy 1984, 30). Fraser suggests that Arsinoe herself was responsible for the popularity of Aphrodite. Later Ptolemaic royal women were associated with Aphrodite (Fraser 1972, 1:239).

64. While Aphrodite and Isis were closely identified in the Hellenistic world (Fraser 1972, 1:198), in Ptolemaic times Aphrodite was sometimes identified with Hathor (Fraser 1972, 1:197), and Isis was, as early as Herodotus, sometimes associated with Demeter (Fraser 1972, 1:259). Moreover, in later periods, Isis and Hathor were often merged (Heyob 1975, 43). Granted that from early in the pharaonic period, Egyptian queens were often shown with the attributes of various female deities (Robins 1993, 23–25) and that the goddesses Hathor and Isis were closely associated in the pharaonic period (see further Quirke 1992; Shafer 1991), the Ptolemaic association of Isis and Aphrodite with cult for various royal women may have developed not so much from the identification of the two goddesses as from the Ptolemaic need to serve two monarchic traditions, the pharaonic, which associated royal women with Isis (as well as with many other Egyptian deities), and the much more recent Macedonian tradition, which connected royal women and Aphrodite.

65. Fraser 1972, 1:240 and n. 401.

with the association of royal wives and royal ἑταῖραι with Aphrodite in both civic and private cult, and then, as rulers themselves began to generate cults in the third century, became part of those as well. While the Philippeum was not the site of a dynastic cult, its nature suggests the kind of understanding of royal power as dynastic that would ultimately lead to dynastic cult. Although the first cult of a woman we know of was posthumous, living women began to receive civic cult before the end of the fourth century. The kings' ἑταῖραι in this early period were, as we have seen, nearly as likely to receive cult as were their wives. Being the wife of a man titled βασιλεύς (king) cannot have been the only reason women received cult: Demetrius' wife, Phila, received cult before her husband took the title βασιλεύς, and kings' ἑταῖραι received cult recognition although not married to a king.

Let us consider the implications and motivation of the early and persistent association of women with Aphrodite in civic and private cult. In the fragments preserved in Athenaeus and in inscriptions recording these cults, the name of the mortal woman and the name of the goddess are simply juxtaposed (indeed, Fraser terms this form of relationship between goddess and royal woman "identity by juxtaposition"[66]), more often, but not always, with the goddess' name coming first. It is a practice much more common for royal women than royal men[67] and is commonly referred to as "assimilation" or "identification"—"symbiosis" is a better choice[68]—but what it means has not been much discussed and is not very clear.[69] Is there any significance in whether the goddess or the mortal comes first?[70] Are we talking about Phila as Aphrodite or Aphrodite as Phila? The parallel would seem to be to the various sub-cults of major deities, e.g., Hera *Basilea*. The usage presupposes a manifestation of divine in mortal form, but the nature of the manifestation is vague. The power of royal women was equally undefined, however real.[71]

There has been no lengthy analysis of the reasons for associating royal women and Aphrodite in cult that has directly addressed not only Ptolemaic

66. Fraser 1972, 1:245. He can find no instance of this form after the third century.

67. Fraser 1972, 1:236 makes this point about the Ptolemies but it would appear to apply more generally.

68. Préaux 1978, 252.

69. Havelock 1995, 128 suggests that those who identified themselves with divinities claimed kinship with them and with it their power, but notes that such people did not claim to be reincarnations of the deity as some rulers did in late Hellenistic times. She points out that Arsinoe, for instance, was not represented as Aphrodite, at least so far as we know. Fraser 1972, 1:245 remarks that it is difficult to speak about the issue with certainty since we know about assimilation only from documents that refer to it without explaining it. He adds that such identifications must have carried with them absorption of attributes, and concludes that assimilation is a form of syncretism.

70. The passages cited all refer to the goddess' name and the individual's in the same case, whereas the inscription from Eresus (Tod 191, 5–6) uses a phrase that one might translate either "altars of Zeus to Philip" or "altars to Philip of Zeus." Badian 1996, 13 insists that this is a cult of "Philip's Zeus"—Zeus as Philip's protector—not Philip as Zeus, and castigates Bosworth 1988, 281 for his differing understanding of the meaning of the passage about the Eresus cult. In fact, Bosworth 1988, 281 seems closer to the messy ambiguity of the phrasing of the inscription when he says, "The precise meaning of this act cannot be recovered, but it seems certain that Philip was deeply associated in the cult of Zeus, and the sacrifices made to Zeus were also in a sense offered to Philip."

71. Nock 1928, 21–42, recognizes the ambiguity of this aspect of ruler cult. Smith 1988, 44, warns against limiting the meaning and therefore the ambiguity of constructs like "Phila Aphrodite."

examples but the earlier, non-Egyptian examples from the fourth century.[72] Some earlier explanations of the phenomenon of cultic association with Aphrodite have dealt only with Ptolemaic Egypt[73] and found specifically Ptolemaic explanations: Ptolemaic control of Cyprus; Ptolemaic interest in sea power (in association with Aphrodite's role, as at Zephyrium, as a protector of seafarers); assimilation of Ptolemaic kings to Dionysus; emphasis on the personal, sexual relationship of the early Ptolemaic wives with their husbands.[74] One must also recall the long pharaonic tradition associating king's wives with Hathor and, to some degree, with Isis.

More general explanations of assimilation to Aphrodite have also been offered. Some have seen assimilation of royal women to Aphrodite as flattery directed at the woman and her husband and primarily related to the woman's beauty; such an explanation would, at best, apply only to cults initiated by cities or individuals, not by rulers themselves.[75] Moreover, this interpretation effectively trivializes beauty and fails to recognize to what degree "beauty is essentially a manifestation of power."[76] Athenaeus, for instance, associates female and male beauty with power, divinity, and monarchy. Athenaeus actually says (566c): τὸ κάλλος βασιλείας οἰκεῖόν ἐστιν ("beauty is related to rule or dominion").

Neumer-Pfau theorized that Aphrodite was a model for all women in the Hellenistic period and thus the most appropriate choice for assimilation by royal women.[77] Fraser suggested that the assimilation and identification of Ptolemaic queens with various deities (not just Aphrodite) was part of the

72. Tondriau 1948c, 40, 44 mentions both non-Ptolemaic and Ptolemaic examples, but his analysis is not rigorous since he simply assumes that the natural choice of goddess for queens to be assimilated to was Aphrodite. Robert 1966, 192–210 and Fraser 1972, 1:236–59 refer only to Arsinoe II Philadelphus (Robert) or to the Ptolemies, although some of their suggestions have implications for non-Ptolemaic cults. Pomeroy 1984, 30 states that "no binding precedents" existed for royal women as did the cult of Alexander for royal men. While I would agree that the cults to Phila and Demetrius' ἑταῖραι in association with Aphrodite can hardly be considered as precedent-setting as Alexander's was for male Ptolemies, Pomeroy's subsequent discussion of the development of various kinds of female cult under Arsinoe II leaves the impression, possibly unintentionally, that there were no earlier precedents at all. See now Mirón Pérez 1998b, 230–35.

73. Pomeroy 1984, 30–38, provides a useful general discussion of the choice of Aphrodite. She refers to the Cypriote connection (as does Fraser 1972, 1:197), to Aphrodite as patroness of the sea (see also Robert 1966, 200–208), and to her past role in cult as a marriage goddess. The last explanation will prove the one most relevant to non-Ptolemaic assimilations to Aphrodite.

74. Gutzwiller 1992, 363–68, while following Pomeroy 1984, 30–38, emphasizes the sexual aspect of the equation, the "power of erotic persuasion over the king" also shown by deification of the king's ἑταῖραι. (Mirón Pérez 1998b, 230–35 reaches a similar conclusion, apparently unaware of Gutzwiller's work.) See also Roy 1998, 119. Gutzwiller suggests that the emphasis on shared affection in marriage and its promotion through assimilation to Aphrodite may have been politically helpful for Berenice I and her daughter because the marriage of each was in some degree controversial. Griffiths 1981, 247–73 argues that Arsinoe II used her sponsorship of Aphrodite to create acceptance of her own power as well as to maintain the social status quo. See also Havelock 1995, 127.

75. Tondriau 1948a, 12–13 speaks of flattery, particularly of a woman's real or supposed beauty, taken as a token of her divinization. But as Tondriau himself concedes (1956, 20–21), beauty is more prominent in literary references to deification than in cult. Mirón Pérez 1998b, 230–35 considers beauty a more important motivation of female deification than I do, but she puts beauty in the general context of cult as recognition of the erotic power of women over men, a much more plausible view than that of Tondriau.

76. Loraux 1992, 20; see n. 75 above.

77. Neumer-Pfau 1982, 55–60. The thesis lacks a strong evidentiary basis, partly because it is so broad as to be by nature unprovable. The idea that the model for queens derived from a general societal model (the reverse, in a sense, of Pomeroy's view [1984, 40] that queens provided the societal model) is made problematic by the difficulty of relating the role of royal women to that of ordinary women.

general Hellenistic phenomenon of syncretism and that identification "created a more genuine feeling of the effective divinity of the queens, and of the ruling house as a whole, than the direct worship of individuals."[78] Let us see how well these suggestions may apply to earlier, non-Ptolemaic assimilations of women to Aphrodite, particularly women associated with kings.

The choice of Aphrodite as the deity to be assimilated has been treated as an inevitability.[79] Why are both royal wives and courtesans connected to Aphrodite? Why are not the wives, at least, associated with Hera instead? Both goddesses had responsibilities for marriage, yet Hera was queen of the gods and consort of the king, Zeus, and, in some places, received cult with him in that role.[80] Assimilation of royal wives to Hera is not, however, common.[81] The answer to the question I have posed relates to the traditional personality of Hera, particularly in Homer. Although I would not dispute the general view that Greek gods should be understood primarily as powers, not persons,[82] in terms of the assimilation of human beings with already existing divinities, the "personality" of the god or goddess probably matters more than the various cults of the deity since the association of the human and divine individuals functions as a way to understand and explain the power of the human being. Hera's personality was probably perceived as either too threatening or too unpleasant to make her a likely choice for association of a mortal with a divinity.

A passage about Pericles' famous mistress Aspasia hints at one reason why assimilation to Hera was rare. Plutarch, clearly incensed at Aspasia's political influence over Pericles despite what he considers her sexual disreputableness, notes that she was called the new Omphale, the new Deianira, and (the new) Hera and quotes a line from Cratinus in which she is assimilated to Hera, clearly with negative intent (*Per.* 24.6). The references to Omphale and Deianira are negative and threatening to male power. Omphale purchased Heracles as a slave and is said to have made him wear female dress and perform female tasks like spinning (Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.6.3; Diod. 4.31.5–8), and Deianira, albeit unwittingly, caused the painful death of her husband Heracles.

The reference associates her with two women who interfered in male activities. It suggests that the primary frame of reference for Hera was similar, most likely epitomized by Hera's treacherous seduction of Zeus in order to

78. Fraser 1972, 1:245–46.

79. Tondriau 1948c, 40, observes that Aphrodite was "naturally" chosen as a model for assimilation and that (44) this "goddess of womanly beauty and power" was obviously the best choice. See also Taeger 1957, 1:260.

80. There is no general study of either the cult of Aphrodite or that of Hera. For Hera, see Farnell 1971, 1:179–223; Pomeroy 1975, 7–8; Burkert 1985, 131–35; O'Brien 1993. For Aphrodite, see Farnell 1971, 2:618–77; Pomeroy 1975, 6–7; Friedrich 1978; Burkert 1985, 152–56; Pirenne-Delforgé 1994. Friedrich and O'Brien concentrate on the Archaic period and on myth, not cult. Pirenne-Delforgé deals only with the Classical and Hellenistic periods.

81. Their number is modest in comparison to the many assimilations to Aphrodite. Theocritus (*Id.* 17.126–34) compares the marriage of Zeus and Hera to the marriage of Ptolemy Philadelphus and his sister, thereby justifying it. Arsinoe took Hera's cult names of "Basileia" and "Teleia" (Fraser 1972, 237–38). Apollonis, wife of Attalus I, was σύνναος (shared a temple) with Hera Basileia at Pergamum (Préaux 1978, 254). Cults to Hera were generally less widespread than those to Aphrodite (Farnell 1971, 179, 618; Fraser 1972, 1:194–95; Parke 1977; and Simon 1983).

82. See discussion and references in Loraux 1992, 25.

get her own political way, as shown in *Iliad* 14.153–353. In myth and cult Hera is portrayed as having royal authority. She sits on a golden throne and wields a scepter. She offers to Paris as bribe her particular gift, royal power. Aspasia is linked to Hera because of her political influence and the perception of that influence as sinister interference, doubtless the consequence of her sexual power over Pericles.

The male Successors tended to prefer assimilation to Dionysus, an eastern conqueror, to assimilation to Zeus, a hereditary ruler as they, after all, were not. Demetrius Poliorcetes was closely connected to him, as many of the Ptolemaic rulers would be. While not linked in myth, Dionysus and Aphrodite may have seemed a more appropriate pairing.[83] Possibly it seemed inappropriate to assimilate a royal woman to Hera if the ruler was not associated with Zeus. It may be that, as the fourth century went on, Hera was losing out to Aphrodite as the goddess most typically associated with marriage.[84] Even in Homer (*Il.* 5.429) Aphrodite is associated with marriage. By the Classical period in Athens, brides sacrificed to Aphrodite and may have dressed in her color.[85] Diodorus (5.73.2), writing in the first century B.C.E., as he describes the special powers of each god, allots brides and marriage and its ceremonies to Aphrodite. Aside from the fact that cults of Aphrodite were more widespread than those of Hera, other factors aided in the dominance of Aphrodite as the fourth century ended and the Hellenistic period began. The patronage of the Ptolemies, especially that of Arsinoe II, increased the popularity of the cult of Aphrodite. Social changes, beginning in the fourth century, made private life more important than previously. The development of romantic comedy and romantic love is suggestive, as is the sense that Hera's "personality" made her an inappropriate goddess of marriage.[86]

None of this is sufficient explanation for the association of royal women with Aphrodite in city and dynastic cult. If Hera was not acceptable, why was the choice for assimilation Aphrodite instead of, say, Demeter? We should look for explanations having to do not with typicality but with royal power. With Aphrodite too, we should pay attention to the "personality" of the goddess in Homer and later literature (although both her cults and literary persona do vary),[87] as well as to powers attributed to her.

Aphrodite is, from the point of view of political power, much less threatening than Hera. When she dares to interfere in battle, she is humiliated by

83. On the tendency to associate Demetrius with Dionysus, see Cerfaux and Tondriau 1957, 180, who suggest that the same tendency may be true of his father. Scott 1928, 222–35 suggests that the Dionysus/Aphrodite equation relating to Demetrius and various of the women associated with him may have been the prototype for the Ptolemies. On associating male rulers with Dionysus and royal women with Aphrodite, see Tondriau 1948c, 35; Smith 1988, 37–38.

84. Savalli-Lestrade 1994, 426 seems to imply this by claiming that assimilations of royal women to Aphrodite unified the private role of the woman as wife with the public role of patroness of citizens.

85. See discussion and references in Oakley and Sinos 1993, 11–16, 31 who point out that Aphrodite and Eros are common figures on Athenian wedding vases. For references to wedding sacrifices to Aphrodite, see Paus. 2.34.12, 3.13.9, *Anth. Pal.* 6.318.

86. See Neumer-Pfau 1982, p. 56, n. 289.

87. Even in literature, as Loraux 1992, 17 rightly observes, Aphrodite had powers and character other than the erotic.

a mortal and very clearly told that it is not her sphere of action (*Il.* 5.311–430). In Homer she can be comic, or at least amusing (*Od.* 8.266–366). The sea-born goddess was long associated with the sea and the preservation of seafarers; clearly Arsinoe's cult as Aphrodite at Zephyrium fits this tradition and conforms to Ptolemaic naval ambitions,[88] but the marine connections of Aphrodite certainly do not make sense for many of the examples of assimilation I have noted.[89] On the other hand, Aphrodite's best known power, sexual desire, can be frightening indeed; one thinks of the old men of Troy looking at Aphrodite's pawn, Helen (*Il.* 3.156–60), or the scene in which Aphrodite compels an unwilling Helen to go to bed with Paris (*Il.* 3.373–420).[90] When she is associated with marriage, it is most often with the sexual aspect of marriage. Through marriage Aphrodite tamed the sexual voracity of women and became a stabilizing force.[91] Her association with ἑταῖραι is obvious. In Corinth and Cyprus her cult was somehow associated with prostitution (Ath. 573c–d). She was often seen as the special protector of courtesans and received cult as Aphrodite Hetairia (Ath. 571c–e, 573c–d). Her very name was the way Greeks referred to the sexual act. Aphrodite *was* sex.

Whatever explanation we offer must account for the repeated pattern of the assimilation of both royal wives and prostitutes to Aphrodite. Whereas one can relate Aphrodite's power as a goddess of the sea to only a few of the cults in which royal women are assimilated to her (only one involves an explicit connection)[92] and no obvious connection exists that would tie Aphrodite's marine powers to royal ἑταῖραι, there is one obvious thing that both kinds of women have in common: both Lamia and Phila, for instance, had a sexual relationship with the same man, a man who was receiving cult in Athens and other places. Although Aphrodite's role as a sea goddess may be

88. On Aphrodite as a marine goddess, see Farnell 1971, 636–41; Pirenne-Delforgé 1994, 433–39, who contrasts Aphrodite's power to sooth or quiet the sea with Poseidon's powers over the sea, powers he often used to upset the oceans. Aphrodite had numerous cults on the sea shore and in harbors. On the Arsinoe cult at Zephyrium and Arsinoe's association with the marine aspects of Aphrodite, see Robert 1966, 200–208 and Fraser 1972, 1:245.

89. Granted Demetrius' role as a naval leader, it is possible that Phila's identification with Aphrodite related to the maritime aspects of the goddess' cults; Athenaeus 253c does say that the Athenians hymned that Demetrius was born of Poseidon and Aphrodite. It is more difficult to connect ἑταῖραι to naval power. Harpalus' courtesans had nothing to do with the sea, and the two Stratonices and the second Phila do not obviously relate to naval power. Certainly, only Arsinoe's cult at Zephyrium is explicitly so connected. Granted that the various assimilations of royal women and courtesans to Aphrodite seem to have a great deal to do with accessibility (see pp. 39–40 below), perhaps Aphrodite's role as a protector at sea, as the accessible deity who can intervene to preserve the individual, is a part of this more general role the cults to royal women played.

90. A story told about Phryne's trial at Athens (Ath. 590e–f) suggests that this sense of the powers of Aphrodite continued to be understood as frightening in some ways. (The story is probably a fiction [see Cooper 1995, 303–18], but it is the fact that it was told that signifies.) When it looked as though Phryne might lose, her defender Hyperides laid bare her bosom as he finished his emotional speech. According to the story, this made the jurors experience fear of the gods because of this servant and interpreter of Aphrodite, and so they spared her.

91. Vatin 1970, 42–43, 54.

92. Robert 1966, 198 suggests that *P Oxy.* 27 1962 offers good evidence that sacred law self-consciously distinguished (according to which sacrificial animals were accepted and which prohibited) the cult of Arsinoe associated with the marine aspects of Aphrodite from those cults associated with her more sexual aspects.

relevant to some of the assimilation cults where this aspect of the goddess' power is not explicitly attested, it cannot be coincidence that both courtesans and wives, sometimes of the same king, are assimilated to Aphrodite. They must have been understood to share the same powers. In literature, assimilation to Aphrodite may indeed be linked in part to beauty, but in cult, sexuality is the more frequent term of reference. In Greek myth people (particularly women) who have sexual relationships with gods are somehow transformed by the experience; in a number of cases they were deified.[93] Both royal wives and royal courtesans had power, recognized by cult, because of their sexual influence over godlike royal men. For mortal men, having sexual relations with Aphrodite, although prestigious, was risky.[94] That kings had sexual partners linked to Aphrodite obviously spoke to their own deified status. Associating their sexual partners with deities may have made men feel or think they looked more powerful; Greek cities clearly thought they would be pleased. If, as has been surmised, Arsinoe II herself helped to shape her association with Aphrodite in cult,[95] then this identification was one that appealed to royal women as well as royal men.[96]

Both royal courtesans and royal wives were public figures in a way that ordinary Greek women could never be, even in the somewhat more relaxed fourth-century and Hellenistic periods.[97] The images of both royal wives and ἑταῖραι appeared in the public places of Greek cities and the great panhellenic shrines. Both kinds of women commanded considerable wealth and might themselves fund statues, buildings, or charities. Both kinds of women were able to act, if only at times, independently. Royal wives and royal courtesans had, therefore, public power, and that power derived, ultimately, from their relationship—fundamentally sexual for both—to the kings, to the new powers that Greek cities had to cope with, develop working relationships with. To understand the women associated with the kings as Aphrodites was a way of recognizing their power (not their typicality) that was less unsettling and probably more meaningful than to understand them as Heras.

93. For instance, the sisters Ino and Semele (see Lyons 1997, 6).

94. So Loraux 1992, 21.

95. Pomeroy 1984, 30, pointing to Arsinoe's known sponsorship of the festival of Aphrodite and Adonis (Theoc. *Id.* 15.22–24), says that "She herself influenced the direction of her own dynastic cult"; see also Tondriau 1948c, p. 28, n. 31. Fraser 1972, 1:197 suggests that her mother may have preceded her as a patron of Aphrodite; Gutzwiller 1992, 363–65, agrees and believes that if Berenice herself did not initiate the identification with Aphrodite, her daughter did it for her.

96. Oakley and Sinos 1993, 47 argue that the scenes of bridal adornment (part of what they see as the growing romanticization of wedding scenes) depicted on Athenian wedding vases and intended for use by women "suggest that women of this time were not seen and did not see themselves simply as passive objects of men's manipulations, but rather as possessed of their own powerful and divinely sanctioned means of seduction." They also point (46) to similarities in scenes of brides receiving gifts to the gifts received by Aphrodite. One could suppose that royal women appreciated and even desired recognition of their grander erotic power.

97. Hawley 1993, 76 points to the great difference between the conventionally silent respectable women of Athens whose names were not even mentioned in public (see Schaps 1977, 323–30) and ἑταῖραι so notorious as to be the subject of many anecdotes in which their names are clearly assumed to be well known. The irony is that royal women also were named in public (often, like courtesans, without reference to the names of husbands or fathers [e.g., Hyp. *Pro Euxenippo* 19, 20, 24, 25]) and might even be the subject of anecdotes quite similar to those told about courtesans (see for instance Ath. 609c for an anecdote about Olympias).

The sources often criticize cults of ἑταῖραι.[98] Athenaeus and his source Theopompus (Ath. 595a–e) condemn Harpalus' cults of ἑταῖραι as showing contempt for the vengeance of the gods and for Alexander's powers. Plutarch (*Mor.* 753f) contrasts with seeming disapproval the cult to Bilistiche with her origins as a barbarian and slave. Similarly, Athenaeus puts the Athenian cults to Demetrius' courtesans in the context of extreme flattery (Ath. 252f) and treats the Theban cult of Lamia in the same fashion (Ath. 253b); he also puts the toast to Antigonus, the θεοὶ σωτῆρες, and Phila Aphrodite in the same context, flattery (Ath. 254a–b). This disapproval does not mean that these cults were generally disapproved of or even that those initiated by the kings themselves indicated their trivialization of either the ἑταίρα or the royal woman who received similar honors.[99] The statements reflect an intellectual tradition officially critical of apotheosis but also the curiously ambivalent attitude toward ἑταῖραι demonstrated by the many stories about them preserved in Athenaeus and often originating in comedy.[100] The tone of these references is difficult to capture. It combines self-satisfied moral disapproval, interest in explicit sexuality, and tacit approval of the public notoriety of these women. Ἑταῖραι were celebrities, not entirely subject to ordinary rules of conduct.

Cults to royal wives and royal ἑταῖραι, especially those instituted by people other than their husbands or lovers, had to do with power and accessibility to power. In the new Hellenistic world of rulers powerful as gods, cults for royal men helped to make them and their power accessible to the general populace, but were not enough. The cult of the women connected to these divinely powerful men made them and their power somehow yet more accessible, perhaps by highlighting their sexuality and domesticity, as the Aphrodite equation implies. The existence of these cults suggests a need to imagine power as both male and female, as is implied not only by female cult, but also by the creation of a female royal title and by other changes in the role of royal women in the Hellenistic period. Indeed, these cults for women associated with rulers form part of a collection of practices developed in the late fourth century that used royal women to help legitimize the newly emergent dynasties.[101]

Clemson University

LITERATURE CITED

Andronicos, M. 1984. *Vergina*. Athens.

Badian, E. 1981. The Deification of Alexander the Great. In *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*, 128–31. Thessaloniki.

98. Pomeroy 1984, 54.

99. A possibility suggested by Pomeroy 1984, 54, although not necessarily endorsed by her.

100. See Henry 1992, 250–68; Hawley 1993, 73–91, who warns (75) that the image of the ἑταίρα is a "constructed fiction." Davidson 1997, 134 notes that scholars have had a hard time determining where ἑταῖραι fit in Greek society, partly because of the kind of ambiguous treatment they received in many sources.

101. For instance, the development of a royal title for women (Carney 1991, 154–72) and of the custom of naming cities after royal women (Carney 1988, 134–42).

_____. 1996. Alexander the Great between Two Thrones and Heaven: Variations on an Old Theme. In *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity,* JRA Supplement no. 17, 11–26. Ann Arbor.

Billows, R. A. 1990. *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State.* Berkeley.

Borza, E. N. 1990. *In the Shadow of Olympus: The Emergence of Macedon.* Princeton.

Bosworth, A. B. 1988. *Conquest and Empire: The Reign of Alexander the Great.* Cambridge.

Breckenridge, J. D. 1968. *Likeness: A Conceptual History of Ancient Portraiture.* Evanston, IL.

Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion.* Cambridge, MA.

Cameron, A. 1990. Two Mistresses of Ptolemy Philadelphus. *GRBS* 31:287–311.

Carney, E. D. 1988. Eponymous Women: Royal Women and City Names. *AHB* 2:134–42.

_____. 1991. "What's in a Name?": The Emergence of a Title for Royal Women in the Hellenistic Period. In *Women's History and Ancient History,* ed. S. Pomeroy, 154–72. Chapel Hill.

_____. 1992. The Politics of Polygamy: Olympias, Alexander, and the Death of Philip II. *Historia* 41:169–89.

_____. 1995. Women and *Basileia:* Legitimacy and Female Political Action in Macedonia. *CJ* 90:367–91.

_____. 2000. *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia.* Norman, OK.

Cerfaux, L. and J. Tondriau. 1957. *Le Culte des souverains dans la civilisation gréco-romaine.* Tournai.

Clerc, D. 1915. *Les Theories relatives au culte des images chez les auteurs grecs du IIme siècle après J.-C.* Paris.

Cooper, C. 1995. Hyperides and the Trial of Phryne. *Phoenix* 40:303–18.

Davidson, J. N. 1997. *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens.* London.

Drees, L. 1968. *Olympia, Gods, Artists, Athletes.* New York.

Farnell, L. R. 1971. *The Cults of the Greek States.* Chicago.

Ferguson, W. S. 1911. *Hellenistic Athens: An Historical Essay.* New York.

Flower, M. A. 1988. Agesilaus of Sparta and the Origins of the Ruler Cult. *CQ* 38:123–34.

_____. 1997. *Theopompus of Chios.* Oxford.

Fraser, P. M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria.* Vol. 1. Oxford.

Fredricksmeyer, E. A. 1979. Divine Honors for Philip II. *TAPhA* 109:39–61.

Freedberg, D. 1989. *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response.* Chicago.

Friedrich, P. 1978. *The Meaning of Aphrodite.* Chicago.

Gardner, E. N. 1925. *Olympia, Its History and Remains.* Oxford.

Ginouvès, R. 1994. *Macedonia, from Philip II to the Roman Conquest.* Princeton.

Gordon, R. L. 1979. The Real and the Imaginary: Production and Religion in the Graeco-Roman World. *Art History* 2(1): 5–34.

Green, P. 1990. *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age.* Berkeley.

Griffiths, F. T. 1981. Home before Lunch: The Emancipated Woman in Theocritus. In *Reflections of Women in Antiquity,* ed. H. P. Foley, 247–73. Philadelphia.

Gryzbek, E. 1990. *Du calendrier macédonien au calendrier ptolémaïque.* Basel.

Gutzwiller, K. 1992. Callimachus' "Lock of Berenice": Fantasy, Romance, and Propaganda. *AJP* 113:359–85.

Habicht, C. 1970. *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte,* Zetemata 14. Munich.

Hammond, N. G. L. 1980. Some Passages in Arrian concerning Alexander. *CQ* 30:47–76.

_____. 1994. *Philip of Macedon.* Baltimore.

Havelock, C. M. 1971. *Hellenistic Art.* Greenwich, CT.

_____. 1995. *The Aphrodite of Knidos and Her Successors: A Historical Review of the Female Nude in Greek Art.* Ann Arbor.

Hawley, R. 1993. "Pretty, Witty, and Wise": Courtesans in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistai* Book 13. *International Journal of Moral and Social Studies* 8:73–91.

Henry, M. 1992. The Edible Woman: Athenaeus' Concept of the Pornographic. In *Pornography and Representation,* ed. A. Richlin, 250–68. New York.

Heyob, S. K. 1975. *The Cult of Isis among Women in the Graeco-Roman World.* Leiden.

Jaschinski, S. 1981. *Alexander und Griechenland unter dem Eindruck der Flucht des Harpalos.* Ph.D. diss., University of Bonn.

Kahrstedt, U. 1910. Frauen auf antiken Münzen. *Klio* 10:261–314.

Kassel, R. 1983. Dialoge mit Statuen. *ZPE* 51:1–12.

Koch, W. 1923. Die ersten Ptolemäerinnen nach ihren Münzen. *ZfN* 34:67–106.

Kron, U. 1996. Priesthoods, Dedications, and Euergetism: What Part Did Religion Play in the Political and Social Status of Greek Women? In *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World,* Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium of 1993, ed. P. Hellström and B. Alroth, 139–82. Boreas, Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations, 24. Uppsala.

Lane Fox, R. 1974. *Alexander the Great.* New York.

_____. 1986. Theopompus of Chios and the Greek World, 411–322. In *Chios: A Conference at the Homereion in Chios,* ed. J. Boardman and C. E. Vaphopoulou-Richardson, 105–20. Oxford.

Le Bohec, S. 1993. Les Reines de Macédoine de la mort d'Alexandre à celle de Persée. *CCG* 4:229–45.

Loraux, N. 1992. What Is a Goddess? In *A History of Women in the West,* vol. 1, ed. P. Schmitt Pantel, trans. A. Goldhammer, 11–44. Cambridge, MA and London.

Lyons, D. 1997. *Gender and Immortality: Heroines in Ancient Greek Myth and Cult.* Princeton.

Macurdy, G. H. 1932. *Hellenistic Queens.* Baltimore.

Mallwitz, A. 1972. *Olympia und seine Bauten.* Munich.

Miller, S. G. 1973. The Philippeion and Macedonian Hellenistic Architecture. *MDAI(A)* 88:189–218.

Mirón Pérez, M. D. 1998a. Cómo convertirse en diosa: Mujeres y divinidad en la Antigüedad Clásica. *Arenal* 5 (1): 23–46.

_____. 1998b. Olimpia, Euridice y el origen del culto dinastico en la Grecia helenistica. *Florllib.* 9:215–35.

Mortensen, K. 1992. Eurydice: Demonic or Devoted Mother? *AHB* 6:156–71.

Neumer-Pfau, W. 1982. *Studien zur Ikonographie und gesellschaftlichen Funktion hellenistischer Aphrodite-Statuen.* Bonn.

Nock, A. D. 1928. Notes on Ruler Cult, 1–4. *JHS* 48:21–42.

_____. 1930. Sunnaos Theos. *HSPh* 41:1–62.

_____. 1944. The Cult of Heroes. *HThR* 37:141–70.

Oakley, J. H. and R. H. Sinos. 1993. *The Wedding in Ancient Athens.* Madison.

O'Brien, J. V. 1993. *The Transformation of Hera. A Study of Ritual, Hero, and the Goddess in the "Iliad."* Lanham, MD.

Parke, H. W. 1977. *Festivals of the Athenians.* Ithaca.

Pirenne-Delforgé, V. 1994. *L' Aphrodite grecque: Contribution à l' étude de ses cultes et de sa personalité dans le panthéon archaïque et classique.* Kernos suppl. 4. Athens and Liège.

Pollitt, J. J. 1986. *Art in the Hellenistic Age.* Cambridge.

Pomeroy, S. B. 1975. *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity.* New York.

_____. 1984. *Women in Hellenistic Egypt.* New York.

Préaux, C. 1978. *Le Monde hellénistique.* Paris.

Price, S. R. F. 1984a. Gods and Emperors: The Greek Language of the Roman Imperial Cult. *JHS* 104:79–95.

_____. 1984b. *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor.* Cambridge.

Quirke, S. 1992. *Ancient Egyptian Religion.* New York.

Raubitschek, A. 1941. Phryne. *RE* 20(1): 893.

Rice, E. 1993. The Glorious Dead: Commemoration of the Fallen and Portrayal of Victory in the Late Classical and Hellenistic World. In *War and Society in the Greek World,* ed. J. Rich and G. Shipley, 224–57. London and New York.

Richter, G. M. 1965. *The Portraits of the Greeks.* London.

Ridgway, B. S. 1987. Ancient Greek Women and Art: The Material Evidence. *AJA* 91:399–409.

Robert, L. 1966. Sur un décret d'Ilion et sur un papyrus concernant des cultes royaux. *American Studies in Papyrology* 1:175–211.

Robins, G. 1993. *Women in Ancient Egypt.* Cambridge, MA.

Roccos, L. J. 1995. The Kanephoros and Her Festival Mantle in Greek Art. *AJA* 99:641–66.

Roy, J. 1998. The Masculinity of the Hellenistic King. In *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power, and Identity in Classical Antiquity,* ed. L. Foxhall and J. Salmon, 111–35. London and New York.

Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, C. 1993. Skepseis me Aphorme ena Eurema apo ta Palatitsia. *MDAI(A)* 5 (3):1139–71.

Savalli-Lestrade, I. 1994. Il ruolo pubblico delle regine ellenistiche. In *Ἱστορίη: Studi offerti dagli allievi a Giuseppe Nenci in occasione del suo settantesimo compleanno,* ed. S. Alessandrì, 415–32. Puglia.

Schaps, D. 1977. The Women Least-Mentioned: Etiquette and Women's Names. *CQ* 27:323–30.

Schleif, H. 1944. Das Philippeion: Baubeschreibung. In *Olympische Forschungen,* vol. 1, ed. E. Kunze and H. Schleif, 3–24. Berlin.

Scott, K. 1928. The Deification of Demetrius Poliorcetes. *AJPh* 49(2,3): 137–66, 217–39.

_____. 1931. The Significance of Statues in Precious Metals in Emperor Worship. *TAPhA* 62:101–23.

Shafer, B. E. 1991. *Religion in Ancient Egypt: Gods, Myths, and Personal Practice.* Ithaca and London.

Simon, E. 1983. *Festivals of Attica.* Madison.

Smith, R. R. 1988. *Hellenistic Royal Portraits.* Oxford.

Taeger, F. 1957. *Charisma: Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes.* Stuttgart.

Tondriau, J. 1948a. Princesses ptolémaïques comparées ou identifiées à des déesses (IIIe–Ier siècles avant J. C.). *Bulletin de la Société royale d'archéologie d'Alexandrie* 37:12–33.

_____. 1948b. Les Souveraines lagides en déesses, au IIIième siècle avant J.-C. *Études de papyrologie* 7:1–15.

_____. 1948c. Comparisons and Identifications of the Rulers with Deities in the Hellenistic Period. *Review of Religion* 13:24–47.

_____. 1956. La Divinisation de la beauté: Figure littéraire et thème religieux. In *Studi in onore di A. Calderini e R. Paribeni,* vol. 1, 15–22. Milan.

Van Bremen, R. 1996. *The Limits of Participation: Women and Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic Period and Roman Periods.* Amsterdam.

Vatin, C. 1970. *Recherches sur le mariage et la condition de la femme marriée à l'époque hellénistique.* Paris.

Vermeule, E. 1979. *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Poetry.* Berkeley.

Vickers, M. 1972. Hellenistic Thessaloniki. *JHS* 92:156–70.

Walbank, F. W. 1984. Monarchies and Monarchic Ideas. In *The Cambridge Ancient History.* 2d ed. Vol. 7, pt. 1, *The Hellenistic World,* ed. F. W. Walbank and A. E. Astin. Cambridge and New York.

Wiesner, J. 1939. Olympia (Philippeion). *RE* 18.1:105–7.

Wikander, C. 1996. Religion, Political Power, and Gender—The Building of a Cult-Image. In *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium of 1993,* ed. P. Hellström and B. Alroth, 183–88. Boreas, Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations, 24. Uppsala.

Zschietzschmann, W. 1944. Das Philippeion: Baugeschichte. In *Olympische Forschungen,* vol. 1, ed. E. Kunze and H. Schleif, 24–52. Berlin.