



Culture and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt: The Museum and Library of Alexandria

Andrew Erskine

Greece & Rome, 2nd Ser., Vol. 42, No. 1. (Apr., 1995), pp. 38-48.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0017-3835%28199504%292%3A42%3A1%3C38%3ACAPIPE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-3>

Greece & Rome is currently published by The Classical Association.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/classical.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CULTURE AND POWER IN PTOLEMAIC EGYPT: THE MUSEUM AND LIBRARY OF ALEXANDRIA

By ANDREW ERSKINE

Within the palace complex in Alexandria, the city founded by Alexander in Egypt, a community of scholars was established in what was known as the Museum (or Mouseion); linked to this was a library, the Great Library of Alexandria. These two institutions are often celebrated for their role in the history of scholarship, but they were also the products of the Hellenistic age and of the competition which arose between the successors of Alexander. In many ways these two institutions encapsulate the ideology and policy of the early Ptolemies. It is the purpose of this paper to explore this aspect and set them in a wider context.

In spite of the famous intellectuals who worked in Alexandria, men such as Euclid, Callimachus, and Eratosthenes, the evidence for the Museum and Library is very poor. It is not even certain whether they were founded by Ptolemy I or II, although it is most likely that they were set up under the first Ptolemy and developed under the second.¹ But paucity of evidence has not prevented debate.² My concern here is not with the form of these institutions, but rather with the fact of their existence at all. It is useful, however, to begin by presenting an outline of each institution.

The Museum was a community of scholars which was both academic and religious. It was religious in so far as it was centred on a shrine of the Muses, the Greek deities of artistic and intellectual pursuits, hence the name, the Museum. These scholars were engaged in the study of science (for instance, medicine, mathematics, astronomy) and in the study of literature (editing the major Greek texts such as Homer). As well as studying they seem also to have acted as teachers. The number of members is unknown, as are most of their names. They all appear to have been supported by the kings who provided them with pay and meals.³ This did not please everyone – Timon of Phlius, a contemporary writer of polemical verse, attacked the Museum in the following lines:⁴

In the populous land of Egypt there is a crowd of bookish scribblers who get fed as they argue away interminably in the chicken coop of the Muses.

A less prejudiced view of the Museum is found in the geographer Strabo's description of the city of Alexandria. Although brief and written almost

300 years after the establishment of the Museum, this is still our earliest informative account:

The city has extremely beautiful public precincts and also the royal palaces, which cover a fourth or even a third of the whole city area. For just as each of the kings, from love of splendour, would add some ornament to the public monuments, so at his own expense he would provide himself with a residence in addition to the existing ones, so that now in the words of the poet 'there is building upon building'. But all are linked with each other and with the harbour, even those which lie outside it. The Museum is also part of the palace complex; it has a covered walkway, a hall with seats (exedra) and a large house, in which there is a common dining hall for the learned men who share the Museum. This group of men have communal possessions and a priest in charge of the Museum, who used to be appointed by the kings but is now appointed by Caesar.⁵

Strabo does not mention the Library in his discussion of Alexandria and our knowledge of the building is negligible. Was it part of the Museum or a separate building? Nor is much known of the organization of the Library. There was always a librarian in charge, presumably appointed by the king, since the librarian often acted as tutor to the royal family. A papyrus found at Oxyrhynchus provides the names of most of the librarians of the third and second centuries B.C.⁶ It is clear from our evidence, scrappy as it is, that the Ptolemies made a determined effort to obtain as many books as possible for their library. Buying up books in the book markets of Athens and Rhodes was one way of increasing the collection,⁷ but the Ptolemies also turned to more extreme methods. According to Galen all books found on board ships that docked in Alexandria were seized, taken away, and copied. Then the copies, not the originals, were returned to the owners. The books acquired in this way were marked 'from the ships'. The Athenians, perhaps, should have known better than to lend one of the Ptolemies their precious official edition of the tragedies of Sophocles, Aeschylus, and Euripides, even if he did give them 15 talents as a security. The king kept the originals and returned the copies with the small consolation that they were produced on the very best papyrus available.⁸ Whatever the truth of these stories the view prevailed that the Library's appetite for books was voracious. Some even suggested that the Ptolemies wished to acquire copies of all books ever written, though translated into Greek first.⁹

When modern scholars seek to explain the foundation of the Museum and Library they often look to Aristotle. There are several reasons for this. First, there is the explicit testimony of Strabo, who says that Aristotle taught the kings of Egypt how to organize their library. Clearly this cannot be literally true; Aristotle was dead by the time Ptolemy gained control of Egypt. It is most likely that Strabo means that the organization of material

in the Library was modelled on Aristotle's own private library.¹⁰ Secondly, to establish a group of scholars as a Museum, in other words focused round a shrine of the Muses, might seem odd in itself, but it could be explained if it were modelled on Aristotle's own school in Athens, which *was* organized as a Museum. Aristotle's school, the Lyceum, had a shrine of the Muses, a library, and a stress on community.¹¹ There certainly are connections between the early Ptolemies and Aristotle's successors in what became known as the Peripatetic School. The first Ptolemy had a Peripatetic as a tutor for his son and this tutor Strato went on to become head of the Peripatetic School in Athens.¹² But a more important Peripatetic connection is believed to have been Demetrius of Phalerum, who in addition to being a Peripatetic philosopher was also tyrant of Athens. After his overthrow in 307 the failed tyrant fled to Cassander and about ten years later arrived in Alexandria where he was sheltered by Ptolemy.¹³ At least one source suggests that he was in charge of Ptolemy's book-buying programme.¹⁴ As a result it is Demetrius who is thought to provide the link between Aristotle's school and the Museum and Library of Alexandria. Essentially this view holds that the Museum and Library were set up because Demetrius of Phalerum went to Alexandria and suggested it to Ptolemy, who was sufficiently impressed to put it into action. But this Aristotelian link only provides a partial explanation. Ptolemy need not have accepted Demetrius' suggestion.

Further explanation is found in the traditional monarchic practice of patronizing intellectuals and creative artists. Pindar had been at the court of Hieron in Sicily, Euripides at the court of the Macedonian king Archelaus, and Plato had visited the Syracusan tyrants.¹⁵ But Ptolemy is providing something different: it is an institution for intellectuals. It is the sponsorship of scholarly activity rather than the sponsorship of individuals and consequently there is less emphasis on creative artists, such as playwrights and poets who might be expected to glorify the monarch in their verses.¹⁶ What the Ptolemies are doing is on a far larger scale than anything done before – it is institutional patronage that continues from generation to generation. They provide not only money but the necessary facilities, including a library. Yet, the Library becomes an end in itself – the object is to collect as many books as possible. Some sources report that the Library contained as many as half a million scrolls.¹⁷ Such a library, which was in effect a state library, dwarfed the small private libraries of the past.

Although Aristotelian influence and traditional monarchic patronage are relevant to our understanding of the Museum and Library, they fail to

account for the attraction of these institutions to the Ptolemies. What they offer instead are precedents or at least approximate precedents. In order to explain why the Museum and Library were able to develop into such an important pair of institutions, it is necessary to interpret them in the context of the Hellenistic world and in particular in the context of the new kingdom of the Ptolemies, its ideology, and its needs.

On the death of Alexander Ptolemy had seized power in Egypt. Lacking any basis for his rule apart from force he sought to provide himself with a tradition by placing great emphasis on his own links with Alexander. In this way he attempted to legitimize his own position, particularly in the eyes of the Greeks. Invoking Alexander's name could also reflect aspirations of greater conquests. The focus was on Alexander from the very beginning of Ptolemy's reign, when Ptolemy dramatically kidnapped Alexander's body and brought it to Egypt. The body was first taken to Memphis, the traditional capital of Egypt. But when Ptolemy moved the capital to Alexandria, the body went too. There in Alexandria it was put in a gold sarcophagus, which was later replaced with a glass one. The Mausoleum in which the body lay was located within the palace complex, thus making clear the association between Alexander and Ptolemy. The body remained there at least until the time of Octavian's visit to Alexandria.¹⁸

Ptolemy's guardianship of Alexander's body marked him out as Alexander's heir and made him special. This association was reinforced in other ways, for instance by moving the court to Alexandria, a city named after Alexander and founded by him. Alexander also became incorporated into the religious framework of the Greeks of Egypt – a cult of Alexander was set up, which eventually became a dynastic cult,¹⁹ thus firmly linking the Ptolemaic dynasty with Alexander. Further publicity was given to Ptolemy's relationship with Alexander by the publication of Ptolemy's memoirs, which not surprisingly highlighted his own role in Alexander's campaigns.²⁰ It was also suggested that if the Ptolemaic family tree was traced back to about 500 B.C., it would link up with Alexander's family.²¹ Indeed some stories even suggested that Ptolemy's father was not Lagus at all but Philip II, the father of Alexander.²²

This focus on Alexander was of crucial importance to the Ptolemies; it gave the dynasty legitimacy and a tradition. It is in this context that the establishment of the Museum and Library should be placed. Aristotle had been at the court of Philip II in Macedon where he had acted as tutor to the young Alexander.²³ By founding and sponsoring an intellectual community in the manner of Aristotle's school, Ptolemy is again emphasizing the connection and similarity between himself and Alexander. It was Aristotle

who taught Alexander and, as Strabo says, it was Aristotle who taught the kings of Egypt how to organize their library.

Not only did the Library and Museum help to provide a political and dynastic link with Alexander; they also gave the Greek inhabitants of Egypt a cultural link to their own Greek past. One effect of the newly created Hellenistic kingdoms was the imposition of Greek cities occupied by Greeks on an alien landscape. In Egypt there was a native Egyptian population with its own culture, history, and traditions. The Greeks who came to Egypt, to the court or to live in Alexandria, were separated from their original cultures. Alexandria was the main Greek city of Egypt and within it there was an extraordinary mix of Greeks from many cities and backgrounds, all with different civic, social, and religious traditions behind them.²⁴ There would be no *one* tradition to look back to, a tradition which would unite the people. A contrast can be made here with colonies, for instance those sent out from Greek cities in the eighth to sixth centuries B.C. A mother city sends out a colony of its own citizens who establish a new city – but because the colonists all come from the same city they can continue the traditions of the mother city.²⁵

So a Graeco-Macedonian surface was imposed on Egypt, but this surface lacked a unifying tradition – except for a common Greekness. Setting up the Museum and Library is the setting up of a centre of Greek culture and intellectual life in the city. It helps to fill the cultural vacuum that exists within the city. Adopting the practices of Aristotle's school, studying the text of Homer, acquiring the official texts of the Athenian tragedies all help to establish some sense of continuity with a Greek past. The average Alexandrian Greek may have had little knowledge of this or indeed much interest in what went on in the Museum and Library, but these institutions would still be important symbols of this continuity and Greekness.²⁶

So the Ptolemaic kingdom may appear abruptly in Egypt without roots, but the Museum and Library link the new kingdom and its Greek inhabitants to Alexander and to a Greek past and present. It is because they help to supply this need that they survive and strengthen. And the more they survive the more they themselves act not as links with a tradition but as the tradition itself. Consequently these institutions can gain still more strength.

The Ptolemaic emphasis on Greek culture establishes the Greeks of Egypt with an identity for themselves. It also enables this Greek identity to be projected outwards to a wider Greek world, all the more important if there is a feeling that Macedonians are not real Greeks.²⁷ But the emphasis

on Greek culture does even more than this – these are Greeks ruling in a foreign land. The more Greeks can indulge in their own culture, the more they can exclude non-Greeks, in other words Egyptians, the subjects whose land has been taken over. The assertion of Greek culture serves to enforce Egyptian subjection. So the presence in Alexandria of two institutions devoted to the preservation and study of Greek culture acts as a powerful symbol of Egyptian exclusion and subjection. Texts from other cultures could be kept in the library, but only once they had been translated, that is to say Hellenized.

Yet, at the same time, this need for separateness also reflects a fear that the Egyptians might pose a threat to the Greeks' own cultural identity. A reading of Alexandrian poetry might easily give the impression that Egyptians did not exist at all; indeed Egypt itself is hardly mentioned except for the Nile and the Nile flood, both of which had been well-known among Greeks since at least the time of Herodotus.²⁸ This omission of the Egypt and Egyptians from poetry masks a fundamental insecurity. It is no coincidence that one of the few poetic references to Egyptians presents them as muggers.²⁹

A dramatic expression of Greek identity came in the form of a spectacular religious procession which took place in Alexandria in the early third century B.C. The only source for this procession is a lengthy description in Athenaeus, who found his information in a book called 'On Alexandria' by a certain Callixinus of Rhodes.³⁰ It is not known how common such events were in Alexandria. The emphasis in the surviving account of the procession is on Dionysus but it is evident that he was not the only god honoured in the celebration. The visual impact would have been tremendous, as some examples will demonstrate. There was a four-wheeled float, 21 ft long on which was a 15 ft statue of Dionysus, dressed in purple, saffron, and gold and surrounded by gold objects. It took 180 men to drag this float along. It was followed by an extraordinary statue, which was drawn by 60 men. This statue surprised the crowd by standing up mechanically, pouring a libation of milk, and then sitting down again. On another float pulled by 300 men there was an enormous wine press in which 60 men dressed as Satyrs trampled on ripe grapes and sang. The procession also consisted of numerous animals: there were 2,400 dogs including Indian, Hyrcanian, and Molossian dogs, sheep from Ethiopia, Arabia, and Euboea, cows from India and Ethiopia. Then there were more exotic animals: leopards, cheetahs, lions, a giraffe, an Ethiopian rhinoceros, and cages of all sorts of birds. The procession concluded with a display of Ptolemaic military forces, consisting of over 57,000 infantry and over

23,000 cavalry. Ptolemy's control over both the human and the natural world is forcefully demonstrated.³¹

This procession is very revealing about Ptolemaic Egypt. In essence it is a religious procession, but its magnificence and its content transform it into something more than this. For anyone watching, whether they are foreigners, who might be paying a visit or there on a diplomatic mission, or Alexandrian Greeks or native Egyptians, the procession hammers out the message of Ptolemy's enormous wealth and power.³² For Alexandrian Greeks, both those watching and those taking part, it will be a celebration and affirmation of Greekness. But it is even more than this; it is also a procession shouting out Greek superiority to any native Egyptians who happen to be in the vicinity. Thus in a popular, visual form the procession embodies those same elements which were observed above in the case of the Library and Museum.

But the procession also reflects Ptolemaic aspirations to rule. On one level these aspirations are represented by the very fact of the procession, but they are also visible in the detail of the images used in the procession. There was a float on which statues of Alexander and Ptolemy stood together, thus emphasizing the association between Alexander and Ptolemy. Alongside Ptolemy was placed a statue representing the city of Corinth. This is rather enigmatic but it is most likely that it represents the League of Corinth, the League of Greek cities set up by Philip of Macedon and used by Alexander for the war against Persia. The implication here is that Ptolemy was now heir to Alexander's leadership of the Greek cities of the mainland. Thus the next float contained expensively dressed women, who are said by Athenaeus to represent 'the cities of Ionia and the rest of the Greek cities of Asia and the islands which had been subdued by the Persians'. As this cart followed Alexander and Ptolemy, it again suggests the leadership of Alexander and his heir Ptolemy, this time over Greeks won by Alexander from the Persians. So Ptolemy is emphasizing his claim to leadership over the Greeks.³³ This claim or even assertion of leadership can be found in the reigns of both Ptolemy I and Ptolemy II. The first Ptolemy announced himself to be the champion of Greek freedom, the second is praised by the court poet Theocritus for the extent of his rule outside Egypt, and praised by the League of the Islands of the Aegean for all the benefits he has given the islands and the rest of the Greeks.³⁴ At the time of the Chremonidean War the Athenians described Ptolemy II as following the policy of his ancestor by showing his enthusiasm for the common freedom of the Greeks.³⁵ In these statements they were echoing the image Ptolemy II was himself projecting.

The Ptolemies not only sought to be the political leaders of the Greek world; the foundation of the Museum and Library reveals that they also sought to be the cultural leaders. Being cultural leaders was a reflection of their aspiration to political leadership. The scholars of Alexandria came from all over the Ptolemaic Empire and beyond. Eratosthenes and Callimachus came from Cyrene, Aristophanes from Byzantium, Philitas from Cos, and Theocritus from as far afield as Syracuse. So just as the Ptolemies sought to establish control over other Greek states, so they also sought to establish control over Greek culture. They went about in just the same way – seizing books from ships, tricking foreign states into relinquishing them, practices such as these might seem more like the high-handed attitude of an imperial power than a book collector. The aim was all Greek books, thus a monopoly of Greek culture. They wanted Homer, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, the works of Aristotle. And there is something imperialist in the treatment of the books themselves – organizing them, cataloguing them, and editing them. Callimachus must have spent many years on his work entitled *Tables of persons eminent in every branch of learning, together with a list of their writings* or *Tables* (Πίνακες) for short. It was written in 120 books and was divided according to subject or genre, Table of Orators, Table of Philosophers, Table of Lyric Poets, etc. Each author was listed alphabetically with a short biography and a list of titles of their works and for good measure the total number of lines in each work.³⁶

One of the main industries of the Museum and Library was the production of definitive editions of the great works of Greek literature, especially Homer. The editing of Homer was undertaken as early as the first librarian, Zenodotus, and successive scholars worked on new versions, most famously Aristarchus, the librarian in the late third century. But it was not just Homer who got the editorial treatment. Aristophanes of Byzantium produced editions of Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, and his namesake Aristophanes.³⁷ In cataloguing and editing these texts in this (comparatively) systematic way the scholars of the Museum and Library were exerting their control over the Greek cultural heritage. The new Hellenistic world has an effect here too. As far as the scholars of Alexandria are concerned it is a *Greek* cultural heritage, not one divided into Athenian, Theban, etc. Callimachus' *Tables* are divided by genre, not by geography. This reflects the mixed nature of Alexandrian society at this time.

So the Ptolemies not only exerted power over Greek states they also exerted it over Greek literature. They acted as political leaders of Greece, both in ruling Greek states and supporting them – at different times they provided financial aid to both the Achaean League and the Spartans.³⁸

Corresponding to this was their role as cultural leaders. In this capacity they presented a gymnasium together with a library to the city of Athens, a gift from the new cultural capital of Greece to the old.³⁹ The Museum and Library made Alexandria the focus for intellectuals from throughout Greece. Furthermore the Ptolemies gained prestige not simply because they possessed the Museum and Library but as a result of association with the contents of these institutions. They possessed definitive copies of Homer, the Athenian tragedies, and other important works.

A sign of the wider political significance of the Museum and Library in the Greek world is the way that they were copied by the upstart kingdom of the Attalids in Pergamum. By the second century the Ptolemies were weaker than they had been and the Attalids exploited this weakness to gain more power for themselves. In addition to taking over Ptolemaic possessions in Asia Minor they acted as benefactors of the Greeks both politically and culturally.⁴⁰ Thus they offered funding to the Achaean League and, as the Ptolemies had done before them, they put up public buildings in Athens, the famous Stoas of Attalus and Eumenes.⁴¹ Again, therefore, there was the emphasis on Athens. But their emulation of the Ptolemies went further than this, because they also set up their own library and intellectual centre at Pergamum.⁴² They then proceeded to try and poach Alexandrian scholars including the librarian of Alexandria himself, Aristophanes of Byzantium, a man famous for his knowledge of the Library's organization. The Ptolemies reacted firmly to this; Aristophanes never got to Pergamum, but was put in prison in Alexandria and he stayed there until he died.⁴³ The Ptolemies took further steps to put a premature end to this new royal library. Their secret weapon in this cultural war was their control over the supply of papyrus. Pliny the Elder tells us that the Ptolemies banned the export of papyrus; it is unclear whether this only applied to Pergamum or was a general ban or indeed whether the whole affair has been exaggerated.⁴⁴ This drastic measure failed to put an end to the Pergamene Library which resorted to the use of animal skin instead. So by the second century the Alexandrian Library was seen as a potent political symbol which the Ptolemies would fight to protect. One consequence of this rivalry was the rise in the number of forged manuscripts on the market in that period and afterwards.⁴⁵ Original manuscripts and previously unknown works by famous authors were much in demand. Each library wanted something the other one did not possess.

But the important point is that these two kingdoms were competing with each other for prominence and prestige in the Greek world. And these

institutions and their success were symbols of the power of the kingdoms. So their establishment was not a simple academic exercise but had wider political significance.

NOTES

1. P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford, 1972), i. 321–2, 469 n. 69, 475 n. 13, R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 95–102.
2. In addition to Fraser and Pfeiffer, note recently L. Canfora, *The Vanished Library* (London, 1989, originally published in Italian, Palermo 1987), R. Blum, *Kallimachus: the Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography* (Madison, Wisconsin, 1991, originally published in German, Frankfurt, 1977), M. El-Abbadi, *The Life and Fate of the Ancient Library of Alexandria* (Unesco, Paris, 1990), G. Weber, *Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft: die Rezeption von Zeitgeschichte an Hof der ersten drei Ptolemäer* (Stuttgart, 1993), pp. 56–101.
3. On the Museum in general, Fraser, op. cit. (n. 1), i. 312–19; on pay, op. cit., 310–11, Athen. 11.493e–94b, Vitruvius 7 Pref. 8; on meals, Strabo 17.793–4, quoted below.
4. Timon Fr. 60 W (Diels 12), Athen. 1.22d.
5. Strabo 17.793–4.
6. *P. Oxy.* 1241; Fraser, op. cit. (n. 1), i. 322–3.
7. Athen. 1.3b.
8. Galen, *Comm. in Hipp. Epid.* iii, CMG 5.10.2.1, pp. 78–9, quoted in Fraser, op. cit. (n. 1), i. 480 n. 147. Galen's views may have been coloured by the fact that he was a native of Alexandria's erstwhile rival Pergamum.
9. In general, Ps. Aristeas, 9–10, followed by John Tzetzes in G. Kaibel, *Com. Graec. Frag.*, p. 19f. (Pb), on which Blum, op. cit. (n. 2), pp. 104–13. Pfeiffer, op. cit. (n. 1), pp. 99–102. Texts included the Pentateuch (Ps. Aristeas), probably also Zoroaster (Pliny, *N.H.* 30.4), and Egyptian texts translated by Manetho, on all of which Fraser, op. cit., i. 329–30, 505–11.
10. Strabo 13.608.
11. Library, Strabo 13.608–9; the will of Theophrastus (head of school 322–c.286) refers to the Museum and emphasizes the communal nature of the school, D.L. 5.51–7; Fraser, op. cit. (n. 1), i. 312–16 stresses the similarities though J. P. Lynch, *Aristotle's School* (Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1974), pp. 121–3, would minimize them.
12. D.L. 5.58.
13. D.L. 5.75–85.
14. Ps. Aristeas, 9–10, followed by John Tzetzes in G. Kaibel, *Com. Graec. Frag.*, p. 19f. (Pb).
15. On these, Weber, op. cit. (n. 2), pp. 33–53.
16. This is not to diminish Alexandrian poetry, but it is only part of more extensive Ptolemaic patronage.
17. John Tzetzes, op. cit. (n. 9), gives almost half a million, while Aul. Gell. 7.17.3 gives c. 700,000.
18. Kidnapping and sarcophagus: Strabo 17.794, Diod. 18.26–8, Arrian *FGH* 156 F.9.25, 10.1, Paus. 1.6.3. Octavian visited the body and accidentally knocked off part of the nose, Dio 51.16.
19. Fraser, op. cit. (n. 1), i. 215–19.
20. Arrian 1.1; C. Bradford Welles, 'The Reliability of Ptolemy as an Historian' in *Miscellanea di Studi Alessandrini in Memoria di A. Rostagni* (Turin, 1963), pp. 101–16, R. M. Errington, *CQ* 19 (1969), 233–42.
21. Fraser, op. cit. (n. 1), i. 45, ii. 123 n.62.
22. Pausanias, 1.6.2.
23. Plut. *Alex.* 7–8; F. L. Vatai, *Intellectuals in Politics in the Greek World* (London, 1984), pp. 112–16.
24. Fraser, op. cit. (n. 1), i. 38–74.
25. A. J. Graham, *CAH²* iii. 3, 153–5.
26. Cf. G. Zanker, *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry* (London, 1987), pp. 19–22, who places Alexandrian poetry in the context of a need for cultural continuity. More recently, in Sarajevo, it was the role of the National Library of Bosnia Herzegovina as a cultural symbol that contributed to its destruction in August 1992.

27. Herod. 5.22, Dem. 9.31; E. Badian, 'Greeks and Macedonians' in B. Barr-Shar and E. N. Borza (edd.), *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Hellenistic Times* (Washington, 1982), pp. 33–51.
28. Herod. 2.19–27. On Egypt in Alexandrian poetry, Weber, op. cit. (n. 2), pp. 369–99.
29. Theoc. 15.46–50, a passage played down by R. L. Hunter, 'Greek and non-Greek in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius' in S. Said (ed.), *ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΜΟΣ* (Leiden, 1991), pp. 81–99. On Greek/Egyptian relations, note also A. E. Samuels, *The Shifting Sands of History: Interpretations of Ptolemaic Egypt* (Lanham/New York, 1989), pp. 35–49.
30. Athen. 5.197–203, *FGH* 627 F2; E. E. Rice *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Oxford, 1983) with text.
31. On the role of animals, see K. M. Coleman, 'Ptolemy Philadelphus and the Roman amphitheatre' in W. J. Slater (ed.), *Roman Theatre and Society* (Ann Arbor, forthcoming 1995).
32. Perhaps reinforced by the presence of a 180 ft gold phallus in the procession, Athen. 5.201e.
33. Athen. 5.201d–e; on these statues and their interpretation, Rice, op. cit. (n. 30), pp. 102–10.
34. Diod. 19.62.1–2, 20.37.2; Theoc. 17.77–94; *SIG*³ 390, esp. lines 10–20.
35. *SIG*³ 434–5, lines 15–20.
36. Blum, op. cit. (n. 2), pp. 124–81, Fraser, op. cit. (n. 1), i. 452–4, F. Schmidt, *Die Pinakes des Kallimachos* (Berlin, 1922).
37. On Alexandrian scholarship, Pfeiffer, op. cit. (n. 1), pp. 87–233, Fraser, op. cit. i. 447–79.
38. Plut. *Arat.* 41, *Cleom.* 22, Polyb. 2.51.
39. In general, Polyb. 5.106.6–8, C. Habicht, *Classical Antiquity* 11 (1992), 68–90; gymnasium with library (the Ptolemaion), Paus. 1.17.2, *The Athenian Agora*, vol. 3 *Literary and Epigraphic Testimonia*, ed. R. E. Wycherley (Princeton, 1957), pp. 142–4, nos. 456–63 (460, 461 on library), Habicht, *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit* (Göttingen, 1982), pp. 112–17.
40. Polyb. 32.8.5, Livy 42.5.3; Habicht, *CAH*² viii. 331, 376.
41. Achaea, Polyb. 22.1; Athens, J. M. Camp, *The Athenian Agora* (London, 1992), pp. 172–5, Vitruv. 5.9.1.
42. Pfeiffer, op. cit. (n. 1), pp. 234–51, E. V. Hansen, *The Attalids of Pergamum* (Ithaca, 1971²), pp. 390–433. The evidence for the Library is collected in J. Platthy, *Sources on the Earliest Greek Libraries* (Amsterdam, 1968). Much of it stresses the rivalry between Pergamum and Alexandria.
43. *Vit. Aristoph.* (p. 362 West), quoted in Fraser, op. cit. (n. 1), ii. 662. His knowledge of the Library was revealed when he uncovered plagiarism in a poetry competition, Vitruv. 7 Pref. 5–7.
44. Pliny, *N.H.* 13.70.
45. So Galen, *Comm. in Hipp. De Nat Hom.*, *CMG* 5.9.1, pp. 55, 57, quoted in Fraser, op. cit. (n. 1), ii. 481 n. 150.

My thanks to Kathleen Coleman, Malcolm Latham, and Theresa Urbainczyk for help and comments.