

ABSTRACT

The Antithesis of ὕβρις and Humility in the Pursuit of Glory: A Christological Contour of Beauty

David E. Folks

Director: Jeffrey Fish, Ph.D.

Ὑβρις permeates ancient Greek literature and history. From epic to ancient kings, notions of self-exaltation are abundant. Men try to make themselves into gods and face the consequences. Comparatively, Jesus of Nazareth demonstrates humility, despite ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων (“being in the form of God”). The antithesis between Jesus and the civilization of ὕβρις before him is worthy of aesthetic consideration. In this thesis, I provide a theological aesthetic through which to see the beauty of Christ’s humility in the *Carmen Christi* (Philippians 2:6-11) against the ὕβρις identified through Greek history and literature. This takes place in three parts: 1) I establish a theological aesthetic by which to conduct my examination; 2) Through Homer, Solon, and ruler cults I examine the language of ὕβρις, its causes, and its consequences; 3) I elucidate the humility of Christ aesthetically in comparison to its Greek counterpart to contemplate its anthropological implications.

APPROVED BY DIRECTOR OF HONORS THESIS:

Dr. Jeffrey Fish, Department of Classics

APPROVED BY THE HONORS PROGRAM

Dr. Elizabeth Corey, Director

DATE: _____

THE ANTITHESIS OF ὙΒΡΙΣ AND HUMILITY IN THE PURSUIT OF GLORY: A
CHRISTOLOGICAL CONTOUR OF BEAUTY

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

Baylor University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Honors Program

By

David E. Folks

Waco, Texas

December 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	iii
Introduction	1
Chapter One: Establishing a Theological Aesthetic	4
Chapter Two: The Language of Self-Exaltation in Homer, Solon, and Ruler Cults	13
Chapter Three: <i>Carmen Christi</i> : How Humility Refutes “Υβρις”	51
Conclusion	72
Works Cited	74

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My thanks goes first and foremost to Dr. Fish, who has generously given his time and energy as a mentor for this project. In the course of this project, Dr. Fish has modeled Christian humility for me. Our conversations together have enlivened my soul with a deeper love for God. I am greatly indebted to his insights throughout this thesis.

I am also grateful to Dr. Burris who has deeply imprinted me with a love for the classics. From basic grammar to Herodotus, Solon, Sappho, and Pindar, the bulk of my Greek study has been under his tutelage.

This project would have been impossible without the support of all the professors and faculty in the School of Music, the Honors Program, and the Classics Department, who have graciously afforded me the opportunity to pursue my (often conflicting) interests despite the logistical difficulties it has entailed. Dr. Michael Alexander, Dr. Sandor Ostlund, and Dr. Ken Jones, and Mary Moore have all been particularly helpful.

My thanks also goes to Dr. Donnelly, who has graciously agreed to be my outside reader for this Thesis and whose wisdom helped me greatly in the early phases of this project.

Lastly, I am grateful to my parents, Patrick and Janette Folks, who have shown me unconditional love and who have supported me in all my endeavors every step of the way. Above all else, I am grateful they have raised me in the faith I here profess.

“If one could be found who was able to add to his instinct for the right or the beautiful, a clear idea of the reason for its rightness or beauty, he would be among men what a living man would be in the dead world of flitting shades.”

-Edith Hamilton, *The Greek Way*

INTRODUCTION

In this thesis I will provide a consistent theological aesthetic and call attention to a neglected Christological contour of the aesthetic dimension of God's glory¹ by comparing the humility of Christ described in "The Christ Hymn" (Philippians 2:6-11) with examples from Greek history and literature in order to reflect on the anthropological applications of Christ's work for his people today.² This theological aesthetic is distinct from an aesthetic theology, a natural theology of beauty, or a general philosophy of aesthetics.³ The theological aesthetic outlined here seeks to follow a protestant dogmatic approach, wherein the revelation of Christ witnessed to in the inerrant Scripture presides over the study of aesthetics.⁴

Thus, in this paper, I work with the assumption that the 66 books of Western protestant canon are authoritative, sufficient, and internally consistent texts demonstrating the person and work of Jesus Christ and through which Christians are to store up in jars of clay the treasure of "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in

¹ This language is borrowed from King (2018).

² "The Christ Hymn" is also known as the *Carmen Christi*. I will use these interchangeably throughout my essay.

³ See Balthasar (2009): 34. Balthasar explains the distinction between a Theology of Aesthetics and Aesthetic Theology: "It seems... necessary to steer clear of the theological application of aesthetic concepts. A theology that makes use of such concepts will sooner or later cease to be a 'theological aesthetics—that is, the attempt to do aesthetics at the level and with the methods of theology—and deteriorate into an 'aesthetic theology' by betraying and selling out theological substance the current viewpoints of an inner—worldly theory of beauty."

⁴ For Jesus said, "You search the Scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that bear witness about me" (Jn. 5:39).

the face of Jesus Christ” (2 Cor 4:6).⁵ Thereby, biblical authority presides over aesthetics for “all Scripture is breathed out by God” (2 Ti 3:16) and therefore is God’s means for us to know himself, the source of all beauty.

In Chapter One, I establish a theological aesthetic in order to frame the beauty of Christ. This aesthetic is largely derived from Jonathan King’s *The Beauty of the Lord* and centers around defining and distinguishing beauty and glory from one another. After rooting the discussion within the medieval transcendentals, I claim beauty is a perfection of God—a view predicated upon the Doctrine of Divine Simplicity. Then, I establish the relationship of God’s perfections (including beauty) to glory, defining divine glory as the sum of the divine perfections, or the *total perfection*. Through this lens, an aesthetic consideration of God’s work of Theodrama (Trinity *ad extra*) becomes significant as a means of knowing the imminent Trinity (Trinity *ad intra*) and considering how men relate to this God.

I separate Chapter Two into 3 parts. The first part utilizes Solonic poetry to identify Greek perspectives on human presumption and its consequences—ὑβρις and ἄτη (ruin, destruction, blind frenzy). Beginning with an identification of ὑβρις’ original meaning, I treat the poem as a unity to identify how satiety (κόρος) precedes ὑβρις and how ἄτη follows. This requires a reevaluation of several key passages of Solon 13W. The second part utilizes the Iliad to demonstrate divine presumption and the trespass of honors (τιμαί) as ὑβρις. The *Iliad* witnesses that ἄτη is a *necessary* consequence of ὑβρις.

⁵ Unless otherwise noted, throughout this thesis I will be using the *English Standard Version* for the translation of the bible, and I will be using the SBL edition of the Greek by Holmes (2013).

I supplement this argument with that of the Hellenistic Philosopher Philodemus, who views Hector as *hybristic* on account of his divine claims. Philodemus also sees Homer's epic as a condemnation of these behaviors. In the third part, I apply the paradigm of my prior examination to an analysis of ruler cults. I examine three key figures—Alexander the Great, Demetrios Poliorketes, and the Roman Emperor Caligula. Each of these figures demonstrated the ὑβρις of divine presumption by attempting to accrue divine honors to themselves. Subsequently, each fell short of the immortality they strove for.

In Chapter Three, I attempt to elucidate the humility of Christ as apparent in the *Carmen Christi* (Phil. 2:6-11). Then, I compare it against the ruler cults of the prior chapter meanwhile explicating the exaltation of Christ that came through his humility. I posit that the antithesis between them constitutes a “holy chiasm” because Christ's method of glory-seeking is utterly opposite that of the cults. This serves as a Christological contour of beauty within the Theodrama that reveals the glory of God. I end with mediations on how men may pursue glory via participation in Christ.

CHAPTER ONE

Establishing a Theological Aesthetic

The medieval transcendentals—Truth, Goodness, and Beauty—are transcendental by derivation from the essential transcendental: Being.¹ For anything to *be*—or even to think of something as being—necessitates that things *are* and have *being*. In other words, existing is common to all things and therefore transcends distinctions placed on it. Furthermore, the transcendentals access different aspects of Being: Truth is *being as knowable*, Goodness is *being as desirable*, and Beauty *being as delightful*.² Beauty is necessarily related to Truth and Goodness, for “only it dances as an uncontained splendor around the double constellation of the true and the good.”³

What makes any particular thing beautiful is difficult to pin down; yet structure, proportion, harmony, agreement, unity, and symmetry are all identified as elements.⁴ Jonathan King sums up these terms into “fittingness”—meanwhile recognizing that God can display beauty that escapes these categories—and measures beauty in terms of its

¹ On being as the essential transcendental, cf. Aquinas, *ST*, Ia, q.65, a.3. Note the summary in King (2018): 17: “A transcendental property is an attribute by which all existing things are predicated in some degree or other as a necessary condition for their very existence.”

² See Clark (2001): 29. Clark states that the three medieval transcendentals “Are distinct from each other in what they explicitly affirm about being, but they refer to the identical reality as it exists in itself.” The italicized phrases are terms coined by Jonathan King.

³ Balthasar (2009): 18. For the interrelation of beauty and truth see p.9: “In a world that no longer has enough confidence in itself to affirm the beautiful, the proofs of the truth have lost their cogency. In other words, syllogisms may still dutifully clatter away like rotary presses or computers which infallibly spew out an exact number of answers by the minute. But the logic of these answers is itself a mechanism which no longer captivates anyone. The very conclusions are no longer conclusive.”

⁴ Mitchell (2007): 37.

“fittingness-intensity.”⁵ Logically, God, who is the source of all things, can only communicate goodness, truth, and beauty to the degree that he possesses them or *is them*. Therein lies the crucial doctrine of divine simplicity (DDS). DDS is the notion that God is his doing, that God *is* his attributes and that his attributes are not in conflict to one another—i.e. God’s justice is his mercy and his kindness is his love.⁶ King lists four components to Simplicity: 1) God cannot have any spatiality or temporal parts; 2) there are no intrinsic accidental properties in God, meaning that changes in extrinsic properties of God are not a real change of God; 3) there are no true distinctions between the essential properties in God’s nature (although there may be conceptual distinctions); 4) God has no real distinction in essence and existence.⁷ By holding to DDS, beauty must be a divine perfection, for if God has beauty to him, he must be beauty.⁸ This is “the ontological basis for predicating all of the perfections of God—God simply *is* all his perfections in pure act.”⁹

What is Beauty?

A central claim of this aesthetic framework is that beauty is an objectively real, yet subjectively experienced, perfection of God.¹⁰ As C.S Lewis famously argued, beauty

⁵ King (2018): 11.

⁶ For further study, see Anselm, (2007): 24; Similarly, Augustine, *Confessions* 1.4.4.

⁷ King (2018): 42.

⁸ Scripture often references the beauty of God: “Your eyes will behold the king in his beauty; they will see a land that stretches afar” (Isaiah 33:17).

⁹ King (2018): 44.

¹⁰ Because God is perfect in all of his being and doing, the attributes of God may rightly be labeled as perfections for he is the faultless source of love, joy, peace, patience, and all else that he is.

is not merely “in the eye of the beholder,” although not all perceive it equally. As Lewis says: the waterfall is indeed sublime, it does not merely make one feel sublime thoughts.¹¹ I follow King’s definition of beauty as “the intrinsic quality of things which, when perceived, pleases the mind by displaying a kind of fittingness.”¹² So beauty is an objective quality of real things, but is it an attribute of God as I propound? This is contested. Jonathan King summarizes a few significant perspectives:

Bavinck appears to equate beauty with God’s glory.... For both Edwards and Balthasar, beauty is a perfection of God’s glory.... In Barth’s case beauty is not a perfection of God’s glory but rather is the delight and pleasure for God that is awakened in us by the persuasive force in the form of the glory of his revelation to us.... [where] God’s perfections themselves are beauty’s ontological ground.¹³

The Barthian view—though incomplete— is key to understanding this properly. Firstly, Barth views beauty as being characterized by a relationship with the (other) perfections of God—the manifestations of God’s *total perfection*.¹⁴ *Total perfection* is here used synonymously with the divine δόξα (glory), for DDS demands that God is his perfections and also δόξα can refer to “the divine nature or essence either in its invisible or its perceptible form.”¹⁵ Intuitively, humility, kindness, and every virtue is beautiful, since—to utilize Barth’s terminology—in them we are awakened to delight and pleasure.

¹¹ Lewis (1965): 7: “To say that the cataract is sublime means saying that our emotion of humility is appropriate or ordinate to the reality, and thus to speak of something else besides the emotion; just as to say that a shoe fits is to speak not only of shoes but of feet.” In many more words, cf. Balathasar, *The Glory of the Lord*, 20: “The prior theoretical decision which must be made is the following: Are we objectively justified in restricting the beautiful to the area of inner worldly relationships between ‘matter and form’, between ‘that which appears and the appearance itself’, justified in restricting it to the psychic states of imagination and empathy which are certainly required for the perception and production of such expressional relationships.”

¹² King (2018): 9.

¹³ King (2018): 333.

¹⁴ King (2018): 41.

¹⁵ Kittel, Gerhard, and Friedrich (1964), s.v. δόξα.

Barth is correct in this. Yet, distinguishing the virtues from one another and the beauty they share is nearly impossible since there is no true “distinction between the essential properties of God’s Nature.”¹⁶ The fruits of the spirit in Galatians 5 support this. These virtues are characteristic of the Christian who is living in relationship with God.¹⁷ These attributes are the “fruit” of abiding in the vine of Christ and his Spirit.¹⁸ Thus, each listed virtue is God’s attributes communicated, for he gives what he is. The point of Paul’s metaphor is that the virtuous life is the result of unity with and participation in God. Most notably, the “fruits” of the Spirit in Galatians 5:22 are not actually “fruits” at all: καρπὸς is singular. The virtues interweave—they are interdependently defined; Paul even uses “patience” and “kindness” when defining love: “Love is patient, love is kind” (1 Cor. 13). The distinction between virtues may then be more of a conceptual sort. This is where Barth errs: he does not see the relationship between beauty and any given perfection of God as a basis for recognizing beauty itself as a perfection of God. On the other hand, King allows for Barth’s central point in saying that beauty has its existence in an objective form,¹⁹ and simultaneously argues that since beauty is a quality of glory, it must therefore be a perfection of God. This is keeping with the perspective of Edwards and Balthasar, the latter of which “ascribe(s) to the beautiful... the same inward analogous

¹⁶ Ibid., 42.

¹⁷ Galatians 5:22, “But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control; against such things there is no law.”

¹⁸ John 15:5, “I am the vine; you are the branches. Whoever abides in me and I in him, he it is that bears much fruit, for apart from me you can do nothing.”

¹⁹ King (2018): 50: “Inasmuch as an objectivist view is premised in our theory of beauty, this implies that the quality of beauty has no real being in the abstract (i.e., not purely nominal) but must have existence in an objective form. That is to say, beauty in the order of reality pertains only to something that has form, for something that has no form is sheer abstraction.”

form that we ascribe to the one, the true, and the good.”²⁰ For if beauty can follow the pattern of the one, true, and the good as Balthasar argues, and if glory is the sum perfection of every attribute of God, then beauty can assuredly be called both a perfection of God and a quality of glory.

The Relationship Between Beauty and Glory

The term “glory” (δόξα) is employed by the New Testament authors in disparate ways that confuse the sense of the abstract “glory” we are here discussing.²¹ This range of meaning provides insight into the means of creaturely participation in glory. However, let it suffice for now, there is God’s extrinsic glory (*ad extra*) and his intrinsic glory (*ad intra*). These correspond respectively to the trinity operating economically and essentially. The economic trinity (*ad extra*) is essentially how the three persons of the trinity are united in the Theodrama. Theodrama is the idea that God’s works of Creation, Redemption, and Consummation can be likened to a drama wherein the conclusion of the story is greater than its genesis. Theodrama is thus used as a blanket term for God’s work—what he does. The type of δόξα concerned with here is that of the abstracted glory

²⁰ Balthasar (2009): 37: “May we not think of the beautiful as one of the transcendental attributes of Being as such, and thereby ascribe to the beautiful the same range of application and the same inwardly analogous form that we ascribe to the one, the true, and the good?”

²¹ On the full range of meaning, see Arndt, Danker, and Bauer (2000) s.v. δόξα: I. a) Condition of being bright or shining, brightness splendor, radiance; b) of humans involved in transcendent circumstances and also transcendent beings; c) the state of being in the next life is thus described as participation in the radiance or glory; II. A state of being magnificent, *greatness, splendor*; III. honor as enhancement or recognition of status or performance, *fame, recognition*.”

ad intra inasmuch as it is revealed *ad extra*. My goal is to demonstrate how abstracted, metaphysical beauty relates to the glory of God himself.

This paper is predicated upon King’s claim that the “beauty of God manifested economically is perceivable *as a quality of the glory* of God inherent in his work of Theodrama.”²² Glory and beauty are distinct and beauty is subsumed under glory as an attribute of it. This also means that “the display of God’s glory is thus always beautiful, always fitting, always entails an aesthetic dimension to it.”²³ For glory is much more than a single quality but is often used—as quoted in Barth earlier— as a term for the *total perfection*, the sum of the divine attributes. Compare John Piper’s recent work, *Providence*, where he echoes these sentiments:

He [Jonathan Edwards] does not mean that the glory of God is one divine attribute among others.... I used the phrase “the beauty of the full panorama of his perfections” to define the glory of God.” In other words, God’s glory is not any one of his perfections but the beauty of all of them, and the perfectly harmonious way they relate to each other, and the way they are expressed in creation and history.²⁴

Although this use of glory is widely recognized in scholarship, the relationship of beauty to it is still obscure.²⁵

²² King (2018): 24. Italics added. For a lengthier explanation of Theodrama, see Balthasar (1988). Theodrama is the idea that God’s works of Creation, Redemption, and Consummation constitute God’s drama. This drama runs parallel the theatrical contours of “The Hero’s Journey” present in works such as Homer’s *Odyssey*, wherein the conclusion of the story is greater than its genesis after a climactic shift in the story’s direction. In redemptive history, Jesus’ death and resurrection is this shift. The future glorification of mankind is key to its climactic conclusion.

²³ King (2018): 51.

²⁴ Piper (2020): 40.

²⁵ As a supporting example of scholarly consensus see Morgan et al. (2010): 165; cf. King (2018): 48: “[The Glory of God] corresponds with his very being and sometimes functions as a sort of summation of his attributes.”

The confusion lies in the wide semantic range of the term “δόξα” (glory), often capturing the sense of splendor, fame, luminosity, radiance, weight, and authority.²⁶ For this reason, beauty and glory are often (wrongly) used interchangeably. For example, it is common to say “that sunset is glorious” when really it is meant that it is beautiful. People recognize the splendor, luminosity, and joy-inducing eminence from the sunset and will thus call it glorious. But glory means much more. This false-substitution is similarly common with “honor.” Ancient ruler cults attempted to accrue honors to themselves as a method of glory seeking, the idea being that fame and authority constitute glory and a sort of immortality. However, δόξα is distinct from κλέος.²⁷ Reducing δόξα to a sense of honor misses the true heart of glory, for which Christ is the true exemplar.

For theological reasons, it is necessary to distinguish beauty and glory. This may yet have application for the Christian in contemplating the eschatological “prize of the upward call of God in Christ Jesus” (Phil. 3:14) more fully. As stated earlier, beauty should more properly denote the “intrinsic quality of things which, when perceived, pleases the mind by displaying a kind of fittingness.”²⁸ In other words, beauty is an objective reality in relation to other objective forms, that when perceived subjectively produces pleasure or awe. Dietrich Von Hildebrand’s words are apt here:

We are not speaking of beauty in the general sense of the word... then we are concentrating on metaphysical beauty, which is an aura, a refulgence, a radiance of the inner qualities of these virtues. It is a beauty which St. Augustine calls

²⁶ Lewis, (1942), 41; Fame, luminosity, and weight are all key aspects of glory for Lewis. He defines it as “good report with God, acceptance by God, response, acknowledgement, and welcome into the heart of things. The door on which we have been knocking all our lives will open at last.”

²⁷ *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, s.v. κλέος; “fame, renown, glory.”

²⁸ King (2018): 9.

“*splendor veri*,” and which is, as it were, a radiation of every genuine quality that adheres to every good in the sum of its qualities.²⁹

Whereas beauty “adheres” to every good quality; glory is the sum of them. Given this relationship between beauty and glory, the relevance of the *Christ Hymn* is apparent. For the person and work (past, present, and future) of Jesus is God’s “self-showing”³⁰ of his glory, wherein the nature of the Trinity *ad intra* (from within) is displayed (*ad extra*) without. For, Jesus perfectly images (reveals) God in what he does as “the Word who became flesh,” who “was with God and was God” (John 1:14; 1). Therefore, the humility of Christ apparent in his incarnation/kenosis demonstrates to the world the true nature of the Trinity. The eternal relationship between Father and Son is shown through the earthly obedience and submission of Jesus.³¹

Then, as Barth was wont to do, by Christological focus we will arrive at a better understanding of God. Where the fittingness of the Theodrama is most intense, there will

²⁹ von Hildebrand (2001): 78–92.

³⁰ Barth, *KD*. II. I, 647: “And the final thing which we must say in this connexion about God’s glory is that it is God Himself in the truth and power and act of His self-glorification on and in and through that which is dark in itself because it is distinct from Himself and is not divine but opposed to the divine. God’s glory is the answer evoked by Him of the worship offered Him by His creatures. If we say now that God is beautiful, and make this statement the final explanation of the assertion that God is glorious, do we not jeopardize or even deny the majesty and holiness and righteousness of God’s love?” Though I differ with Barth in how he frames the relationship between Beauty and Glory, he places proper emphasis on God’s intent to self-declare his own glory and sees this act of self-declaration through his creatures are part and parcel of “glory” itself. Barth also powerfully argues that there is significance to the character and work of God in creation of which “beauty” is not a sufficient term. Glory does include this, but is not limited to it.

³¹ For further reading, see Jürgen Moltmann’s chapter in J. C. Polkinghorne (2001): 140. Here he provides an excellent summation of Balthasar’s view of kenosis as the self-declaration of the economic trinity. In the kenotic work of Christ, it is revealed that “it the essential nature of the eternal Son of the eternal Father to be ‘obedient’ in complete love and self-surrender, just as it is the essential nature of the eternal Father to communicate himself to the Son in complete love.” Additionally, this economic submission of the Son is distinct from the Eternal Subordination of the Son (ESS). ESS decries blasphemes the trinity by saying that Jesus is *ontologically* lower in position. In contrast, economic subordination argues that Jesus’ ongoing ministry as High Priest God at the right hand of God reveals that relationship of obedience to the Father which he demonstrated in his earthly ministry is eternal.

the glory of God be best revealed—at the incarnation of Jesus. However, our discussion will first begin with an analysis of the language of self-exaltation within Greek literature and history which Jesus rejected—that of *hybristic* presumption.

CHAPTER TWO

The Language of Self-Exaltation in Homer, Solon, and Ruler Cults

The Christological contour of beauty that is Christ's kenotic (self-emptying) work and subsequent exaltation can be better understood against the historical backdrop of the Hellenistic culture that the New Testament characters and authors both directly and indirectly knew. By understanding Greek and Roman notions of self-exaltation which Jesus rejected in his actions, the beauty of his work becomes that much more apparent. To this end, I will first elucidate the classical notions of ὑβρις and ἄτη present in Homeric and Solonic poetry. My goal is not to merely understand the human appropriation of divine honors and qualities that are found in classical literature and Hellenistic history, but rather understand the broader dynamics of ὑβρις in Greek thought and the related idea of self-exaltation. Furthermore, I will attempt to identify these notions in the sphere of divine exaltation within Alexander the Great and subsequent ruler cults who attempted to make themselves ἴσα θεῶ (equal to or like unto God). First, I will turn to the Athenian poet Solon and to Homer's Iliad before turning to concrete historical examples.

Solon the Poet

To understand the figure of Solon is to gain crucial perspective on classical notions of guarding against self-exaltation. Solon the Athenian statesman and poet provided practical wisdom through poetry on how life ought to be lived within the πόλις.¹

¹ See Hornblower et al. (2012): s.v. Solon: "Solon shows in his poems that he was trying to achieve a compromise between the demands of the rich and privileged and of the poor and unprivileged, and that he satisfied neither. . . . Nevertheless, in the creation of a free peasantry, the weakening of

This poetry was didactic and reinforced his own revolutionary reforms. His wisdom was so influential that Herodotus even records his dialogue with Croesus and exalts Solon through it. Croesus sought to be acclaimed by Solon as the most blessed (ὄλβος) man because of his unparalleled wealth. The record of Solon's response is characteristic of his poetry: Solon refuses to bequeath this title to him, instead honoring men such Cleobis and Biton who worked like oxen to haul their mother five miles and died honorably in consequence. Later in the *Histories*, Croesus recounts a Solonic proverb as he was burning at the stake by command of King Cyrus. This reference to Solon secures the favor of Cyrus and helps Croesus to receive the favor of Apollo, who quenches the fire and saves his life.² Herodotus thereby cements Solon as a man whose wisdom on blessedness (ὄλβος) is unparalleled.

Specifically, Solon 13W witnesses to Greek perspectives on human presumption and its consequences— ὕβρις and ἄτη. Throughout the poem, Solon condemns unjust gain and the presumption that precedes it, yet his perspective helps to identify the trends of presumption within the society that he attempts to moderate.³ Prudent here is a brief

the aristocracy and the strengthening of the assembly and the judicial system, Solon laid the foundations for the successful and stable society of Classical Athens.”

² Herodotus, *The Histories*, 1.30-31; 1.86-87.

³ Versnel (2011): 208. For further discussion, see pp. 205-211. Solon 13W is a source of contention in scholarship. Notably, the apparently contradictory ideas in lines 13 and 67 lead many to argue that portions of the poem are inauthentic or that Solon is thematically incoherent. I hold the view that the poem is internally consistent, and this perspective will provide for an alternative reading of the poem. Lattimore (1947): 161–79 demonstrates unity in Solon 13W by tracing the progression of thought in stages. However, Lattimore does not resolve the contradiction. Others such as Allen (1949) expanded upon Lattimore's methodology by arguing for the poem's thematic coherence. Stoddard (2002) claims that Solon is utilizing subtle irony as a rhetorical device to trick his audience, whereas Allen (1949) takes wealth as the central theme of the poem and sees it as a prayer for wisdom to pursue wealth rightly in proper measure. I follow the latter view throughout the course of this chapter. The debate between whether the poem promotes “arbitrary fate” and “a perspective of divine justice” will have significance for our later discussion of the *Iliad*. For this paper, I hold the view that Solon 13W is both a unity and has thematic coherence.

outline of the poem: Solon invokes the Muses asking for prosperity (ὄλβος), saying that he wishes to have money (χρήματα) but is unwilling to possess it unjustly in fear of ruin (ἄτη; ll. 1-9). Solon uses extended metaphors to explain how ἄτη arises and in what way it is dispensed (ll. 17-29). He discusses how mortals vainly think they can escape this judgement and frames it in the context of various occupations (30-63). Solon then marks the contrast in the dispensation of judgement between the one attempting to εὖ ἔρδειν and κακῶς ἔρδοντι (ll. 67-69) and gives final statements on the role of fate, the gods, and mortal behavior in relation to profit (κέρδεα) and ruin (ll. 70-76).

I intend here to reevaluate key passages of the poem in view of the original meaning of ὕβρις and its relationship to other terms in order to locate Solon's consistent outlook on human self-exaltation in the context of ὄλβος ("blessedness" or "wealth"). This reevaluation will center around the proper antecedent of the pronoun αὐτῶν in line 75 and the sense of ὅφ' ὕβριος (line 13) and εὖ ἔρδω (line 67, 69).

The original meaning of Hubris is crucial to understanding the Solonic perspective on human presumption and its consequences. J. T. Hooker tracked the evolution of ὕβρις in his paper "The Original Meaning of Hubris," showing that the term originally "carried with it no moral condemnation whatever but simply meant 'exuberant physical strength.'" ⁴ This same view is affirmed by Michellini who locates the essential meaning of ὕβρις by identifying its use in the Greek corpus with reference to plants. ⁵ Since vegetable life is devoid of social relations, study of them allows for clarity in the term's basic meaning. This removes the factor of human relations that obscures the

⁴ Hooker (1975): 125.

⁵ Michellini (1978).

term's sense into "outrage; violence."⁶ Rather, Michellini states that *hybris* is when an organism "puts self-aggrandizement above the performance of the social role assigned to it."⁷ Aristotle's *De Generatione Animalium* is apt here: αἱ δὲ τὴν τροφήν ἐξυβρίζουσιν: "The vines **grow in excess** on account of nourishment."⁸ This form of hubris is a result of being overly fed (κόρος) or nourished.⁹ Therefore, when Homer decides to use ὕβρις in a specifically negative way, he accompanies it "with another word which expresses reproach."¹⁰ Thus, the terms associated with ὕβρις alter its force. When ὕβρις is paired with foolishness (ἄφροσυνή) in Solon 13W, it does not prove the inherently immoral quality of ὕβρις.¹¹ Rather, in Solon 13W the terms associated with ὕβρις are modifying its

⁶ See Hooker (1975): 125: "Only later did it take on the pejorative significant 'physical strength wrongly applied,' so 'wantonness, lewdness, violence, insolence in thought or deed, contemptuous treatment of another, brutality.' Hooker later asserts that it is precisely in Solon that ὕβρις takes on an inherently immoral quality. He argues that the association of ὕβρις with κόρος and Solon's vision of it as a product of certain types of νόος designates it as inherently immoral. Hooker errs in this.

⁷ Michellini (1978): 38-39.

⁸ Translation mine. For full text, see Gerber (1999). Unless otherwise noted, all translations are from Gerber's Loeb text.

⁹ For a definition of κόρος and its connection with ὕβρις, see Michellini (1978): 36: "The connection....would help to explain a signal feature of the mysterious ὕβρις of the poets, its continual association with κόρος, or satiety, an association so close that the terms virtually substitute for each other in many cases.... The concrete meaning of the word is never in doubt: "satiety" means having enough, or too much, to eat."

¹⁰ Hooker (1975): 125: In Hooker's analysis, he demonstrates that in early poetry, ὕβρις is almost always accompanied by another term that denotes its moral function. The term is essentially neutral. For an example of morally neutral use of ὕβρις in human interaction, see Herodotus, *Hist.*, 2.32.2.

¹¹ For reference to the association of different types of νόος with *hybris*, see Solon Fr. 4.7, 6.3, and 13.15.

original meaning as “excessive exuberance”¹²—not denoting violence.¹³ The most crucial term associated with ὕβρις in Solon 13W is wealth (ὄλβος).¹⁴ Solon 13W begins with an invocation from Solon to the Muses requesting for “Prosperity (ὄλβος) from the blessed gods and a good reputation (δόξαν) always from all men.”¹⁵ Solon then continues to “identify *hybris* with the unjust desire for wealth,”¹⁶ whereas “unjust” is understood as “improper, unfitting, out of place.”¹⁷ Thus, ὄλβος (wealth, prosperity) is the specific sphere that explains in what way mankind is being excessively exuberant. Lastly, ὕβρις in poetry is often associated with the “negative or oxymoronic harvest of death and ruin (ἄτη).”¹⁸

¹² Michelini (1978): 36. “ὕβριζω and ἐξυβρίζω are used in the botanical texts of Theophrastus—and once in Aristotle—to refer to the excessive growth and exuberance in plants.” For the remainder of this thesis, I will use “self-aggrandizement” and “excessive exuberance” as interchangeable phrases to capture this force of ὕβρις.

¹³ ὕβριζω can be used as a transitive verb. LSJ, s.v. ὕβριζω “despitefully, outrage, insult, maltreat, commit outrage against.” This use of the word will be explored later in this chapter the context of the *Iliad* and ruler cults respectively.

¹⁴ See *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, s.v. ὄλβος: “happiness, fortune, prosperity, usu. material and worldly.” While this term is used for blessedness, ὄλβος has a material component to it.

¹⁵ Μοῦσαι Πιερίδες, κλυτὲ μοι εὐχομένω ὄλβον μοι πρὸς θεῶν μακάρων δότε καὶ πρὸς ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων αἰεὶ δόξαν ἔχειν ἀγαθήν· “Muses, hearken to my prayer. Grant that I have prosperity from the blessed gods and a good reputation always from all men.” Solon 13W, ll.2-4.

¹⁶ Solmsen (1949): 109.

¹⁷ Hooker (1975): 127. In reference to *Od.* 6.120, 9.175, and 13.201: “Again, it is wrong to see in οὐδὲ δίκαιοι a reference to an abstract δίκη meaning ‘justice’: a meaning which is virtually absent from the Homeric poems. Persons described as οὐδὲ δίκαιοι are simply those without δίκη, those who do not conform to the usually accepted norms of conduct.... so ὕβριςται when opposed to δίκαιοι must mean men who use their physical strength in ways other than the norm: in other words, οὐ κατὰ δικάην”; LSJ, s.v. δίκη, ἡ. I, II.

¹⁸ Michellini (1978): 39; Cf. Cunliffe s.v. ἄτη, “bewilderment, infatuation, caused by blindness or delusion sent by the gods, mostly as the punishment of guilty rashness; III. fine, penalty, or sum lost in a lawsuit.” Though ἄτη does refer to the fine or penalty lost in the sphere of wealth, its meaning is not limited to this in the context of Solon who is concerned with τίσις and δίκη.

Solon condemns *hybristic* behavior in men by associating it with ἄτη (ruin/blind-frenzy):

τίς ἂν κορέσειεν ἅπαντας;/ κέρδεά τοι θνητοῖς ὅπασαν ἀθάνατοι,/ ἄτη δ' ἐξ
αὐτῶν ἀναφαίνεται, ἦν ὅποτε Ζεὺς/ πέμψη τεισομένην, ἄλλοτε ἄλλος ἔχει.

What could satisfy everyone? In truth the immortals give men profit, but **from it (them?)** there is revealed ruin, which now one, now another has, whenever Zeus sends it to punish them.¹⁹

There are important interpretive issues at play in the poem, one such issue is the

the antecedent of αὐτῶν in line 75. Does it refer to θνητοῖς, κέρδεα, or ἀθάνατοι?

The identification of this term's antecedent is syntactically vague —there are three plural masculine nouns in the prior clause. But the purpose and theme of the poem will aid identification. Lattimore identifies throughout Solon's work a theme of general “disapproval of greed for money, of those persons who always want more when they have enough.”²⁰ This theme's permeance in 13W is apparent by the early condemnation of wealth gained unjustly in line 7 (ἀδίκως δὲ πεπᾶσθαι) and in Solon's initial prayer to the Muses requesting wealth, reputation, and power.²¹ Furthermore, the acquisition and desire for wealth are—in Lattimore's estimation—the purpose of Solon's catalogue of occupations in 13W.²² Therefore, Campbell's identification is apt: “ἐξ αὐτῶν i.e. from gain, κέρδεα.”²³ Similarly, in Lattimore's estimation, “to what does αὐτῶν refer? I would

¹⁹ Solon 13W.73-76.

²⁰ Lattimore (1947): 163.

²¹ Ibid., 163.

²² Solon's catalogue runs from line 43 through 62.

²³ Campbell (2003): 240.

refer it to κέρδεα.”²⁴ Since gain (κέρδεα) summons divine judgement in the form of ἄτη, it is also key to note that if ἄτη is the product of *hybris*, *hybris* is itself is the product of overconsumption (κόρος). In this case, it is wealth or gain (κέρδεα) which is consumed in excess.

Furthermore, this understanding of ὕβρις enables a reevaluation of the prevailing translation ὕφ’ ὕβριος in line 11 as “with violence”:

ὄν δ’ ἄνδρες **τιμῶσιν ὕφ’ ὕβριος**, οὐ κατὰ κόσμον ἔρχεται, ἀλλ’ ἀδίκους ἔργμασι
πειθόμενος οὐκ ἐθέλων ἔπεται, ταχέως δ’ ἀναμίσγεται ἄτη·

But on the other hand, wealth which men **prize on account of *hybris*** (not “with violence”) comes not orderly, but obeying unjust actions, it unwillingly follows and is mixed up swiftly with *Atē*.

Though Solmsen, Gerber, and West²⁵ all translate the phrase as “with violence,” there is no accompanying term with ὕβρις which indicates a change in its meaning from “self-aggrandizement” to “violence.” Secondly, ὑπό with the genitive normally indicates a genitive of cause or agent.²⁶ Consequently, it is better to take the phrase not as describing the *manner* under which the prizing of wealth takes place, but rather the *cause* of it. The original meaning of *hybris* as the excessive vitality of biological life is transferable to financial success—which is also suggested in line 70 by the terms συντυχίην ἀγαθήν “good fortune.” In other words, “self-aggrandizement”—by entering into the economic

²⁴ Lattimore (1947): 178. This significant portion of the poem should not be overlooked in its significance. Lattimore describes the men in the catalogue as “short-sighted; they do not realize that wealth has come to them by divine dispensation, not through their own cleverness; and they want more.” This identification is shared widely in scholarship, see Allen (1949): 60, fn. 21.

²⁵ See West (1993): 77. “The riches that the gods give are dependable from top to bottom of the storage jar, but those that mortals *cultivate with violence* come award and unwilling at the call of crime.”

²⁶ My adjusted translation which accounts for the genitive of cause. Brill s.v. ὑπό 2A.d: “of cause because of, on account of, through || often of conditions or feelings”; cf. LSJ s.v. ὑπό II.3-4 “of Cause or Agency.” According to LSJ, it may also be correct to identify this as a genitive of accompanying circumstances.

sphere—becomes a kind of greed which longs for an excess of a rightful ὄλβος prayed for at the beginning of the poem. Solmsen’s sentiment applies: “[Solon] identif[ie]s *hybris* with the *unjust* desire for wealth.”²⁷ By prizing wealth, those who have ὕβρις desire something beyond their limited allotment.

There is yet another problem. The translation of ὕβρις as “violence” is not supported by the social relationships in the text, that is, nowhere does the poem indicate the stealing of wealth which would carry with it the infringement—or violence—upon another’s τιμή. The infringement we are concerned with is not horizontal (man-to-man) in nature, but rather vertical (man-to-gods). It is the mortal self-aggrandizement over the allotment of wealth provided him by the divine. As Allen comments, “since the limit of wealth is not visible to men, they are in constant danger that unceasing effort will lead them to surpass the limit permitted them.”²⁸ Similarly in line 11, τιμῶσιν, a form of the verb τιμάω, when it takes ὄν as an object—which itself refers to πλοῦτον (wealth) in line 9—does not refer to the acquisition of wealth, which is implied in Gerber’s translation, but rather the estimation or valuation of wealth.²⁹ It is far more reasonable to see Solon’s use of ὕβρις (self-aggrandizement in the sphere of wealth) as the cause of the men valuing wealth rather than their acquiring it through violence. It is this mistranslation of τιμῶσιν which

²⁷ Solmsen (1949): 109. Italics mine.

²⁸ Allen (1949): 61. The concept of a limited allotment for mortals is not contradicted by Solon’s statement that “there lies no speakable (discernable) limit of wealth to men” (πλούτου δ’ οὐδὲν τέρμα πεφασμένον ἀνδράσι κεῖται). Firstly, it is not that there is no limit of wealth for men, but that it is not discernable without divine wisdom. Additionally, the idea of limited allotment is introduced by the term ὕβρις itself. This has to do with the poetic relationship between κόρος and ὕβρις. This also makes greater sense of Solon’s question in line 73: “Those of us who now have the most money want twice as much as they have got. Who can ever satisfy (κορέσειεν) them all?”

²⁹ LSJ, s.v. τιμάω: “II. of things, hold in honour or esteem, value, prize.” Gerber (1999) translates ll.9-12 as, “Wealth which the gods give remains with a man, secure from the lowest foundation to the top, whereas *wealth which men honour* with violence comes in disorder.” Italics mine.

reinforces the mistranslation of ὕβρις. For if the wealth is acquired *from someone*, the infringement of τιμή necessarily involved could justify taking ὕφ' ὕβριος as “with violence.” Instead, by taking τιμῶσιν as “prizing” and ὕφ' ὕβριος as a genitive of cause, the meaning of the poem shifts.

Along this line of thinking, further reevaluation of the poem is necessary, specifically, that of lines 67 through 69:

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν εὖ ἔρδειν πειρώμενος οὐ προνοήσας/ ἐς μεγάλην ἄτην καὶ χαλεπὴν
ἔπεσεν,/ τῷ δὲ κακῶς ἔρδοντι θεὸς περὶ πάντα δίδωσιν/ συντυχίην ἀγαθήν,
ἔκλυσιν ἀφροσύνης.

Particularly, εὖ ἔρδειν and κακῶς ἔρδοντι are in question. Gerber's Loeb translation reads as follows:

The man who tries **to act rightly** falls unawares into great and harsh calamity, while to the one who **acts badly** the god gives success in all things, an escape from his folly.³⁰

Although the sentiment can be found in Greek literature that people's noblest efforts can go awry, does this fit in Solon's poem? Considering the opening prayer for ὀλβός, the list of occupations, and the emphasis on ἄτη as financial ruin, a sudden shift to purely moral action is not keeping with the poem as a whole. Gerber's translation assumes this moral component where there isn't one, and thus misses the true moral issue at hand: self-aggrandizement. Whereas he makes these phrases to constitute proper and improper action in themselves, I posit that these phrases constitute economic success or failure, considering ἔρδω can be used synonymously to an adverb with πράττω. Πράττω is often

³⁰ Solon 13W.66-70.

used to denote the managing of affairs or the conducting of business³¹—taking on this economic connotation:

But one on the hand, the one attempting **to fare well** falls unawares into great and harsh calamity, but on the other hand, to the one **faring poorly** god gives **good fortune**, an escape from foolishness.³²

Πράττω and ἔρδω have a similar basic meaning —“to do, or accomplish.”³³

Contextualized in the discourse of wealth and the lengthy list of occupations (line 37-58), it is natural to see this economic connection with the adverbial qualifiers of ἔρδω.

Essentially, it is unnecessary to assume that the difference between the one fairing poorly and one faring well is moral in nature. “These phrases can simply signify success or failure in an action.”³⁴ This permits a shift in the poem’s interpretation, as the judgement of Zeus is no longer upon the well-meaning or righteous person, but rather upon the one who is self-aggrandizing over and above their divine allotment. As Allen puts it, Solon thinks that “each thing has its proper limits, which cannot be exceeded without the subsequent exaction of penalty.”³⁵

Therefore, I suggest that the poem is concerned with the relationship between divine wisdom and foolishness-induced excess. Solon 6C brings the meaning of 13W into focus:

τίκτει γὰρ κόρος ὕβριν, ὅταν πολὺς ὄλβος ἔπῃται ἀνθρώποις ὁπόσοις μὴ νόος ἄρτιος ἦ.

³¹ LSJ, s.v. πράττω.

³² My translation with the adjusted meaning.

³³ LSJ, s.v. ἔρδω ; s.v. πράττω

³⁴ Allen (1949): 58.

³⁵ Ibid., 62.

For satiety (κόρος) gives birth to *hybris*, whenever great wealth (πολὺς ὄλβος) comes to men of unsound mind.³⁶

“Excessive exuberance or self-aggrandizement” in the realm of wealth-seeking is the natural consequence of being overfed (κόρος) on wealth. Those who have much are likely, or perhaps inevitably will want more. This is why the bestowal of good fortune (συντυχίην ἀγαθήν) upon those who are faring poorly (κακῶς ἔρδοντι) over those faring well is not arbitrary. Those who are faring well (εὖ ἔρδειν) are more likely to fall into ὕβρις and incur ἄτη. By overfeeding on gain (κέρδεά), men become *hybristic* from which ἄτη appears (line 73).

On the basis of the reevaluation of these passages, we can find a system of justice in Solon’s poem which is coherent. Solon is saying that the gods do not send retribution against men they have bestowed wealth upon; instead, they send it against those who prize wealth on account of ὕβρις—with which ἄτη is mixed up (line 13).³⁷ Lines 9-10 demonstrate that wealth justly gained remains steadfast with a man—i.e. this kind of wealth is not lost due to ἄτη.³⁸ Additionally, wealth given to the one fairing poorly as an “escape from foolishness” [ἄφροσύνης] in line 70 is significant, because the foolishness is avoided

³⁶ Solon 13W. 3-5, trans. Gerber (122-123).

³⁷ For an opposing view, see Stoddard (2002): 151. Stoddard criticizes Allen’s view that lines 74-76 restate the ideas of the first half and provide unity. Her argument hinges upon how Allen appears to identify the κέρδεα of line 74 as “unjust gains” rather than merely “gains.” This criticism is fair; however, Stoddard’s rebuttal does not justify her claim that the first half of the poem is utilizing irony as a didactic technique and thus that the system of justice in the poem is incoherent. This is because in my analysis, it not the gains themselves which are the issue, but rather the motivation behind taking the gains (i.e. whether or not ὕφ ὕβριος) and whether or not this trespassing mortal limits as a result.

³⁸ ἄτη can be used specifically as the opposite of κέρδος. See *Diccionario Greigo Espanol* s.v. ἄτη: “obfuscation, madness... op. of κερδός ‘wealth and happiness,’ ruin, loss, perdition

by receiving the wisdom to know one's limits,³⁹ since it is the “unsound mind” [μῆ νόος ἄρτιος]⁴⁰ that results in κόρος and eventually ὕβρις. For the unsound mind is one who is ignorant of these limits and overfeeds.

Solon thus condemns the excessive exuberance (*hybris*) of wealth amongst people who will not be satisfied by any amount of gain (line 73) and thus will fall into great and harsh ἄτη (67-70). Solon's broader work warns against this ὕβρις and calls for moderation in the desire for wealth: “But you who have ushered in satiety [κόρον] of many good things, having quieted the staunch heart in your breast, establish your ambition [μέγαν νόον] in moderation. For we shall not obey, nor shall these things be fitting [ἄρτια] for you.”⁴¹ Although *hybris* is not explicit, μέγαν νόον is very similar to the “thinking big” or [φρόνειν μέγα] which constitutes *hybris*.⁴² Additionally, ἄρτια parallels the [μῆ νόος ἄρτιος] of Solon 6C within an explicitly *hybristic* context. That is, there is something unfitting or inappropriate about the excess consumption [κόρος] which demands that *hybristic* behavior is checked. Solon's poetic work thus demonstrates the necessity of opposing *hybris*, recognizes that there is an aspect of impropriety to it [ἄρτια], and reveals that *hybris*, as excessive exuberance, is the product of excess consumption.

³⁹ See Solmsen (1949): 120. “When it comes to the basic moral and political considerations by which Solon justifies his course, we find the emphasis again put on the need for moderation and learn once more that the conditions which breed surfeit [κόρος] and *Hybris* must at all costs be avoided.”

⁴⁰ Cf. Solon 6C: τίκτει γὰρ κόρος ὕβριν, ὅταν πολὺς ὄλβος ἔπῃται ἀνθρώποις ὅποσις μὴ νόος ἄρτιος ᾖ. “For excess breeds insolence, whenever great prosperity comes to men who are not sound of mind.”

⁴¹ Translation mine. Solon 4.8W: ὑμεῖς δ' ἡσυχάσαντες ἐνὶ φρεσὶ καρτερὸν ἦτορ, οἱ πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐς κόρον [ἡ]λάσατε, ἐν μετρίοισι τίθεσθε εἰ μέγαν νόον· οὔτε γὰρ ἡμεῖς πεισόμεθ', οὔθ' ὑμῖν ἄρτια τα[ῦ]τ' ἔσσεται.

⁴² Cairns (1994): 79. Cairns' work will be analyzed in greater detail later this chapter.

Iliad

To understand the work of Homer in the *Iliad* is to gain critical perspective on pre-classical Greek notions on self-exaltation. Homer's two epics were treasured throughout their transmission and meticulously studied by ancients and moderns alike. This is also true of the Roman era, as Virgil's epic, the *Aeneid*, borrows from Homer's material to help root Roman identity and heritage in ancient ground. Kings, conquerors, and Roman statesmen were known to study the *Iliad* specifically as a source for individual, communal, and military wisdom.⁴³ Homer, alongside Hesiod, profoundly influenced Greek civilization and even now his work is part of the foundation of the Great Western Tradition. For the purposes of our topic, the *Iliad* demonstrates the relationship of ἄτη to *hybris*: that ἄτη is a necessary consequence of *hybris*. One could analyze this theme from a number of angles. In this chapter, I will seek to illuminate the relationship between ἄτη and ὕβρις by identifying Hector's *hybristic* presumptions of divinity and their consequences, ending with a short examination of a passage in Philodemus' *On the Good King According to Homer* which discusses presumption.

As stated earlier, *hybris* originally meant excessive exuberance, self-aggrandizement, or uncontrolled growth. Within the context of human relationships, however, the verb means "to outrage, insult, maltreat, treat despitely."⁴⁴ This use of the verb can involve the reduction of someone else's τιμή (honor) within social relationships. In Douglas Cairns' review of N.R.E Fisher's work, *Hybris: a Study in the Values of*

⁴³ Alexander the Great is the chief example. Cf. Strabo, *Geography*, 13.1.27; Plutarch, *Lives*, 8. The idea that Homer was useful source of wisdom for many areas of life of life is early and is satirized in Plato's *Ion*.

⁴⁴ LSJ, s.v. ὕβρις.

Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece, Cairns affirms Fisher’s “basic contention that *hybris* bears an essential reference to dishonour,” recognizing that “questions of honour often cannot be separated from questions of justice.”⁴⁵ Cairn continues to qualify Fischer’s work by showing how *hybris* is not limited to the trespass of honors, but also comprises, as this thesis has emphasized, “exuberant high spirits (MacDowell), being too full of oneself/of the good things of life (A. N. Michelini, HSCP 1978), and ‘thinking big’, presumption, or ‘thinking more than mortal thoughts’ (Dickie).”⁴⁶ His concluding assertion is crucial for my argument:

‘[T]hinking big’ [sc. φρονεῖν μέγα and similar expressions] is always a potential or implicit insult (and ‘thinking more than mortal thoughts’ always represents an infringement of divine *timē*). *Hybris* certainly bears an essential reference to dishonour, but it cannot be pinned down to actual verbal or physical affronts or the intention to commit such affronts.⁴⁷

“Thinking more than mortal thoughts” as a marker of *hybris* is key, for it demonstrates that the τιμή integral to the identity of a hero is also integral to the divine life. In the *Theogony*, Zeus dispenses τιμαί to the gods: Ὀλύμπιον εὐρύοπα Ζῆν ἄθανάτων: ὃ δὲ τοῖσιν ἐὰς διεδάσσατο τιμάς (“Farseeing Zeus, of the immortals divided their dignities amongst them”).⁴⁸ Here “dignities” is a more apt translation than “honors,” for τιμή does not merely constitute a form of opinion or respect but rather in this context refers to sacred spheres of influence which are apportioned to each divinity.⁴⁹ William

⁴⁵ Cairns (1994): 77

⁴⁶ Cairns (1994): 78.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 79; cf. Solon 4.8W and the use of μέγαν νόον in the context of κόρος.

⁴⁸ Hes. *Th.* 884-885 (tr. Most).

⁴⁹ Cf. Strauss Clay (2006): 154: “Each divinity possesses not only his particular sphere of activity, his *timai*, but also his particular mode of interaction with mortals.” This use of τιμή as “dignities” is not isolated. Zeus trespassed these honors, which Poseidon decries. See *Il.* 15.185ff for comparison: ““Well

Furley echoes this sentiment in saying that the Homeric hymns function to “chart the emergence of the Olympian gods under Zeus' dominion, showing how powers and privileges were apportioned among them.”⁵⁰

Thus for immortals and mortals alike, τιμή can be trespassed. In book 9, Achilles decries the hubristic action of Agamemnon saying:

ἄσσο' ἔλαχόν γε· γέρας δέ μοι ὅς περ ἔδωκεν
αὐτίς ἐφυβρίζων ἔλετο κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
Ἀτρείδης ἄσσο' ἔλαχόν γε· γέρας δέ μοι, ὅς περ ἔδωκεν,
αὐτίς ἐφυβρίζων ἔλετο κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
Ἀτρείδης⁵¹

Although τιμή is not explicitly stated, the term γέρας (sign of honor, honorific gift, prize)⁵² presupposes notions of τιμή, for a prize is awarded to those who have accomplished and established themselves and their dignities—much as the gods of Olympus do in the Homeric hymns. Achilles claims that Agamemnon is *committing hybris* (ἐφυβρίζων) against him by stepping out of bounds, by not respecting what fell to Achilles—growing beyond his own allotment of τιμή.

What justice is there then for *hybris*, what divine retribution? Ἄτη is this divine judgment. It is the blindness that comes over an individual, or the ruin and harm which one receives.⁵³ It is important to note that this judgement may not be instantaneous. As

now, surely, though he is noble, he has spoken arrogantly, if by force and against my will he will restrain me who have equal honor [ὀμότιμον] with himself. For three brothers are we, begotten by Cronos, and born of Rhea—Zeus, and myself, and the third is Hades, who is lord of the dead below. And in three ways have all things been divided, and to each has been apportioned his own domain” (tr. Murray).

⁵⁰ Furley (2011): 206–231.

⁵¹ *Il.* 9.367–369 (tr. Fagles): “All that fell to me by lot; but my **prize** [γέρας]—he who gave it to me has taken it back in his **arrogant pride**, lord Agamemnon, son of Atreus.”

⁵² *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, s.v. γέρας.

⁵³ *Diccionario Greigo Espanol* s.v. ἄτη: “obfuscation, madness, madness that is at the same time guilt; ruin, calamity, disaster; op. of κερδός ‘wealth and happiness,’ ruin, loss, perdition.” Cf. *LSJ* s.v. ἄτη:

Solon 13W demonstrates in lines 26-29, “one man pays the penalty at once, another later, and if they themselves escape the penalty and the pursuing destiny of the gods does not overtake them, it assuredly comes at another time.”⁵⁴ Aeschylus’ *Persians* is likewise revealing: ὕβρις γὰρ ἐξανθοῦσ’ ἐκάρπωσε στάχυν ἄτης, ὅθεν πάγκλαυτον ἐξαμᾶι θέρος. (“outrage [*hybris*] has blossomed, and has produced a crop of **ruin** [ἄτη], from which it is reaping a harvest of universal sorrow.”)⁵⁵

Therefore, when Patroclus commits *hybris*, he too faces judgement. After successfully warding off the Trojans from the Achaean ships according to Achilles’ command, Patroclus continues to press enemy lines. The poet uses a verbal form of ἄτη (ἄασθη) to describe his resultant state:

But Patroclus went for Troy’s and Lycia’s lines, *blind in his fatal frenzy* (ἄασθη)—luckless soldier. If only he had obeyed Achilles’s strict command he might have escaped his doom... But the will of Zeus will always overpower the will of men... he will spur a man to battle, just as he urged Patroclus’ fury now.⁵⁶

This frenzy from Zeus is the fruit of several *hybristic* actions. For one, Patroclus took the armor and horses of the semi-divine Achilles.⁵⁷ This was an act of “excessive exuberance” in its own right, for these horses were no ordinary steeds but the “magnificent gifts of the

“bewilderment, infatuation, caused by blindness or delusion sent by the gods, mostly as the punishment of guilty rashness,” also, “personified, the goddess of mischief, author of rash actions.”

⁵⁴ Solon 13W, ll. 26-29 (tr. Gerber).

⁵⁵ 821-22 (tr. Sommerstein).

⁵⁶ *Il.* 16.685ff (tr. Fagles); cf. Janko (1992): 397: “The poet lets us glimpse Patroklos’ state of mind as he plunges him, and us, back into battle, reminding us that he will be led to disaster by disobeying Akihilleus’ order to return after saving the ships (87ff)...Fenik ... compares how Hektor becomes too dizzy with victory to heed the warnings; like Patroclus (653ff.)”

⁵⁷ For the armoring of Patroclus cf. *Il.* 16.130-155. Specifically, note lines 154-55 for juxtaposition of mortality with immortal steeds: ὃς καὶ θνητὸς ἐὼν ἔπεθ’ ἵπποις ἀθανάτοισι (“he, being but mortal, kept pace with immortal steeds.”)

gods to Peleus, shining immortal gifts.”⁵⁸ Patroclus was therefore guilty of appropriating to himself divine honors, divine tools intended only for immortal use. In addition, Patroclus both defied the authority of Achilles by ignoring his warning to return when the mission was accomplished, and also defied the god Apollo himself, by whom he was seriously wounded.⁵⁹ These actions together constitute Patroclus’ *hybris*. Zeus warned Achilles of this punishment after Patroclus has already departed: he promised Achilles that Patroclus would fight well but would not return from the battle alive.⁶⁰ Accordingly, when Patroclus sought to storm Troy himself, he was stopped by Apollo, who thwarted him a 3rd time. The god screamed “Back —Patroclus, Prince, go back! It is not the will of fate that the proud Trojans’ citadel fall before your spear, not even before Achilles—far greater man than you!”⁶¹ Patroclus’ failure was that he attempted to “self-aggrandize” over and above the gods’ intent for him.

This theme is reinforced in book 9 when the Prayers (λίται)—the daughters of Zeus—and Ruin (Ἄτη) are anthropomorphized by Phoenix. These Prayers follow after Ἄτη, and where Ἄτη makes men fall, the Prayers seek to heal this hurt:

ὃς μὲν τ’ αἰδέσεται κούρας Διὸς ἄσπον ιούσας, τὸν δὲ μέγ’ ὤνησαν καὶ τ’ ἔκλυον
 εὐχομένοιο· ὃς δέ κ’ ἀνήγηται καὶ τε στερεῶς ἀποείπη, λίσσονται δ’ ἄρα ταί γε Δία
 Κρονίωνα κιοῦσαιτῶ Ἄτην ἅμ’ ἔπεσθαι, ἵνα βλαφθεὶς ἀποτίσῃ.

Now him who will respect the daughters of Zeus, when they draw near, him they greatly benefit, and hear him when he prays; but if a man denies them and

⁵⁸ *Il.* 16. 864-867 (tr. Fagles); cf. Janko (1992): 421: “Horses are often part of the spoils... Hektor longs to win Akhilleus’ divine pair, but they elude him just as he earlier eluded Patroklos (866=383).”

⁵⁹ *Il.* 16.789-804)

⁶⁰ *Il.* 16. 250-255 (tr. Fagles).

⁶¹ *Il.* 16. 707-709 (tr. Fagles).

stubbornly refuses, then they go and beg Zeus, son of Cronos, that **Blindness** may follow that man **so that he may fall and pay full recompense**.⁶²

The use of ἄρα “expresses consequence”: “If a man denies them [the prayers]... *then* they go.”⁶³ Furthermore, the use of a purpose clause (ἵνα... ἀποτίσῃ) indicates that Ἄτη is designed to make mortals pay for the debt incurred by their transgression. The transgression, according to Phoenix, is the failure to “respect the daughters of Zeus,” that is, to pray and reverence the gods as they should be worshiped. Mortals have a function to fulfill in the divine economy. Therefore, by rejecting this cosmic order, they are necessarily “self-aggrandizing.” Because this type of ὕβρις is at odds with the τιμή of the gods, the Prayers will ensure that Ἄτη comes down from Zeus.

Hector, despite his undeniable nobility—as the poem progresses—exhibits more and more *hybristic* behavior, above all in his divine pretensions. First, it is crucial to note that the clearest indicator of mortal *hybris* is the pursuit of immortality. Possessing pretensions of immortality is for mortals necessarily “growth in excess,” since this is the fundamental, immutable distinction between man and the divine. So in the same pattern set by Patroclus, Hector presumes divine prerogatives when, in book seventeen he “exchanged his armor... and donned the deathless arms of Peleus’ son Achilles, arms the gods of the sky once gave his loving father.”⁶⁴ Zeus’ condemnation of Hector confirms the significance of his transgression:

οὐδέ τί τοι θάνατος καταθύμιός ἐστιν,
ὃς δὴ τοι σχεδὸν εἴσι· σὺ δ’ ἄμβροτα τεύχεα δύνεις
ἄνδρὸς ἀριστῆος, τόν τε τρομέουσι καὶ ἄλλοι·

⁶² *Il.* 9.500-515 (tr. Fagles).

⁶³ LSJ, s.v. ἄρα.

⁶⁴ *Il.* 17. 194-197 (tr. Fagles).

τοῦ δὲ ἑταῖρον ἔπεφνες ἐνῆέα τε κρατερόν τε,
τεύχεα δ' οὐ κατὰ κόσμον ἀπὸ κρατός τε καὶ ὤμων
εἴλεν· ἀτάρ τοι νῦν γε μέγα κράτος ἐγγυαλίζω,
τῶν ποινήν ὃ τοι οὐ τι μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντι
δέξεται Ἀνδρομάχη κλυτὰ τεύχεα Πηλεΐωνος.

Not in your thoughts is death, that yet surely draws near you; but you are putting on the immortal armor of a preeminent man before whom others besides yourself also tremble. His comrade, kindly and mighty, have you slain, and improperly have stripped the armor from his head and shoulders. But for now I will grant you great might, in recompense for this, that in no way shall you return from the battle and Andromache receive from you the glorious armor of the son of Peleus.⁶⁵

There are several key elements here. Firstly, the excerpts' language refers to the trespass of honor, boundaries, and the presence of limits. Hector grabbed the armor οὐ κατὰ κόσμον ("improperly"; lit. "not according to order"). Notably, this is the precise phrase used in Solon 13W of the wealth sought "on account of *hybris*" (ὕφ' ὕβριος) which comes οὐ κατὰ κόσμον (line 11). Secondly, Zeus' judgement of Patroclus presages his judgement of Hector. Both Patroclus and Hector don the same deathless arms of Achilles and both subsequently fall into ἄτη. In fact, "the immense distinction of the armour is stressed by the poet as Hektor puts it on; then his presumption is further amplified by the words of Zeus which follow. Probably only sons of divinities like Akhilleus.... may properly wear armour made by Hephaistos."⁶⁶ Since both Patroclus and Hector lacked this divine claim, their actions necessitated punishment. The narrative demonstrates this is not an isolated instance but a pattern. Thirdly, as Janko noted, in this passage Zeus recognizes that Hector is not aware of his own mortality: "not in your thoughts is death" (οὐδέ... θάνατος καταθύμιός ἐστιν). Hector is losing the distinction between man and the

⁶⁵ *Il.* 17.201-208 (tr. Murray).

⁶⁶ Janko (1992): 80-81.

divine and thus Zeus doles out the divine justice of frenzied ἄτη.⁶⁷ This lack of sustained focus on one's own mortality runs counter to the heart of the heroic code, which demands that a hero constantly consider death. The acts of a hero are predicated on this consideration, in order that in spite of death, a hero should be remembered and honored and thus attain a kind of surrogate immortality.⁶⁸

But Hector does not merely forget his mortality; he explicitly wishes for divinity. Divine heritage is central: "If only I could be so much the son of aegis-bearing Zeus."⁶⁹ He also wishes for immortality in its own right: "If only I were as sure of immortality, ageless all my days" (εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼν ὧς / εἶην ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήρω ἡματα πάντα).⁷⁰ Yet, the most dangerous of his desires is what follows, his wishing that he "were [to be] prized as they prize Athena and Apollo" (τιοίμην δ' ὧς τίετ' Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἀπόλλων).⁷¹ Here *τιοίμην* is from *τίω*, an epic predecessor to *τιμάω* (to honor, esteem).⁷² Hector desires to be the object of worship; he desires divine prerogatives. Ironically, Hector desires to be

⁶⁷ Ibid., 81: "Hektor gloried in the knowledge of Zeus's support (15.719-25). In this Book and the next that support is gradually withdrawn, and Hektor appears increasingly over-confident; see 18.284-309n."

⁶⁸ For an example of the heroic code cf. the Sarpedon and Glaucus' dialogue in *Il.* 12. 324-329 (tr. Fagles): ὦ πέπον εἰ μὲν γὰρ πόλεμον περὶ τόνδε φυγόντε αἰεὶ δὴ μέλλοιμεν ἀγήρω τ' ἀθανάτω τε ἔσσεσθ', οὐτέ κεν αὐτὸς ἐνὶ πρώτοισι μαχοίμην οὐτέ κε σὲ στέλλοιμι μάχην ἐς κυδιάνειραν: νῦν δ' ἔμπηξ γὰρ κῆρες ἐφ' ἑσπέρῃσι θανάτωιο μυρία, ἃς οὐκ ἔστι φυγεῖν βροτὸν οὐδ' ὑπαλύξαι, ἴομεν ἢ ἐτ' εὖχος ὀρέξομεν ἢ ἐτις ἡμῖν ("Ah my friend, if you and I could escape this fray and live forever, never a trace of age, immortal, I would never fight on the front lines again or commands you to the field where men win fame. But now, as it is, the fates of death await us, thousands poised to strike, and not a man alive can flee them or escape—so in we go for attack! Give our enemy glory or win it for ourselves!")

⁶⁹ *Il.* 13.825-26 (tr. Loeb).

⁷⁰ *Il.* 8.538-542 (tr. Fagles).

⁷¹ *Il.* 8.538-541 (tr. Loeb): "I would that mine own self I might be immortal and ageless all my days, [540] and that I might be honoured even as Athene and Apollo, so surely as now this day bringeth evil upon the Argives." Cf. LSJ, s.v. *τίω*.

⁷² *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, s.v. *τίμαω*.

the son of the aegis-bearer, but his judgement is to be killed by the one who wields Zeus's aegis.⁷³

Our earlier examination of the Prayers (λίται) is now vindicated: if a man denies the Prayers and stubbornly refuses, they petition Zeus that “Blindness may follow that man so he may fall and pay full recompense.”⁷⁴ Blindness (ἄτη), is then the mechanism for the atonement of trespassed honors. If a plant “self-aggrandizes” and is not fulfilling its proper function, the solution is to prune it and redirect the wasted energy into the fruit.⁷⁵ However, the solution for mortal *hybris* is for him to fall with ἄτη—to face ruin. If a man is not struck with ἄτη for his divine pretenses, then injustice against the gods goes unpunished. To the extent that divine justice exists within the Homeric world, so too does hubris necessitate ἄτη.

The philosophical writings of the Hellenistic philosopher Philodemus illuminate my analysis and provide a bridge to my discussion about ruler cults. Philodemus was a prolific Epicurean thinker whose philosophic writings survive predominantly in fragments.⁷⁶ While Epicureans generally viewed poetry as an unsuitable medium for teaching, Philodemus' work *On the Good King According to Homer* frames Homer as a “moral guide for the political ruler.”⁷⁷ Philodemus thinks “Homer himself indicates the

⁷³ Achilles receives the Aegis in Book 18 before battling Hector. This is the same aegis Athena wielded in *Il.* 4.17.

⁷⁴ *Il.* 9. 512-515; κιοῦσαιτῷ Ἄτην ἅμ' ἔπεσθαι, ἵνα βλαφθεὶς ἀποτίσῃ.

⁷⁵ Note the treatment of the almond tree in Theophrastus *Historia Planarum* 2.7.6. It is ὑβρίζον, or “chastened” in its luxuriance in order to correct the tree and improve its function.

⁷⁶ Oxford Classical Dictionary, s.v. Philodemus.

⁷⁷ Asmis (1991): 3.

difference between good and bad... by correcting abuses depicted in his own poetry, and it is the task of the philosopher to show how Homer makes the corrections.”⁷⁸

Philodemus’ analysis of Hector marks his understanding of Homer’s moral admonitions regarding self-exaltation:

πολὺ δὲ [μ]ᾶλλον ἐν ταῖς εὐ[τυχ]ίαις ἄνθρωπος ὢν <οὐκ> ἐ[γίγνω]σκειν, ἀλλ’
{οὐκ} ἴσα θε[οις] ἐφρονεῖ καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς ἴσα]ζεν αὐτοῖς. Καί που [φάς τῶ]ν
κρείττωνων τις [φῦ]ναι τε κα[ὶ] γ[έ]νος ἔλκειν [ἐφ]ρενοῦτ[ο, κ]αθάπερ ἔνιοι τῶ]ν
ὑστερον μοναρχησάν]των.

And much more, in favorable times, he [Hector] failed to recognize that he was a human **being, but had godlike thoughts and tried to be equal to the gods themselves.** And on account of claiming somewhere to be born as one of the superior beings and also to derive his lineage (from them) he undergoes correction, just as some also of those who ruled later.⁷⁹

Philodemus here recognizes Homer’s intentional judgement of Hector for his divine presumption. Although the word ἄτη is not employed, the causative relationship between presumption and judgement is apparent. Philodemus instead uses ἐφρενοῦτο (“undergoes correction”) from the verb φρενέω, “to make wise, instruct, or inform.”⁸⁰ There is a relationship then between his failure to recognize, or know (ἐγίγνωσκειν) and his need to be corrected, or made wise (ἐφρενοῦτο).⁸¹ These terms are specific to the state of the human mind, for one of unsound mind (μὴ νόος ἄρτιος) will by satiety (κορός) commit

⁷⁸ Ibid., 20-21

⁷⁹ Column 91, 14-24.

⁸⁰ LSJ, s.v. φρενέω

⁸¹ I interpret Homer’s use of φρενέω as a figure of speech for “getting what’s coming to him.” Therefore, I do not find it necessary that Hector have a moment of self-realization or repentance within the poem’s narrative.

hybris.⁸² Notably, Philodemus’ comparison of Hector’s correction with that of “those who ruled later” is a reference to the Hellenistic ruler cults and Roman emperor cults. He must have in mind some who served as examples of ὕβρις and ἄτη in action. Philodemus, therefore identifies immoral behavior through his philosophical analysis of the *Iliad* and offers this to Calpernius Piso, the recipient of this work, as a warning against senatorial pitfalls and abuses of power.

Hector never overtly claims divinity in the text, however, in book 13, Poseidon says that he did: Ἐκτωρ, ὅς Διός εὖχετ’ ἐρισθενέος πάις εἶναι (“Hector, who boasts to be the child of mighty Zeus”).⁸³ As noted by Fish, this can be seen as an exaggeration on the part of Poseidon, yet Byzantine scholarship takes it at face value, referencing the abundance of divine longing throughout the poem—to which Janko says “smacks of presumption; [and] it confirms Poseidon’s words to Aias that Hector Διός εὖχετ’ ἐρισθενέος πάις εἶναι.”⁸⁴ Fish further notes that these various instances support the Byzantine interpretation of εὖχετ’ as “profess loudly, boast, or vaunt”⁸⁵ rather than the common translation “to pray.” Furthermore, it is possible that taking Achilles’ horses and donning his deathless arms may constitute the attempt of Hector to realize these pretensions that Poseidon decries.

⁸² Solon 6C, τίκτει γὰρ κόρος ὕβριν, ὅταν πολλὸς ὄλβος ἔπηται ἀνθρώποις ὁπόσοις μὴ νόος ἄρτιος ᾖ (“For excess breeds insolence, whenever great prosperity comes to men who are not sound of mind.”)

⁸³ *Il.* 13.54 (tr. Fagles).

⁸⁴ Janko (1992).

⁸⁵ LSJ s.v. εὖχομαι, III

Philodemus powerfully summarizes his own commentary in this passage: “He [Hector] reveals that Homer disdains such manifestations of presumption.”⁸⁶ Homer wants the audience to consider that hubristic presumptions to divinity will be punished, that ἄτη will surely come. By treating the *Iliad* as representative of the pre-classical warnings against self-exaltation, we are now prepared to see the extension of Homeric influence into more documented history. Just as Philodemus did in his time, I will now paint the notions of ὕβρις and ἄτη with larger strokes as we examine how Alexander the Great and subsequent ruler-cults attempted to garner τιμαὶ ἴσα θεῶ (honors equal to gods) unto themselves.

Ruler Cults

Early figures of the Hellenistic age such as Lysander and Philip II of Macedon demonstrated that divine honors (*isotheoi timai*) could be granted to living mortals, not just mythical founders or divinized heroes like Heracles. For example, Phillip II inserted a grandiose statue of himself among the statues of gods of Olympus during his celebratory procession, at which time he was assassinated by Pausanias.⁸⁷ His son, Alexander the Great, traveled further down the path of apotheosis, so much so that he later came to reject his lineage, instead claiming to be descended from Zeus-Ammon and instituting the practice of *proskynesis* as an assertion of his divinity among the Greeks

⁸⁶ Fish’s translation, ll. 38-41: καταμην[ύει δὲ τὸν Ὀμηρον ὅτι τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν φρονημάτων δυσ<σ>ώπ]οῦμενος αὐτόν τε τοιοῦτον

⁸⁷ For a detailed account of the procession and assassination cf. Martin and Blackwell (2013): 39-41.

and Macedonians.⁸⁸ Alexander's war-frenzy and attempts at apotheosis came to end in an early death—likely due to alcohol poisoning. Yet Alexander's tendency toward divinization did not die with his body. His spirit of self-exaltation continued within the *diadachoi*, who garnered *isatheoi timai* unto themselves as well. Following the law of reciprocity, these honors were exchanged for services—namely protection and provision—which were typically seen as divine duties: “Since Hellenistic kings... resembled the immortal gods in the care they took for humans, they deserved to receive similar expressions of gratitude as the gods....the king is to receive *isotheoi timai*.”⁸⁹ In some instances, these honors were demanded of the people.⁹⁰ In others, they were the gifts of the people—sometimes genuine, sometimes a form of appeasement—in return for the *diadachoi* acting like gods by fulfilling the roles of savior (σωτήρ), benefactor (εὐεργετής), and manifest presence (ἐπιφάνης). These honors sometimes came at the expense of the traditional gods.⁹¹ One example of this is the Ithylphallic Hymn which the Athenians sung to Demetrius Poliokoretes.⁹² The hymn dared to condemn the Olympian gods as absent and even suggested they do not exist. Instead of giving honors to the gods, the Athenians gave worship to Demetrius. Divine honors were expressed in various

⁸⁸ *Proskynesis*, though traditionally taken as equivalent with prostration, may have expressed itself in a wide variety of physical postures. On this, see Abe (2018). Additionally, there is significant scholarly debate whether *Proskynesis* was viewed as an act of worship for the Persians or for the Greeks, for which Bowden (2013) is the most prominent voice. However, as Abe notes, *Histories* 1.131-140 and Isoc. *Paneg.* 151 demonstrate that the Greeks did generally fear the religious implications of this act, to which Tuplin (2017) bears witness, p.16: “pace Bowden 2013, it does seem to be precisely *proskunēsis* that prompts Greek ideas of Persian deification of living king.”

⁸⁹ Erskine (2003): 433, who refers to IG 12.7, 506 and SEG 41.75 as examples of this.

⁹⁰ Cf. Philo, *Legat.* IX; XVI. The Roman emperor Caligula made extreme demands of the Jews for the worship of the emperor cult. He installed cult statues in the synagogues.

⁹¹ Cf. Cairns (1994): 79.

⁹² Athen. 6.253bb-f (tr. Austin). This hymn will be a source for later discussion in this chapter.

ways: they often “involved worship and displayed evident dynastic intentions.”⁹³ More specifically, the king would be honored by the establishment “of a cult, with temple or altar, priest, sacrifices, and games, modeled on that granted to the Olympian gods (*isotheoi timai*).”⁹⁴ In this chapter, I seek to analyze historical examples of ὕβρις and ἄτη in Alexander the Great and subsequent rulers. First, I will examine the apotheosis of Alexander through the incident at Siwah and the institution of *proskynesis*. Then I will turn from the striking example of Demetrios’ Poliorketes Ithylphallic Hymn to Emperor Calligula’ mania described in Philo’s *Legatio ad Gaium*.

Alexander

Alexander the Great wished to be considered a living god. His desire for divinity was downstream of the Iliad, broader myth, and Aristotle’s teaching on the relationship of political power to divinity and excellence (ἀρετή). Alexander attempted to establish his divinity through a favorable oracle at Siwah⁹⁵ and by his institution of *proskynesis*.

Alexander’s tendency towards divine presumption cannot be understood apart from the influence of his tutor Aristotle, who speaks in the *Politics* about the godlikeness of the truly virtuous man:

“if there is any one man so greatly distinguished in outstanding virtue [ἀρετῆς]... it is no longer proper to count these exceptional men a part of the state; for they will be treated unjustly if deemed worthy of equal status, being so widely unequal

⁹³ Coppola (2016): 24.

⁹⁴ Edson, Farwell, and Price (2016).

⁹⁵ For a detailed account of the expedition to Siwah, cf. Martin and Blackwell (2012): 75-76.

in virtue and in their political ability: since such a man will naturally be as a god among men (ὥσπερ γὰρ θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις εἰκὸς εἶναι τὸν τοιοῦτον.)”⁹⁶

Thus we can imagine Alexander prized virtue (ἀρετῆς) as a possible means of becoming a god, or godlike.⁹⁷ What this supreme virtue consists of is left unclear, however.

Mitchell indicates that “it must be connected to the achievement of the ‘good life’, which is the political life.”⁹⁸ For Alexander, it may have consisted partly in his belief that

“justice was inherent in any action that Zeus determined. So too with any great king:

whatever he causes to happen must be taken as just.”⁹⁹ That he received the message of

becoming godlike with enthusiasm is apparent in his famous oration to his army at the

mutiny of Opis in 324 B.C: “I nonetheless established, if I may be forgiven for saying so,

an empire comprising most of the world! Are you sick of Asia, where *your glorious*

achievements have made you the equals of the gods?”¹⁰⁰ Notably, the language *vos... dis*

pares fecit used here by Alexander closely parallels the Greek construction of honors

isatheoi (“like or equal to the gods”). Considering the persuasive telos of the speech, it

may be that Alexander is exaggerating; nevertheless, the use of the perfect verb *fecit*

implies that Alexander at this point in his campaign already considered his army, and by

⁹⁶ Aristot. Polit. 3.1284a (tr. Rackham): εἰ δέ τις ἔστιν εἷς τοσοῦτον διαφέρων κατ’ ἀρετῆς ὑπερβολήν, ἢ πλείους μὲν ἐνὸς μὴ μέντοι δυνατοὶ πλήρωμα παρασχέσθαι πόλεως, ὥστε μὴ συμβλητὴν εἶναι τὴν τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετὴν πάντων μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν τὴν πολιτικὴν πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνων, εἰ πλείους, εἰ δ’ εἷς, τὴν ἐκείνου μόνον, οὐκέτι θετέον τούτους μέρος πόλεως: ἀδικήσονται γὰρ ἀξιούμενοι τῶν ἴσων, ἄνισοι τοσοῦτον κατ’ ἀρετὴν ὄντες καὶ τὴν πολιτικὴν δύναμιν: ὥσπερ γὰρ θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις εἰκὸς εἶναι τὸν τοιοῦτον.

⁹⁷ On the influences of Aristotle on Alexander regarding ἀρετή, cf. Martin and Blackwell (2012): 20-21.

⁹⁸ Mitchell (2013): 98.

⁹⁹ Arrian, *Anab.*, 4.7.7-9 (tr. Hammond).

¹⁰⁰ Q. Rufus, *Historiae Alexandri Magni*, 10.2.24-25: Asiaene pertaesum est, quae vos gloria rerum gestarum dis pares fecit?

extension himself, to have achieved this divine status. Alexander's military success could thus constitute the excellence deserving of glory equal to the gods, for "military success... could make a mortal 'god-like' (*isotheos*)."¹⁰¹

Alexander's competition with Iliadic figures drove his pursuit of apotheosis as well. According to Plutarch, Aristotle's annotations and commentary were included in a copy of the *Iliad* which Alexander kept as a guide throughout the course of his conquests: "Alexander took with him Aristotle's recension of the poem, called the *Iliad of the Casket* and always kept it lying beside his dagger under his pillow."¹⁰² The caution undertaken to protect this book demonstrates the importance of the *Iliad* in the formation of his character and regulation of his behavior. Strabo confirms this much and demonstrates through his discourse on Alexander's competition with Agamemnon how intensely Alexander prized this text.¹⁰³ He says that when Alexander conquered Ilium, he boasted to have accomplished in 11 days what it took Agamemnon 10 years to accomplish. This is an attempt to outcompete a heroic and mythical figure.

Alexander's pursuit of excellence led him to pursue divinity in competition with figures of the broader myth tradition. Apart from his foundation in the mythic tradition on account of his tutelage under Aristotle, he is also reported to have possessed volumes of

¹⁰¹ See Chaniotis (2007): 55-57; cf. Mitchell (2013), 98: "It is the possession of this incomparable virtue and political ability in one man which elevates him to the position of Absolute King, and gives him a special place in regard to law. For, Aristotle says, such a man is like a god among men (Aristotle, *NE*.7.1145a19).

¹⁰² Plutarch, *Alex.*, 8.2 (tr. Perrin). The same passage says he considered the *Iliad* a "resource for the art of war" (τῆς πολεμικῆς ἀρετῆς ἐφόδιον).

¹⁰³ Strabo, *Geography*, 13.1.27.

Euripides, Sophocles, Aeschylus, and Phylistus among others.¹⁰⁴ From this base of mythic knowledge came the important “religious and ritual background to the deification of the living, for which Heracles provided one mode. It is undoubtedly true that Alexander attempted to emulate the hero.”¹⁰⁵ Moreover, Alexander’s family claimed Heracleian lineage. The combination of these factors led Alexander to make his own pilgrimage to the oracle, following the steps of his supposed ancestor.¹⁰⁶

The debacle of the oracle at Siwah made Alexander’s *hybristic* presumption apparent. According to Justin, Alexander, “wishing... to claim divine birth ... sent men ahead to bribe the priests to give the responses he wanted.”¹⁰⁷ The response he desired was to be hailed as the son of Zeus-Ammon and thus to lay claim to divinity itself. Thus, “when he entered the temple, the priests immediately hailed him as the son of Hammon and he, delighted at his divine adoption, ordered that he be henceforth regarded as the god’s son.”¹⁰⁸ Justin reveals to us that Alexander was not merely looking for a confirmation of divine sonship in accordance with his mother’s tale,¹⁰⁹ but that he wished to leverage his divine claim to increase authority over his army. Arrian too addresses the true intentions of Alexander in his *Anabasis*, for “he himself traced his birth in part to

¹⁰⁴ Plutarch, *Alex.*, 8.3 (tr. Perrin): “Harpalus sent him the books of Philistus, a great many of the tragedies of Euripides, Sophocles, and Aeschylus, and the dithyrambic poems of Telestus and Philoxenus.”

¹⁰⁵ Mitchell (2013): 103.

¹⁰⁶ Arrian, *Anab.* 13.1.27

¹⁰⁷ Justin 11.1 (tr. Yardley).

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Olympias, Alexander’s mother, dreamed her womb was struck by Zeus’s lightning. On the other hand, Phillip II claimed that he had seen a giant snake (a god in disguise) sleeping with Olympias. Olympias later told Alexander he was born from divine seed. See Martin and Blackwell (2013): 4;8.

Ammon, In any case he set out for Ammon with this idea, hoping to secure more exact knowledge of his affairs, or at least to say he had secured it.”¹¹⁰ Arrian plays the cynic. He has his own suspicions about whether Alexander received a genuine admission of his divinity from the priest. He further indicates that Alexander was already attributing his paternity to Ammon prior to any such confirmation. The implication is that Alexander was more concerned with political and personal advantage than the truth of his lineage.

Whether or not Alexander legitimately believed that he was a god is at this point is tangential to the argument. One possibility is that he believed his own delusion and was suffering from— to utilize the archaic paradigm presented thus far—the blind frenzy (*atē*) that accompanies it. Or, though aware of his own mortality, he nevertheless desired divinity and its outward benefits which is—according to the paradigm—a *hybristic* act of trespassing the confines of humanity. In either case, Alexander attempted to garner to himself the praise, power, and glory which are only befitting of a god. Those beholden to his divinity would now be subject all the more to his authority. Further, even those not believing his divinity would still be under the auspices of this pretense. Q. Curtius Rufus says as much:

Alexander now believed that the time was ripe for the depraved idea he had conceived some time before, and he began to consider how he could appropriate divine honors to himself. He wished to be believed, not just called, the son of Jupiter, as if it were possible for him to have as much control over men’s minds as their tongues, and he gave orders for the Macedonians to follow the Persian’s customs in doing homage to him byprostrating themselves on the ground.¹¹¹

¹¹⁰ Arian, *Anabasis*, 3.2 (tr. Brunt).

¹¹¹ Q. Rufus, *History of Alexander*, 8.5.5 (tr. Rolfe).

Curtius Rufus recognizes the “appropriation of divine honors” and paints Alexander as a tyrannical figure who, through the divine claim, is dominating the whole being of his soldiers—a cruel ironic twist of the so-called “liberation” that Alexander offered to each conquered city. As Curtius Rufus says, Persian *proskynesis* was key to the advancement of this power, for which Siwah served as a justification.¹¹²

Alexander knew that introducing *proskynesis* into his military would be perceived as an act of worship to the Macedonian and Greek populations. The story of Callisthenes, a historian who accompanied Alexander, is particularly telling. Callisthenes, among many of the other military officials, is required to perform the Persian custom of *proskynesis* after being given a golden cup to drink from. The expectation was that only then would he rise and receive the customary Macedonian kiss. Callisthenes alone drank from the cup but refused obeisance, since he associated it with the worship of gods.¹¹³ According to Arrian’s narrative, he previously decried the enjoinder to obeisance, saying that “even among the gods themselves there is variety in the honours paid, and indeed another layer of worship distinguishing the heroes from the gods. It cannot be right to blur all this by raising mortals to an inflated status with extravagant honours, and in so doing to demean the gods—as far as men can—by the indignity of reducing the

¹¹² Arrian, *Anabasis* 4.9.9 (tr. Hammond): “The prevailing account has Alexander keen to introduce formal obeisance: behind this was this conviction that his true father was Ammon rather than Philip.... Even on this issue there was no lack of flatterers to indulge his wish.”

¹¹³ Bowden (2013) argues that this account is fictitious, partially because the ancient sources are never listed by Arrian. Nevertheless, Abe (2018) agrees with Bosworth (1995): 77-78, that a “historical core was variously adapted,” and that “Arrian’s material is more Hellenistic in flavour [than Curtius] and could very well echo the contemporary debate on the propriety of deifying a living man.” Essentially, there is value in this account as representing Greek perception of the practice of *Proskynesis*, regardless of the historicity of the event itself.

honors paid them to parity with men.”¹¹⁴ The language of “proper” thought and of transgression against the gods is key here, for these are the markers of hubris—the excessive or uncontrolled growth beyond one’s intended function or limits, extending to the transgression of the τίμαι of others. When the attendants of Alexander alerted him to Callisthenes refusal, Alexander refuses to give him the customary Macedonian kiss.¹¹⁵ Notably, Arrian explicitly identifies Alexander’s refusal of the kiss as ὕβρις.¹¹⁶

This refusal is *hybristic* in two ways. Firstly, this is a transgression against Callisthenes— Callisthenes was wrongly denied the custom of friendship and loyalty. Yet, there is a more significant *hybris* present in Alexander’s divine imitation: he refuses to bestow favor on those who neglect proper worship to him as a god. In accordance with his mythical influences and competitive spirit, Alexander, as the supposed son of Zeus, has put himself in Zeus’ place.¹¹⁷ We may here recall book 9 of the *Iliad* where Ἄρη (Ruin) and the Λιταί (the Prayers, daughters of Zeus) appear as personified deities. The Prayers, when unheeded (meaning that worship was not given to the gods), would petition Zeus to send Ἄρη as judgement. In like fashion, Alexander imitates Zeus when he is informed by his attendants (who parallel the Prayers), that proper worship was

¹¹⁴ See Arrian, *Anabasis* 4.11 (tr. Hammond): ἄλλαι τιμαὶ πρόσκεινται, καὶ ναὶ μὰ Δία ἥρωσιν ἄλλαι, καὶ αὗται ἀποκεκριμένοι τοῦ θεοῦ. οὐκ οὖν εἰκὸς ζύμπαντα ταῦτα ἀναταράσσοντας τοὺς μὲν ἀνθρώπους ἐς σχῆμα ὑπέρογκον καθιστάναι τῶν τιμῶν ταῖς ὑπερβολαῖς, τοὺς θεοὺς δὲ τό γε ἐπὶ σφίσιν ἐς ταπεινότητα οὐ πρόπευσαν καταβάλλειν τὰ ἴσα ἀνθρώποις τιμῶντας.

¹¹⁵ Arrian, *Anabasis*, 4.12.3-5.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 4.12.6

¹¹⁷ Cf. Q. Rufus, *History of Alexander*, 8.5.5: Iovis filium non dici tantum se, sed etiam credi volebat.

neglected by Callisthenes. Alexander, like Zeus, decides to withhold his favor and thereby spelled his ruin, for Alexander later had Callisthenes executed.¹¹⁸

Demetrios Poliorketes

The spirit of Alexander continued in subsequent ruler cults, characterized by the pursuit of divinity and receiving the prerogatives of it. When Demetrios Poliorketes returns to Athens in 291 B.C after defeating Demetrius of Phaleron, the Athenians sing a processional hymn celebrating his return:

How the greatest and dearest of the gods have come to the city! For the hour has brought together Demeter and Demetrios; she comes to celebrate the solemn mysteries of the Kore, while he is here full of joy, as befits the god (ὥσπερ τὸν θεὸν δεῖ), fair and laughing. His appearance is majestic, his friends all around him and he in their midst, as though they were stars and he the sun. Hail son of the most powerful god Poseidon and Aphrodite. For the other gods are either far away, or they do not have ears, or they do not exist, or do not take any notice of us, but you we can see present here; you are not made of wood or stone, you are real. We pray to thee (εὐχόμεσθα δὴ σοι).¹¹⁹

As Chaniotis notes, there is great significance to the etymological associations of Demetrios' name with Demeter, to the attribution of divine parentage with Poseidon and Aphrodite, and to the praise of Demetrios' characteristics which are fundamentally religious—i.e. the “majestic” appearance and luminary language.¹²⁰ This is all to say nothing of the explicit confession of him as a god (ὥσπερ τὸν θεὸν δεῖ, “as befits the god”) and of directing prayers to him as such (εὐχόμεσθα δὴ σοι). Coppola notes that this title of θεός is not only used of Demetrios here but also of Antiochus IV and Ptolemy V

¹¹⁸ Martin and Blackwell (2012): 134. Callisthenes's was killed on charge of treason. It was accused that he had knowledge of or facilitated the pages' failed conspiracy to kill Alexander. The accuracy of this claim is unclear.

¹¹⁹ Athen. 6.253bb-f (tr. Austin).

¹²⁰ Chaniotis (2007): 431.

among others. Ptolemy II even “deified Ptolemy I and Berenikē as *Theoi Soteres*.”¹²¹

Apotheosis became a trend—it became increasingly common from the time of the initial *diadachoi* down through the generations of the dynastic kings.¹²²

Yet, arguably starker than all of these lofty claims is the undeniable infringement of τιμή against the gods who are accused of being far away, not noticing or hearing men, and even of possibly not existing.¹²³ Callisthenes’s concern was that “raising mortals to extravagant proportions by excesses of honour” will bring “the gods... down to a demeaning and unfitting level.”¹²⁴ This concern is certainly vindicated. The exaltation of Demetrios came at the cost of what rightfully belonged to Olympus. Whether or not Demetrios sought these honors like Alexander did is not clear. It may be, however, that simply receiving or accepting them is equivalent to such a wish. Demetrios had the opportunity to deny these honors, and yet his reception of them constitutes the satiety (κόρος) by which *hybris* is begotten, and after which ἄτη comes. For these honors are not meant for men, and when man receives them they will undoubtedly affect his character.

The consequences of this *hybris* are suggested in Demetrios’ later life. Since he had been hailed as a living god, Demetrios’ “ambitions approached their zenith, and he

¹²¹ Coppola (2016): 19-20.

¹²² Wheatley and Dunn (2020): 349f: “The acceptance of cult and divine honours had developed significantly since the initial resistance Alexander the Great had faced during his lifetime.”

¹²³ We may recall that *hybris*, by nature, refers to dishonor. Cf. Cairn (1994): 79. For more on Demetrios and Antigonos Monophthalmos’ shared reception of these honors, cf. Landucci (2016). Cf. p. 41: “Around 307/306, at least a part of the public opinion was convinced that bestowing the god’s own honours upon living men was not only a form of tribute toward a benefactor, as Demetrius Poliorketes could be considered, but constituted a grave sacrilege and an insult to the ancient gods.”

¹²⁴ Arrian, *Anabasis*, 4.11

aspired to emulate Alexander's grand military vision with an *Anabasis* of his own."¹²⁵ In comparison, when Patroclus and Hector fell into ἄτη, the frenzy was also distinctively militaristic. Before their death, they both accomplished great military feats rivaling the gods. This same phenomenon is reflected in Demetrios and Alexander's mutual push towards conquest—one seeking dominance over the known world. That ἄτη is a consequence of ὕβρις is thereby attested by these historical figures. It is after assuming much of oneself that such a person will make foolish and grandiose attempts to realize their presumption.

Emperor Caligula

The spirit of Alexander continued through the Hellenistic rulers and entered into the Roman emperors. Although Gaius Caligula began his rule in 37 A.D. as a beloved figure, he quickly fell into madness as he toyed increasingly with notions of godhood. As a result, he despised the Jews who would not offer the same worship as the Alexandrians. This led to a Greek pogrom against the Jews, culminating in a colossus of Gaius' image being forced into the Jewish temple, along with many smaller statues imposed upon Jewish synagogues.¹²⁶ Philo's account of the embassy to Gaius (*Legatio ad Gaium*) witnesses to the dangers of self-exaltation and elucidates how a satiety (κορός) of honors can affect ὕβρις and ἄτη.

It is necessary first to outline the progression of Gaius' delusion: Philo reports that in the days of great prosperity preceding his sickness, Caligula was never... puffed

¹²⁵ Wheatley and Dunn (2020): 358.

¹²⁶ Philo, *Legat.*, XLIII.346. All translations of Philo are from Henry and Whitacre (1958) unless otherwise noted.

up by the vast honours given to him.... [and] never wished anyone to address him as a god” (XXIII.153-154). However, when he fell ill, he succumbed to his excess through sumptuous living (II.14). This led to the blindness (τυφλώττει) of Caligula’s mind (IV.22), for he “no longer considered it worthy of him[self] to abide within the bounds of human nature but overstepped them in his eagerness to be thought a god” (XI. 75). Then, in similar fashion to the Ithyphallic Hymn, when Caligula was “filled with envy and covetousness, [he] took possession wholesale of the honours...of the deities themselves” (XI.80). Just like Alexander, Caligula started receiving *proskynesis* as worship from the Alexandrians (XVI.116) and considered that he was above the law, since he supposed his nature and virtue put him above it (XVII.119). Furthermore, he began “not only saying but thinking that he was God” (XXV.162).¹²⁷ This thinking quickly led him to soar “above man’s estate and already rank(s) himself as among the gods” (XXXI.218). Caligula also voyaged to Egypt specifically because he thought the city would “foster the idea of godship which occupied his dreams.” He thought that he could imitate the success of the Ptolemaic cult (XLIII.338). Lastly, he intended to transform the “temple in the Holy City” to bear his name “the new Zeus made manifest” (XLIII.346), and at being approach by the embassy, he exclaimed “Are you the god-haters who do not believe me to be a god, a god acknowledged among all the other nations but not to be named by you?” (XLIV.353)

Caligula is an ideal demonstration of the paradigm of self-exaltation presented thus far. Once he began to indulge both his physical and psychological appetites, he

¹²⁷ Cf. Q. Rufus, *History of Alexander*, 8.5.5: “He [Alexander] wished to be believed, not just called, the son of Jupiter” (tr. Rolfe).

would no longer be satisfied by the limits of his mortality and began to pursue things not meant for him. There was a discontentedness with the limitations of his humanity that led him to first pretend, and then believe that he could actually be a god. He paid the price for this *hybris* when he was betrayed and assassinated like Julius Caesar.¹²⁸ However, it could be said that the descent into madness, into irrationality, into incredibly erratic and politically foolish tyranny represents the kind of blindness and frenzy inherent in ἄτη, as we have discussed. Several key words and phrases in Philo's treatment of Caligula deserve further analysis.

Philo notes that he “no longer considered it worthy of him[self] to abide within the bounds of human nature but overstepped (ὑπερέκυπτε) them in his eagerness to be thought a god” (XI. 75). This is crucial, for the term ὑπερέκυπτε has its parallel in other contexts of *hybris* and honor where the preposition ὑπέρ indicates the trespass or impropriety of the action it is affixed to.¹²⁹ Further, he “no longer considered it worthy of himself.” The underlying assumption in Caligula's thinking is that there was a measure of growth by which he was able divinize. This of course we can characterize as “self-aggrandizement” or “excessive exuberance.”

Caligula's emulation of Alexander and Ptolemy is notable. The institution of *proskynesis* and his move to Egypt are immediately striking examples of his imitation.

¹²⁸ Barret (1991): 168-171. See also pp. 140-153 for an extended discussion on the divine honours Caligula received.

¹²⁹ Cf. II. 9.497-502 with the use ὑπερβήη (from ὑπερβαίνω “transgress”): “Even the very gods can bend, though theirs is even greater excellence and honor and might. These by incense and reverent vows and libations and the savor of sacrifice do men turn from wrath with supplication, when any man transgresses and errs (ὑπερβήη καὶ ἀμάρτη)” For a mortal to transgress (ὑπερβαίνω) these honors reserved for the gods and for them alone is, as Michelini puts it, “self-aggrandizement above the performance of the social role assigned.” (tr. Fagles). See Michelini, “Υβρις and Plants,” 38-39.

But the shared obsession with Zeus on the part of Alexander, Hector, and Caligula, is truly remarkable. On the one hand, Alexander makes himself to be the son of Zeus and seems to parrot Zeus in his encounter with Callisthenes. Likewise Hector is accused by Poseidon of boasting to be the child of Zeus in Poseidon in the *Iliad*.¹³⁰ Yet Caligula goes the furthest in his presumption and, in his madness, identifies himself as the “new Zeus made manifest” (XLIII.346). In all, there is a shared obsession with appropriating the power and influence, the prestige and honor of the father of all the gods. The pattern demonstrates that unchecked *hybris* knows no bounds and will chase after the highest thing it can conceive.

¹³⁰ Cf. *Il.* 13.54 Ἐκτωρ, ὅς Διός εὔχετ’ ἐρισθενέος πάις εἶναι.

CHAPTER THREE

Carmen Christi: How Humility Refutes Ὑβρις

Paul wrote his epistle to Philippians c. 61A.D while in Roman captivity pending trial before Emperor Nero.¹ The city of Philippi is named after Philip II of Macedon, who founded the colony in 356 B.C and whose son Hellenized the known world. Yet, this city, taken by the Romans in 167 B.C., was designated as a Roman colony in 42 B.C. by Marc Antony and then supplemented with a larger population in 30 B.C by Emperor Augustus when he defeated Marc Antony. Philippi, though a Roman colony, retained its indigenous Hellenistic influences. This is especially evident through the wide range of worshipped deities in addition to the presence of the imperial cult.²

The Apostle Paul was writing to a predominantly gentile population. Harmon states that there was “a negligible Jewish presence” and that “the fact that there was no synagogue... suggests a predominantly Gentile congregation.”³ Further, of those mentioned by name within the epistle, Lydia, Euodia, and Syntyche are all distinctively Greek names while Clement is Roman.⁴ Furthermore, the Philippian church was

¹ Fee (1999): 12: Paul wrote “from Rome in the early 60’s.”

² Schnabel (2004): 2:1152; Harmon, (2015): 23-27. Harmon notes that although the dating of imperial cults is in question, the cult of Augustus was likely already established in the first century. Harmon also says that the evidence suggests the presence of “Apollo Comaeus, Artemis, Dionysios, the hero Aulonites, the Kabiroi, Zeus, [and] the Egyptian gods Isis and Sarapis... Silvanus, Cybele and Bacchus, along with a temple for the Egyptian gods... Diana, Dionysios, and Isis.”

³ Harmon (2015): 28-29.

⁴ Fee (1999): 26.

cofounded by the half-Greek Timothy (Acts 16:1) and notably inaugurated with the baptism of Lydia, who was from the Greek settlement of Thyatira (Acts 16:14-15).

This is the audience and context for Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. I present what has come to be known as the *Carmen Christi* (Phil. 2:6-11) here as a counterexample to the Greek notions of ὕβρις. In this chapter, I seek to call attention to a Christological contour of beauty present in Christ's humility which refutes ὕβρις in the pursuit of glory. First, I will present the hymn and identify key features of Christ's humility. Then, I argue that Paul's language makes this comparison against cultic *hybris*. Lastly, I will frame this contrast aesthetically and contemplate the anthropological applications of this contour of beauty.

It is prudent to provide an account the hymn and of how it exalts Jesus' humility as a better path to glory. The first half of the passage is centered around Christ's *Kenosis*—his emptying and humiliation— and the latter half on his glorious exaltation:

⁵ τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ⁶ ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἄρπαγμόν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, ⁷ ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος· καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος ⁸ ἑταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ· ⁹ διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν, καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα, ¹⁰ ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων, ¹¹ καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσῃται ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς.

⁵ Have this mind among yourselves, which is yours in Christ Jesus, ⁶ who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, ⁷ but emptied himself, by taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men. ⁸ And being found in human form, he humbled himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, even death on a cross. ⁹ Therefore God has highly exalted him and bestowed on him the name that is above every name, ¹⁰ so that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the

earth,¹¹ and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.⁵

Whether or not the passage is properly a hymn or merely “exalted prose” is not the concern of this chapter.⁶ Primarily, the *Carmen Christi* serves to present the humility of Christ as a model for the Philippian church.⁷ Paul commands the Philippians in 2:3 not to do anything from “selfish-ambition or conceit but in humility (ταπεινοφροσύνη).” After which, he commands the Philippians to emulate the mindset (τοῦτο φρονεῖτε) of Christ in his perfect demonstration of it.

It is thus prudent to examine in what way Christ’s humility is on display. Christ’s humility is primarily on display through incarnation, wherein he forsook the divine prerogatives that would be available to a god-man. Though in very essence God (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων) he did not consider (οὐχ...ἡγήσατο) his equality with God (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ) as a thing to be grasped (ἀρπαγμὸν)” (Phil. 2:6). μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων may be more properly is translated as “*that which characterizes a given reality*” considering that the term μορφή denotes not just appearance, but “those characteristics and qualities which are essential to it.”⁸ Additionally, according to Hoover’s philological analysis of ἀρπαγμὸς, there is a sense of possession inherent in the term, that is, the “statement carries with it the assumption that τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ represents a status which

⁵ Phil. 2:4–11. Unless otherwise noted, throughout this thesis I am using the *English Standard Version* for the translation of the bible and the SBL edition for the Greek by Holmes (2013).

⁶ On the debate of this passage as a hymn or merely exalted prose, see Fee (1992); Martinez (2000); Lohmeyer (1974).

⁷ “The Christ Hymn” of Philippians 2:6-11 is also known as the *Carmen Christi*. I will use these interchangeably throughout my essay.

⁸ Fee (1995): 204.

belonged to the preexistent Christ.”⁹ Hoover’s point, which I affirm, is that Jesus chooses not to exploit the status he already possessed; he does not forsake the status entirely. Further, since the beginning of vs. 6 already affirms his divinity (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων), the latter (οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ) is properly framed against ἄλλα in the beginning of vs. 7. Jesus did not grasp at being like a god but took on the form (once again μορφή) of a slave.¹⁰ Meaning he did not consider being treated like Alexander or Caligula as a thing to be grasped, but entered the contest for glory as a slave instead.

As Shetelich notes in his analysis of Barthian kenotic theology, Jesus never ceased to be the true God in the midst of this. In fact, Jesus “is revealed as true God because of his self-emptying and self-humiliation and because in all of this he never ceased to be true God.”¹¹ So Christ’s Kenosis (ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν) does not mean he relinquished his divinity in any way.¹² Fee further demonstrates in his commentary how the humble emptying of Christ is actually the expression of his divine power:

Paul is thereby trying to set up the starkest possible contrast between Christ’s “being in the ‘form’ of God” and the main clause, “he emptied himself.” Equality with God...was inherent to Christ in his pre-existence. Nonetheless, God-likeness... did not mean for Christ to be a “grasping, seizing” being, as it would for the “gods and lords” whom the Philippians had previously known; it was not “something to be seized upon to his own advantage,” which would be the normal

⁹ Hoover (1971): 118: “likewise [it] renders untenable the view that it intends to say that Christ did not regard equality with God as something to be held fast.”

¹⁰ This twofold usage of μορφή evidence for the Hypostatic Union, wherein Jesus is truly man and truly God.

¹¹ Scheletich (2023): 119.

¹² This is in keeping with the Chalcedonian definition of the hypostatic union.

expectation of lordly power....Rather, his “equality with God” found its truest expression when “he emptied himself.”¹³

Fee makes the essential point that Christ’s refusal to consider his equality “a thing to be grasped or seized” (ἀρπαγμὸν) in vs. 6 invokes a stark contrast to the ruler cults. I will return to this idea later in fuller force. However, another point is crucial here: part of the beauty of Christ’s humility is that his “true expression” of his equality with God is kenotic. Fee says that despite forsaking the earthly prerogatives of his divinity, divinity was in no way abandoned. This is similar to what Hellerman notes: that ἐκένωσεν does not necessitate that he was emptied of his divinity, although it does refer to his condescension.¹⁴ Although a full exposition of kenotic theology escapes the purview of this paper, it is nevertheless important to clarify that “*nothing* belonging to God (including God’s form) is abandoned in the incarnation.”¹⁵ Rather, Christ’s glory involves a “dialectic of concealing and revealing” as he assumes the form of a slave.¹⁶ King clarifies that kenosis is not a forsaking of Jesus’ glory— for there is theological error in accusing God of at any point not being glorious if glory is the *total perfection*. Rather, King identifies that Jesus was manifesting a “fitting” form for his work as the incarnate redeemer. This aligns with Fee’s words that “his equality with God found its

¹³ Fee (1995): 208

¹⁴ Hellerman (2005): 135: “Interpreters have been misled because they assumed the presence of an unspecified genitive qualifier: Christ must have emptied himself “of something.” ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν in Philippians 2:7 should be understood metaphorically, to mean that Christ “emptied *himself*,” he poured himself out.” Hellerman takes this phrase as nearly synonymous with the ἐταπείνωσεν of vs. 8, in that it means he “made himself nothing,” or “he assumed lowly estate.”

¹⁵ Schetelich (2023): 118. So he says in his review of Barth, *CD* II/1.

¹⁶ See King (2018): 164. He takes up the view of O’Brien (1991): 216: “[It is] not that he *exchanged* the form of God for the form of a slave, but that he *manifested* the form of God in the form of a slave.”

truest expression” when “he emptied himself.” Taking on flesh was Christ’s expression of humility and is part and parcel of how Christ is the visible revelation manifesting God’s perfections. For “He is the image of the invisible God.... For in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell.”¹⁷

The Language of Paul

The language Paul employs in the *Carmen Christi* compares Christ to the ruler cults heretofore described. We must remember that Paul’s epistle to the Philippians is written to exhort and encourage a people immersed in a culture of Greek and Roman self-exaltation. Not only did the city’s founder, Philip II, self-aggrandize by making himself an equal among the Pantheon, but also Philippi exists in the Hellenized world as a product of Alexander and the *diadachoi* after him. Further, Paul wrote in 61 A.D. when the horrors of Caligula (ruled 37-41 A.D.) were still fresh in the memory of the Roman empire and when the cult of Augustus was already established. This is even more the case considering that the King Herod who attempted to kill Jesus at birth (Matthew 2:16) was the same Herod known for his relationship with Caligula.¹⁸ It follows that Paul had these cults in mind when he discusses the humility of Jesus in Phil. 2:6-11 and commands the members of the Philippian church not to do anything from μηδὲν κατ’ ἐριθείαν μηδὲ κατὰ κενοδοξίαν ἀλλὰ τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ.¹⁹ These terms are significant as Paul frames the *Carmen Christi* (Phil. 2:6-11) for the church to contemplate.

¹⁷ Col. 1:15;19. Notably, this passage in Colossians is also a major Christological hymn of the New Testament.

¹⁸ Philo, *Legat.*, XXXV.261.

¹⁹ Phil. 2:3: “to do nothing from selfish ambition or conceit but in humility.”

These terms carry with them an implicit reference to the historical examples of ὕβρις I analyzed earlier in the thesis.²⁰ Although κενοδοξίαν is frequently translated as conceit, “empty-glory” is a much more literal and apt definition.²¹ This term serves as a counter-example for the discussion of true glory in vs. 9-11—specifically how both the exaltation and universal confession of Jesus as Lord which will be εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός (Phil. 2:11). Christ’s exaltation comes on account of his kenotic work which “subverts and even lampoons how millions within the Roman Empire took it for granted that somebody with ‘form of God’ should act.”²² Therefore, Paul tells the Philippian church to take on the mind of Jesus in how he ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν (“emptied himself”) and simultaneously tells the church not to do anything from κενοδοξίαν (empty glory). Paul’s message seems to be that there is a right and a wrong thing to be filled and to be emptied of— which fits the paradigm of satiety (κόρος) we have discussed. Paul says not to fill up with empty things, but to be filled by the act of emptying—an apparent indication of the character of God²³ and subsequently a refutation of the ruler cults’ conception of what godlikeness constitutes.

²⁰ It is impossible definitively know Paul’s intention beyond what he declares within the letter. However, the language of the text strongly suggests it be read against its historical background. My intention in this section is to make this connection apparent.

²¹ Strong (2009), s.v. κενοδοξία, “*empty glorying*, i.e. *self-conceit*: —vainglory.”

²² Crossan and Reed (2005): 289.

²³ Schetelich (2023): 111: “Because God’s being is determined for human salvation, Christ’s economic activity “enacts” what God is essentially. The scriptural exegete can thus work “up” from the economy to God’s essential being.”

Paul's use of ἐριθείαν supports this case. It refers in Aristotle to the "self-seeking pursuit of political office by unfair means."²⁴ This use of ἐριθείαν as "selfish-ambition," as opposed to "strife" or "envy," is supported by Paul's usage within the same epistle as he decries those who preach the gospel out of "selfish ambition (οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας) not sincerely, but thinking to afflict me in my imprisonment" (Phil. 1:17). In the immediate context of the letter, Paul's command to shun ἐριθείαν in Phil 2:3 refers back to the false teachers of Phil 1:17. However, the behavior they show is also characteristic of the ruler cults' self-aggrandizement which Jesus' humility refutes. Wright observes this same phenomenon, that Phil 2:6 is the antithesis of the "oriental despots, who understood their position as something to be used for their own advantage."²⁵ Finally, the antonym ταπεινοφροσύνη (lowly thinking) which succeeds κενοδοξίαν and ἐριθείαν cements Paul's contrast against the ruler cults. This term is directly opposed to the "thinking big" [φρονεῖν μέγα] which Cairns identified as ὕβρις.²⁶

The powerful language at the beginning of the *Carmen Christi* demands our attention once more: ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἄρπαγμόν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ (Phil. 2:6).²⁷ The language of ἴσα θεῷ is no mere coincidence. The full weight of our examination on the *timai isatheoi* comes to bear in this moment. For ἴσα θεῷ invokes

²⁴ Arndt, Danker, and Bauer (2000): s.v. ἐριθεία: "Found before NT times only in Aristot. *Politi.* 5, 3 *Politi.* 5, 3 p. 1302b.4;1303a,14, where it denotes a self-seeking pursuit of political office by unfair means." Cf. LSJ, s.v. ἐριθεία: A.II.2, "selfish or factious ambition."

²⁵ Wright (1993): 83.

²⁶ Cairns (1994): 79; *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, s.v. ταπεινοφροσύνη: humility, lowness of sentiment, humiliation, mortification."

²⁷ "Who, though being in the form of God, did not consider his equality with God a thing to be grasped."

thoughts of the emperor cult and their predecessors, and “like ‘form of God’ language, sets Christ over against the Roman emperor.”²⁸ Paul extols Christ as superior to the rulers who have tried to make themselves gods, and then astonishingly shows the same god-man to have become a slave who died a criminal’s death. Additionally, the ending of the *Carmen Christi* states that all will bow to Jesus and confess him as Lord (κύριος). In the context of Jesus’ descent to slave status and crucifixion, Paul’s reference to Jesus as κύριος and σωτῆρ²⁹ asserts what true kingship consists of.³⁰ Additionally, Paul makes this assertion through the conjunction διὸ (“therefore”) in vs. 9 which links the kenosis of Christ with true lordship and true glory.³¹

In contrast to those who attempted to become a god by accruing honors, Jesus, though God, forsook the honors at hand. As Hellerman notes, the *Carmen Christi* is structured to progressively oppose the elites’ practice of self-aggrandizement. Specifically, he identifies the hymn as depicting a *cursus pudorum* (a race of dishonors) in opposition to the Roman *cursus honorum*—“the elites’ upward-bound race for

²⁸ Gorman (2007) 155.

²⁹ Phil. 3:20: “But our citizenship is in heaven, and from it we await a Savior (σωτῆρα), the Lord (κύριον) Jesus Christ, who will transform our lowly body to be like his glorious body, by the power that enables him even to subject all things to himself.” Notably, the titles savior and lord are attached to the creaturely glorification wherein mankind somehow shares in the same glory by analogy. I will discuss this in fuller detail later in this chapter.

³⁰ Fee (1999): 30: “By the time of our letter, the primary titles for the emperor were *Kyrios* and *Soter* (“Lord and Savior”). Not only so, but the cult of the emperor, honoring the emperor in a way approaching deification... In a city like Philippi this would have meant... the context of giving honor to the emperor, with the acknowledgment that... Nero was “lord and savior.”

³¹ Hurtado (2017): 123: “Third, and crucially I think, the striking *dio* of 2:9, and the fact that God is the actor in 2:9-11, show that the service of 2:7-8 must be seen as offered to God, and that 2:9-11 is the divine response. Paul does not just contrast God's act with Christ's...but makes God's act of exaltation a consequence of Christ's obedience.”

honors.”³² This structure is apparent in how, though possessing the form of God, 1) he forsakes it; 2) he becomes a slave; 3) he dies the death of a criminal in crucifixion. Remarkably, he does not consider his being ἴσα θεῷ as a thing to be seized at (ἀρπαγμὸν). For, it would not have *hybristic* for Jesus to receive divine honors as a true living god, since as we have discussed, *hybris* refers to the excess of growth, the trespass of boundaries or limitations, and the infringement of the rights and honors of others. Even though as God he was deserving of all honors during his earthly ministry, nevertheless, he rejected the honors due him. He did not demand *proskynesis*, he did not demand an eponymous priesthood, or sacrifices, or games.³³ Instead of demanding others bow before his feet, like a servant he washed the feet of the apostles (John 13:1-5). Instead of demanding sacrifices be made to him, Jesus became the sacrifice once for all time (1 Pet. 3:18). Demetrios Poliorketes’ worship came at the expense of the Olympian gods—an infringement of τίμη which was constituent to his *hybris*. However, Jesus’ exaltation is εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς (“to the glory of God the Father”). The Father reciprocally shares his glory, which the Son in turn shares with his church.³⁴

Yet, this is not an exaltation of suffering as an end in itself. Jesus appears to have pressed through suffering as he looked eagerly to his exaltation at the right hand of the Father: “who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame,

³² Hellerman (2005): 130ff.

³³ On the types of divine honors, cf. Edson, Farwell, and Price (2016).

³⁴ John 17: 1;4-5;22: “Father, the hour has come; glorify your Son... I glorified you on earth, having accomplished the work that you gave me to do. And now, Father, glorify me in your own presence with the glory that I had with you before the world existed. the glory that you have given me I have given to them, that they may be one even as we are one.” To what extent mankind can share in glory given the definition of δόξα so far provided will be discussed later in this chapter.

and is seated at the right hand of the throne of God” (Hebrews 12:2). Scriptural witness does not exalt the suffering in itself, but rather tells the Christian to count sufferings as joy because of what it produces in the believer (James 1:2-5). The witness of scripture demonstrates that Jesus chose the better path to glory—through humility.

The *Carmen Christi* attests that glory is arrived at by the road of self-abasement in the service of others: 1) Jesus is exalted (ὑπερύψωσεν); 2) Jesus is granted the highest name (ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα); 3) Jesus obtains universal worship from those on the earth, above the earth, and under the earth (vs.10); 4) Jesus receives universal confession that he is Lord (vs.11). First, the Father is the one who exalts Jesus and bestows the name upon him. This is important because the efficacy of honor appears to be tied to the status of the one giving it.³⁵ Even though Hector and Alexander longed for a sort of exalted status as the son of Zeus—and in Alexander’s case, took underhanded actions to ‘possess’ this status—they never truly received it. Alternatively, Jesus, when he humbled himself by submitting to John’s baptism of repentance— which was unnecessary as a sinless man³⁶— he received the Holy Spirit and was hailed by the Father as the “son in whom I am well pleased.”³⁷ Furthermore, the universal worship of Christ described in Phil. 2:10-11 is something Alexander and Caligula dreamed of but

³⁵ Lendon: 1997: 47: “A man’s ability to mobilize aristocratic opinion in favour of another man was proportional to his own honour”; cf. Saller (2000): 849 and Hellerman (2005): 150.

³⁶ Matt. 3:17. Jesus does say it is necessary for him to be baptized in order to fulfill the law. However, it was unnecessary for Jesus to repent of any wrong (Matt 3:14-5).

³⁷ Compare the transfiguration in Luke 9: 28-36 when the Father speaks out of the cloud (which may be itself an allusion to the glory cloud in the vision of Ezekiel) and says “This is my Son, my Chosen One; listen to him!”

never obtained.³⁸ This symmetry between Christ and the World is a holy chiasm. Christ has inverted the world's way of glory seeking. Mortal men made themselves gods only to fall. The immortal God made himself a mortal slave so that he would rise.

The Contour of Beauty

This “holy chiasm” can be understood in light of the theological aesthetic which I established in chapter 1 of this thesis.³⁹ The idea of Christological contours of beauty, as we discussed in Chapter One, relates to the Balthasarian notion of Theodrama, which, at its most basic level, views God's work in creation, redemption, and consummation as dramatic, wherein the conclusion of the drama will be even greater than the joy of its beginning. Like any good drama, there is a climax—in this case Jesus' incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection.⁴⁰ In keeping with this, Jonathan King claims in *The Beauty of the Lord* that “the beauty of God manifested economically is perceivable as a quality of the glory of God inherent in his work of Theodrama” and that “the display of God's glory is thus always beautiful, always fitting, always entails an aesthetic dimension to it.”⁴¹ This means that the person and work of Christ detailed in the *Carmen Christi* is a stable ground from which to identify the beauty of God and gain insight into God's glory.

We may compare some of the Christological contours of beauty that King identifies. He attempts to boil down some of the great symmetry of the Theodrama into three basic contours: 1) that both creation and re-creation (redemption) are through the

³⁸ Compare the desires of Caligula reported by Philo in *Legatio ad Gaium*, XLIV.352-353.

³⁹ King (2018): 22.

⁴⁰ For a fuller explanation of what Theodrama consists of, see Balthasar (1988), *Theodrama*.

⁴¹ King (2018): 24;51.

Son; 2) that just as Adam as the first image bearer was modeled protologically upon Christ, so after the fall of man the image of God is repaired eschatologically through Christ as the second Adam; 3) in analogy to the Son's relationship with the Father, the Son of God, by becoming a man, procures sonship for mankind. Alongside these three basic symmetries are innumerable other smaller contours of beauty.⁴²

I posit that the "holy chiasm" of Christ's humility against the *ὑβρις* of the world can be viewed as an additional Christological contour of beauty. This "holy chiasm" consists in Christ's inversion and redemption of both mankind's trespass of boundaries and abuse of rightful glory. As such, as with the other contours, this chiasm "entails that our formation as Christian disciples is that vital part of God's work in this present age of forming and making beautiful his children, which is all about their being conformed to the image of his Son."⁴³

This contour of beauty applies to the church today in informing what it means to "seek honor, glory, and imperishability."⁴⁴ A full analysis of what it means to seek glory rightfully is beyond the scope of this thesis, nevertheless, I will offer some mediations on how mankind can participate in the glory of God without falling into *hybris* and its consequences.

⁴² For example, just like Jesus is the second Adam, another contour may demonstrate that Jesus is the true Israel.

⁴³ King (2018): 25

⁴⁴ Rom. 2:6. See the fuller context in vs. 6-11: "He will render to each one according to his works: to those who by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, he will give eternal life.... glory and honor and peace for everyone who does good, the Jew first and also the Greek. For God shows no partiality."

Participation in Glory

The witness of scripture supports the idea that we are meant to seek glory in some way. Yet, we must keep in mind the “ever-greater dissimilarity between God and humanity no matter the similarity thereby opening space for genuine divine/human interaction. This human participation in the divine life became the cornerstone for Balthasar’s theodramatics.”⁴⁵ This idea of the *analogia entis*— or the analogy of being— is essential to the discussion of human participation in the divine. That is, when the biblical witness talks about seeking δόξα, it is not saying that we will attain *total perfection* in the sense of becoming God. To the extent that we participate in the *total perfection*, we participate by analogy. Nevertheless, the Father καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ (“called us to his own glory and excellence”) and likewise promised that we may γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως (“become partakers of the divine nature.”)⁴⁶ As noted, God promises to give eternal life to those “who by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality (δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν)” (Rom 2:7). One could object that this type of glory belongs exclusively to eternity and that our exaltation is merely a reference to the bodily resurrection. However, 2 Corinthians 3:13-18 makes us aware that, unlike during the old covenant when Moses wore a veil “so that the Israelites

⁴⁵ Garrett (2010): 417; Barth generally rejected the *analogia entis* because of its relationship to natural theology. Barth seems to retain some idea of an *analogia* in his writings but was mindful not to bypass the role of Jesus as mediator and redeemer. See Dunstan (2021): 119-127: “More concretely, it [sc. Barth’s *analogia*] envisages that the Father and Son share their glory through the Holy Spirit, and the Son of God glorifies the Father throughout eternity. On this basis, the Son of God repeatedly manifests His glory, His perfect divine being and all-sufficiency, through the humanity of Jesus of Nazareth in history as well. When He does, the Holy Spirit unites sinfully impotent humans to the prototypical creaturely glorification of God by Jesus Christ and thereby enables them to know and obey His revealed splendor so that their whole being becomes its image.”

⁴⁶ 2 Peter 1:3-4.

might not gaze at the outcome of what was being brought to an end,” in the new covenant we can now participate in glory:

When one turns to the Lord, the veil is removed... And we all, with unveiled face, beholding the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into the same image from one degree of glory to another (μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν).

The immediacy of the language is key. We “are” being transformed and “when” one turn then the veil is removed. As Gorman notes, that we are “being transformed from glory to glory” implies that there is some measure of glory which we begin from and currently share.⁴⁷ Moreover, to the extent that we behold the glory of God in beholding the Lord, that much are we transformed. Christian exaltation is wholly dependent upon Christ.

This notion has fuller expression in Philippians 2:5 when Paul commands the Philippians to think (φρονεῖτε) as Christ does. Nowhere does he specify that the Philippians are supposed to stop thinking like Christ once the narrative reaches vs. 9-11 where Jesus is exalted. Phil 3:20-21 affirms this: the σωτὴρ will μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ (“will transform our lowly body to be like his glorious body.”) Paul’s usage here of ταπεινώσεως corresponds to his usage of ἐταπείνωσεν (Phil.2:8), linking Christ the exemplar to his people. This pattern of last to first and of low to high is not simply descriptive of Jesus, but prescriptive for his church to participate in. As Barth notes, “New Testament ethics are simply the ‘reflection of [God’s] own being’; by calling his people to lowliness and humility, God calls us into ‘the freedom and the work in which God Himself is God.’”⁴⁸

⁴⁷ Gorman (2007): 80.

⁴⁸ *KD* IV/1, 209, with debts to Schetelich (2023):123-124; Barth makes the claim that “New Testament Ethics are the reflection of [God’s] own being” on the basis of the Doctrine of Divine Simplicity (DDS) discussed in Chapter One.

This call into lowliness is crucial in the pursuit of God, and is part and parcel of how we know him better.⁴⁹ I hereby separate participation in the divine nature into three categories: imitation, reflection, and accolade. These categories correspond to the range of δόξα within the new testament: of humans involved in transcendent circumstances, of radiance or splendor, and of honor or fame.⁵⁰

Imitation

Imitation is a method of participating in the divine δόξα. As Fee notes, the *Carmen Christi* proves this point: “The context makes it clear that vv. 6-8 function primarily as a paradigm— an exemplum.”⁵¹ However, there is notable dissent to this view. Käsemann is opposed to “anything that smacks of ‘imitating Christ,’ as though ethics were based finally on self-effort rather than on grace”; for Martin, it also includes the ‘impossibility of emulating Christ in vv. 9-11.’⁵² Yet both these objections misrepresent what imitation means. The majority view of scholarship recognizes that “imitation has deep roots in the Christian tradition.”⁵³ It does not mean we can perfectly

⁴⁹ On how participation heightens the knowledge of God, see Balthasar (1995): 267: “Christ is exemplary man (ἀρχηγός), also in his experience. Christ’s exemplary experience becomes a law for whoever follows after him. Therefore, when he comes to know God and himself through the experience of suffering, the follower of Christ experiences something of Christ’s own experience.”

⁵⁰ Arndt, Danker, and Bauer (2000) s.v. δόξα: I. a) Condition of being bright or shining, brightness splendor, radiance; b) of humans involved in transcendent circumstances and also transcendent beings; c) the state of being in the next life is thus described as participation in the radiance or glory; II. A state of being magnificent, *greatness, splendor*; III. honor as enhancement or recognition of status or performance, *fame, recognition*.”

⁵¹ Fee (1995): 196; cf. Hurtado (2017): 117.

⁵² Fee (1995): 196. Fee is referring to Käsemann (1968) and Martin (1997).

⁵³ Jensen (2010): 18.

replicate Jesus, but rather it means to have the same mindset of Christ in his sacrificial actions.⁵⁴

What immediately follows the *Carmen Christi* bears out this notion. In Phil. 2:12, Paul links the obedience of Christ to the past obedience of the Philippian church before exhorting them to continue in this faithfulness: “Therefore, Beloved, as you have always obeyed (ὕπακούω), so now... work out your salvation.... for it is God who works in you.” (Phil. 2:12-14). Here ὕπακούω corresponds to the *Carmen Christi* immediately prior: Jesus was ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου (“obedient unto death”).⁵⁵ Furthermore, ὥστε (“therefore”) links the content of the *Carmen Christi* to the exhortation to “work out your salvation.”⁵⁶ Hurtado words are apt here as he identifies a call for Christian imitation on the basis of Christ’s authority as κύριος (Phil 2:11), saying that “if hope for a divine vindication as encouragement for service and patience in humiliation be regarded as ‘unworthy,’ that is a judgment apparently not shared by Paul!”⁵⁷

Reflection

Reflection is a method of participating in the divine δόξα. All throughout scripture Jesus is identified as light and Christians as light-bearers. Jesus says that he is “the light of the world (τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου)” and that “whoever follows me will not walk in darkness, but will have the light of life” (John 8:12). Likewise, Christians are qualified by the Father “to share in the inheritance of the saints in light” (Col. 1:12), that they may

⁵⁴ Again, see Fee (1995): 196; cf. Hurtado (2017): 117.

⁵⁵ Phil. 2:8.

⁵⁶ Hurtado (2017): 125.

⁵⁷ Hurtado (2017): 117.

walk in light (1 Jn. 1:7), and be the “light of the world (τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου)” (Matt. 5:14-16). The shared use of τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου between John 8 and Mathew 5 demonstrates the essence of reflection: whatever light the Christians possesses, it originated in Jesus.

Essentially, the Christian can possess a legitimate sort of glory by imaging or reflecting God; however, the Christian will never be the origin of that light, but only its bearer. That is, the glory of the image of God in men consists in imaging God. Whatever glory there is for man, it is a glory bequeathed to him. Exodus 24:39 is paradigmatic of this circumstantial glory, for Moses’ face visibly shines after his encounter with God. It is precisely from this precedent that Paul argues for a greater glory for believers through the ministry of the Spirit and of righteousness (2 Cor. 3:7-11). He continues in the language of reflection, saying, “For God, who said, ‘Let light shine out of darkness,’ has shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ” (2 Cor. 4:6). So the enlightenment of the Christian comes through knowledge of God’s glory. Yet crucially, this knowledge of glory comes through beholding Jesus.

Barth espouses a similar concept:

Where there is radiance there is also reflection of the radiance... And the final thing which we must say in this connexion about God’s glory is that it is God Himself in the truth and power and act of His self-glorification on and in and through that which is dark in itself because it is distinct from Himself and is not divine but opposed to the divine. God’s glory is the answer evoked by Him of the worship offered Him by His creatures.⁵⁸

So then there is a close relationship between how God’s work of redemption in us—how his qualification of us in light— images him in his glory as we participate in it.

⁵⁸ Barth, *KD*.II.1, 647.

Accolade

Accolade is a means of participating in the divine δόξα. Jesus' words here are simultaneously awe-inspiring and terribly frightening, for he promises that at judgement some will hear "well done my good and faithful servant" (Matt. 25:23) and other will hear from Christ "I never knew you; depart from me, you workers of lawlessness."⁵⁹ I assert that being held in honor by God is equivalent to a creaturely glory in keeping with the *analogia entis*. For, if God the creator is Goodness, Truth, and Beauty himself, then when Truth speaks reality is determined. How God sees an individual and what he says about that person is necessarily true. So, despite the sin of man, to be told "well done" is transformational. I am not equating the conferral of honor with glory generally; rather, it is only with true God that a conferral of honor constitutes a transformation of the individual, and thus a change of glory-status in that person.⁶⁰ 2 Timothy 2:21-22 similarly speaks to the idea of seeking honor from God in how he decides to use us: "If anyone cleanses himself from what is dishonorable, he will be a vessel for honorable use... useful to the master of the house."

The language of adoption is also a form of participation through accolade. Christians groan inwardly as they "wait eagerly for adoption as sons" (Rom. 8:23). Likewise, we know that "he predestined us for adoption to himself as sons through Jesus Christ" (Eph. 1:4). This is not only a future reality but is a current one: "because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, "Abba! Father!" So you

⁵⁹ Matt. 7:21-23; cf. Lewis (1942). In his essay "Weight of Glory," Lewis makes a distinction between what he calls the "beatific vision" and the "miserific vision" on the basis of these two passages.

⁶⁰ Cf. Lendon: 1997: 47; also, Saller (2000): 849 and Hellerman (2005): 150.

are no longer a slave, but a son, and if a son, then an heir through God” (Gal. 4:6-7). This sonship is purposed by the Father and procured by the son.⁶¹ Further, adoption entails the notions of redemption and justification. For God sent Jesus to “redeem those who were under the Law, that we might receive the adoption as sons” (Gal. 4:4-5). The relationship of adoption, justification, and subsequent glorification is perhaps best presented in Romans:

For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the firstborn among many brothers. And those whom he predestined he also called, and those whom he called he also justified, and those whom he justified he also glorified. (Romans 8:29-30)

Those justified are essentially accredited, or accoladed, with a righteousness that Jesus earned and gave to men. When God sees men, accolades men as righteous, it is transformational and thus glorious.

Participation Consummated

Though now we “see through a mirror dimly,” glory is the hope of seeing him “face to face” (1 Cor. 13:12). Although future glory is ineffable, a few closing comments may enlighten our understanding. For Balthasar, Christ “integrates and unveils the true, the good, and the beautiful so that he can communicate to us God’s life of love found within the eternal processions of the Godhead.”⁶² Christ’s work as incarnate redeemer welcomes the believer into the internal life of the Trinity.⁶³ His work *ad extra* reveals

⁶¹ Cf. King (2018):24. Adoption is key in King’s identification of the second Christological contour of beauty.

⁶² Garret (2010): 53.

⁶³ The Catholic notions of Deification and the Eastern Orthodox of Theosis should be mentioned here. A detailed discussion on how this language of consummation differs from these is beyond the scope

something of God *ad intra*. Christ, by this holy chiasm, has inverted the world order of glory seeking by becoming flesh, taking the form of a slave, and dying the death of the cross. Yet he is not idle in his exalted status at the right hand of God; rather, he calls us to join him as coheirs through participating in his kenotic work. Ultimately, “consummation is realized in God dwelling with his people so intimately, it is appropriate to describe the communion of the saints as the church deified by the spirit, living and moving with Christ *in Deo* like a Bride made beautiful in her glory.”⁶⁴

of this paper. See Stavropoulos (1995): 183-192; Kim (2021): 125–50; Strobel (2016): 371–99; Aquinas, *ST*. XXIX.

⁶⁴ King (2018): 296.

CONCLUSION

With our study at an end, we see that the humility of Christ is the antithesis of ὑβρις in the pursuit of glory. Where Hector, Alexander, Demetrios Poliorketes, and Caligula failed, Jesus succeeded. Jesus attained to the exalted status they sought after, but he did it by means of astonishing humility rather than by self-aggrandizement. In Chapter One, we established an aesthetic framework in which to conduct our investigation. We established that beauty is a quality of glory that the divine glory as we understand it is the *total perfection* of God. The Doctrine of Divine Simplicity vindicated the notion that beauty is rightfully a divine perfection. The aesthetic lens provided prepared us for a later evaluation of how the beautiful person and work of Christ incarnate makes God and his plan more striking and awe-inducing.

In Chapter Two, we identified the original meaning of ὑβρις and Solon's use of it in the economic sphere. The identification of κόρος as its cause and ἄτη as its consequence helped to understand how ὑβρις is related to divine presumption and the trespass of honors (τιμαί). Homer's *Iliad* and Philodemus' commentary revealed presumption in action and cemented the necessity of ἄτη as a result. Subsequently, this paradigm was applied to historical examples in Hellenistic history. We examined how Alexander the Great attempted to claim divinity at Siwah, and how he sought divine honors in the institution of Persian *proskynesis*. We found that Demetrios Poliorketes took on Alexander's spirit of self-aggrandizement via the Athenians' Ithyphallic Hymn which praised him as a living God. Finally, Philo's *Legatio ad Gaium* revealed the

pinnacle of divine presumption and the consequences thereof in the madness and audacity of Caligula.

Finally, in Chapter Three we examined the great humility of Christ in his kenotic work as shown in the *Carmen Chrsti*. We noted how both the language of Paul and the history of Philippi justifies a comparison of Jesus' humility against Greek and Roman rulers. We saw how the Son of God being in the form of God, did not grasp divine honors but emptied himself and became a slave. As a result, he was exalted. The distinction between Christ' method of glory seeking and that of the Hellenistic and Roman cultures allowed us to see an additional Christological Contour of beauty which was dubbed the "holy chiasm." Christ's inversion of the world order welcomes the Christian into glory through participation in him. In exploration of participation's means, we explored the Scripture's attestation of imitation, reflection, and accolade.

"What are the riches of his glorious inheritance in the saints" (Eph. 1:18)" is still beyond human comprehension. Indeed, the infinite God is impossible to truly conceive. Yet I hope the analysis of one great symmetry of the work of Jesus as incarnate redeemer has helped to ascertain a greater knowledge of God and a greater knowledge of "upward call of God in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 3:14). Meanwhile, we must be careful not to fall into a ὑβρις which wrought the ruin of so many, including our father Adam. So, let us now seek a glory dependent on participation in Jesus as we look forward to partaking in the divine nature of the incomprehensible trinity and approaching the unimaginable love revealed through Jesus humility.

WORKS CITED

- Abe, Takuji. "Proskynēsis: From a Persian Court Protocol to a Greek Religious Practice." *Tekmeria* 14 (November 19, 2018): 1.
- Adrados, Francisco Rodríguez, and Elvira Gangutia Elícegui, eds. *Diccionario griego-español*. Primera edición. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto "Antonio de Nebrija," 1986.
- Allen, Archibald W. "Solon's Prayer to the Muses." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 80 (1949): 50–65.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/283511>.
- Anselm and Gaunilo. *Basic Writings*. Translated by Thomas Williams. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 2007.
- Aristotle. *Politics*. Aristotle in Twenty-Three Volumes 21. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1977.
- Arndt, William F. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Arrian, P. A. Brunt, A. G. (Antoon Gerard) Roos, and Gerhard Wirth. *Arrian*. Revised text and Translation /. The Loeb Classical Library 236, 269. Cambridge, Massachusetts ; Harvard University Press, 1976. "Anabasis of Alexander. Volume I, Books 1-4 - Baylor University Libraries."
- Arrian., Martin Hammond, John. Atkinson, and Arrian. *Alexander the Great : The Anabasis and the Indica*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2009.
- Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *Theo-Drama: Theological Dramatic Theory*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988.
- Barrett, Anthony. *Caligula: The Corruption of Power*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Barth, Karl, Geoffrey William Bromiley, and Thomas F. Torrance. 2004. *Church Dogmatics: The Doctrine of God, Part 1*. Vol. 2. London; New York: T&T Clark.

- Beare, Francis Wright. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians*. Harper's New Testament Commentaries. New York: Harper, 1959.
- Blank, David. "Philodemus, c. 110–c. 35 BCE." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Classics*, 2016.
- Bosworth, A. B. *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Bowden, Hugh. "On Kissing and Making up: Court Protocol and Historiography in Alexander the Great's « experiment with Proskynesis »." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London* 56, no. 2 (2013): 55–77.
- Cairns, Douglas. "Hybris." *The Classical Review* 44, no. 1 (1994): 76–79.
- Campbell, David A. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry*. Bristol Classical Press, 2003.
- Caneva, Stefano G. "Introduction. Beyond Isolation: Re-Positioning Ruler Cults in the Hellenistic Culture." *Erga-Logoi. Rivista Di Storia, Letteratura, Diritto e Culture Dell'antichità* 4, no. 2 (December 20, 2016): 9–15.
- Chaniotis, Angelos. *War in the Hellenistic World: A Social and Cultural History*. Ancient World at War. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2007.
- Clay, Jenny Strauss. *The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns*. 2nd ed. Bristol Classical Paperbacks. London: Bristol Classical, 2006.
- Clark, S. J. *The One and the Many*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- Coppola, Alessandra. "Kings, Gods and Heroes in a Dynastic Perspective. A Comparative Approach." *Erga-Logoi. Rivista Di Storia, Letteratura, Diritto e Culture Dell'antichità* 4, no. 2 (December 20, 2016): 17–37.
- Cunliffe, Richard John. *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect*. [New ed.]. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1963.
- Dunstan, Andrew. *Karl Barth's Analogy of Beauty: Its Basis and Implications for Theological Aesthetics*. Barth Studies. Milton: Taylor and Francis, 2021.
- Dunstan, Andrew. *Karl Barth's Analogy of Beauty: Its Basis and Implications for Theological Aesthetics*. Barth Studies. Milton: Taylor and Francis, 2021.
- Eastman, Susan Grove. "Philippians 2:6–11: Incarnation as Mimetic Participation." *Journal for the Study of Paul and His Letters* 1, no. 1 (2011): 1–22.

- Edson, Charles Farwell, and Simon Price. "Ruler-Cult, Greek." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Classics*, 2016.
- Fee, Gordon D. *Paul's Letter to the Philippians*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1995.
- Fee, Gordon D. *Philippians*. IVP New Testament Commentary Series. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1999.
- Fee, Gordon. "Philippians 2:5–11: Hymn or Exalted Pauline Prose?" *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 2 (1992): 29–46.
- Garrett, Stephen M. "The Dazzling Darkness of God's Triune Love: Introducing Evangelicals to the Theology of Hans Urs von Balthasar." *Themelios* 35, no. 3 (November 2010): 413–30.
- Gombis, Timothy G. "Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 52, no. 4 (December 2009): 866–68.
- Gorman, Michael J. "Cruciform or Resurrectiform?: Paul's Paradoxical Practice of Participation in Christ." *Ex Auditu* 33 (2017): 60–83.
- Hammond, Mason, and Simon Price. "Ruler-Cult, Roman." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Classics*, 2016.
- Hesiod. *Theogony; Works and Days; Testimonia*. Edited by Glenn W. Most. Revised. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2018.
- Hildebrand, Dietrich von. "Beauty in the Light of the Redemption." *Logos (Saint Paul, Minn.)* 4, no. 2 (2001): 78–92.
- Homer, Robert Fagles, and Bernard Knox. *The Iliad*. Penguin Books, 1998.
- Homer. *Iliad. Volume II*. Loeb Classical Library; LCL171. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.
- Hooker, J. T. "The Original Meaning of *Hybris*." *Archiv Für Begriffsgeschichte* 19 (1975): 125–37.
- Hoover, Roy W. "The Harpagmos Enigma: A Philological Solution." *The Harvard Theological Review* 64, no. 1 (1971): 95–119.
- Hornblower, Simon, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow, eds. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Fourth edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

- Hurtado, Larry W. *Ancient Jewish Monotheism and Early Christian Jesus-Devotion: The Context and Character of Christological Faith*. Library of Early Christology. Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2017.
- Janko, Richard. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volumes 1-5, Books 1-20*. Edited by G. S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Karamanolis, George E. “Philodemus, « Περὶ Ὑβρεως » (PHerc. 1017) ? :: New Readings and the Philodemian Conception of Hybris.” *Cronache Ercolanesi* 35 (2005): 103–10.
- Karris, Robert J. *A Symphony of New Testament Hymns: Commentary on Philippians 2:5-11 ...* Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1996.
- Käsemann, Ernst. “A Critical Analysis of Philippians 2:5-11.” *JTC* 5, no. 1 (1968).
- Kilcrease, Jack D III. “Kenosis and Vocation: Christ as the Author and Exemplar of Christian Freedom.” *Logia* 19, no. 4 (2010): 21–33.
- Kim, Charles Gordon. “‘YOU ARE GODS’: Theosis through a Christic Union in Theodoret of Cyrus.” *St Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 65, no. 3–4 (2021): 125–50.
- King, Jonathan. *The Beauty of the Lord: Theology as Aesthetics*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2018.
- Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Kuhrt, Amélie. “The Achaemenid Concept of Kingship.” *Iran* 22 (1984): 156–60.
- Landucci, Franca. “The Antigonids and the Ruler Cult. Global and Local Perspectives?” *Erga-Logoi. Rivista Di Storia, Letteratura, Diritto e Culture Dell’antichità* 4, no. 2 (December 20, 2016): 39–60.
- Lattimore, Richmond. “The First Elegy of Solon.” *The American Journal of Philology* 68, no. 2 (1947): 161–79. <https://doi.org/10.2307/290951>.
- London, J. E. *Empire of Honour: The Art of Government in the Roman World*. Oxford, New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Lewis, C. S. *The Abolition of Man; or, Reflections on Education with Special Reference to the Teaching of English in the Upper Forms of Schools*. Riddell Memorial Lectures. New York: Macmillan, 1965.

- Lewis, C.S. *The Abolition of Man; or, Reflections on Education with Special Reference to the Teaching of English in the Upper Forms of Schools*. Riddell Memorial Lectures. New York: Macmillan, 1965.
- Lewis, C.S. *The Weight of Glory*. Little Books on Religion ; No. 189. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1942.
- Liddell, Henry George, et al. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Lloyd, James. "Music and Materiality: An Overview of Ancient Greek and Roman Music Archaeology." *Greek and Roman Musical Studies* 8, no. 1 (2020): 1–10.
- Loeb, James, G. P. Goold, and A. T. Murray. *The Loeb Classical Library. No. 170. the Iliad*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1924.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. *Der Brief an die Philipper*. 14. Aufl. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.
- Lynette Mitchell. "Alexander the Great: Divinity and the Rule of Law - Baylor University Libraries." In *Every Inch a King : Comparative Studies on Kings and Kingship in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds*, 2:91–107. Every Inch a King, 2013.
- MacLeod, David J. "Imitating the Incarnation of Christ: An Exposition of Philippians 2:5-8." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 158, no. 631 (July 2001): 308–30.
- Martin, Ralph P. *A Hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation & in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*. Downers Grove, Ill: InterVarsity Press, 1997.
- Martin, Thomas R., and Christopher W. Blackwell. *Alexander the Great: The Story of an Ancient Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Martinez, David. *Baptized for Our Sakes: A Leather Trishagion from Egypt, p. Mich 799*. Beiträge Zur Altertumskunde. Place of publication not identified: De Gruyter Saur, 2000.
- Michelini, Ann. "'Υβρις and Plants." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 82 (1978): 35.
- Mitchell, Louis J. "The Theological Aesthetics of Jonathan Edwards." *Theology Today (Ephrata, Pa.)* 64, no. 1 (2007): 36–46.
- Mitchell, Lynette, and Charles Melville. *Every Inch a King: Comparative Studies on Kings and Kingship in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds*. Boston, UNITED STATES: BRILL, 2012.

- Morgan, Christopher W., and Robert A. Peterson. *The Glory of God*. Theology in Community. Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2010.
- O'Brien, Peter Thomas. *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids, Mich.). Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Paul, Stéphanie. "Welcoming the New Gods. Interactions between Ruler and Traditional Cults within Ritual Practice." *Erga-Logoi. Rivista Di Storia, Letteratura, Diritto e Culture Dell'antichità* 4, no. 2 (December 20, 2016): 61–74.
- Philo of Alexandria, F. H. (Francis Henry) Colson, G. H. (George Herbert) Whitaker 1846 or, and Ralph Marcus. *Philo*. The Loeb classical library 226–227, 247, 261, 275, 289, 320, 341, 363, 379–380, 401. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Philodemus, Jeffery Fish. "On the Good King." Ts. Baylor University, 2022.
- Plutarch, and Bernadotte Perrin. *Lives*. 1 online resource. vols. Loeb Classical Library 46–47, 65, 80, 87, 98–103. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.
- Polkinghorne, J. C. *The Work of Love: Creation as Kenosis*. Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans, 2001.
- Quintus, Curtius. *History of Alexander. Volume I*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946.
- Schetelich, James Alan. "Not a Nevertheless, but a Therefore: Following Philippians 2 with Karl Barth." *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 17, no. 1 (2023): 109–25.
- Solmsen, Friedrich. "Solon." In Hesiod and Aeschylus, 30:107–23. Cornell University Press, 1949. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.cttq45s2.6>.
- Stavropoulos, Christoforos. "Partakers of Divine Nature: Eastern Orthodox Theology: A Contemporary Reader." In *Eastern Orthodox Theology: A Contemporary Reader*, 183–92. Grand Rapids, 1995.
- Stoddard, Kate. "Turning the Tables on the Audience: Didactic Technique in Solon 13w." *The American Journal of Philology* 123 (n.d.): 149.
- Strobel, Kyle. "Jonathan Edwards's Reformed Doctrine of Theosis." *Harvard Theological Review* 109, no. 3 (July 2016): 371–99.
- The Gods Divine Justice or Divine Arbitrariness? - JSTOR. Coping With the Gods: Wayward Readings in Greek Theology, 2011, pp. 151-237 (87 pages)

- Thomas. *Summa Theologica*. Complete English ed. Westminster, Md: Christian Classics, 1981.
- Tyrtaeus, Solon, Theognis, Mimnermus. *Greek Elegiac Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*. Edited and translated by Douglas E. Gerber. Loeb Classical Library 258. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Versnel, Henk. *Coping With the Gods: Wayward Readings in Greek Theology*. BRILL, 2011.
- West, M. L. 1993. *Greek Lyric Poetry*. Oxford University Press.
- Wheatley, Pat, and Charlotte Dunn. "Demetrius the Living God." In *Demetrius the Besieger*. Oxford: University Press, 2020.
- Wright, N. T. (Nicholas Thomas). *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Edinburgh, Scotland: T & T Clark, 1991.
- Young, Frances M., Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth. *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*. Cambridge, U.K. ; Cambridge University Press, 2004.