

## HONORING THE KING IN THE SELEUKID AND PTOLEMAIC EMPIRES: A COMPARATIVE APPROACH. PART 1

Catharine C. Lorber\*, Independent Researcher

**Abstract:** Cultic and other honors offered to rulers by their subjects unambiguously express loyalty to the rulers. Based on data collected for the Seleukid and Ptolemaic empires, a comparison is offered emphasizing the particular qualities of the Seleukid record. The comparison considers geographic distribution, where the honors fell on a public to private spectrum, the occupations and ethnicities of the subjects who offered honors individually, the intensity of these practices, and changes in the patterns over time. We know in advance that honors for the rulers are weakly attested for the Seleukid east, and even in Koile Syria and Phoinike. Should this reticence be interpreted as a possible indication of tepid support for Seleukid rule in these regions? Alternative explanations or contributing factors include preexisting cultural habits, different royal policies, destruction of evidence by wars and natural disasters, and the unevenness of archaeological exploration.

**Keywords:** Seleukids, Ptolemies, honors.

### I. Introduction

A primary form of evidence for the reception of the rule of Hellenistic kings is the offering of honors by their subjects. Honors to Seleukid rulers were offered mainly by political entities—cities and *koina*—in the culturally Greek regions of western Asia Minor. But other forms of honors were possible, for example the erection of a statue or other dedication by private persons, officials, or military units. The comparison of honors offered to Seleukid rulers with those offered to their rivals the Ptolemies is not intended to see who garnered more honors—that was already known in advance—but to form a more nuanced picture. What are the differences from region to region? Do those who offered personal dedications differ by occupation or by ethnicity from one kingdom to the other, or from region to region? Do any of the patterns change over time?

\* A first version of this paper was written for Seleukid Study Day VI, whose theme was the reception of Seleukid rule. I am grateful to Altay Coşkun and Richard Wenghofer for inviting me to participate in Seleukid Study Day VI, and to Vito Messina for useful discussions.

## II. Honors from Asia Minor, the Aegean, and Coastal Thrace

The offering of civic honors by the polities of Asia Minor, the Aegean, coastal Thrace, and the Greek homeland has been well studied and those offered to the Seleukids and the Ptolemies require only summary treatment here. These civic honors are considered transactional, a part of the process of negotiating status between local governments and the king. In the inscriptions that survive most fully the honors are explicitly described as repayment for benefactions received from the kings, and the establishment of honors was reported to the kings in the context of formal diplomacy. The civic honors offered to the Seleukids and to the Ptolemes are similar in kind and even in number.

The diachrony for the Seleukids presents some ambiguities, because it is not clear in every case which king is honored. Nevertheless it is obvious that Seleukos I, Antiochos I, and especially Antiochos III were more widely honored than Antiochos II and Seleukos II. Honors from the reign of Seleukos II almost exclusively concern the deification at Smyrna of his grandmother, Stratonike, and the promotion of her cult as Aphrodite Stratonike. The paucity of honors for Seleukos II himself is no doubt due to the fact that he was driven from Asia Minor by his younger brother. There is no obvious explanation for the scarcity of honors for Antiochos II.

The polities that offered civic honors to the Ptolemies were not necessarily under direct Lagid rule, but were allies (though the precise meaning of that term can be ambiguous). In the diachrony, Ptolemy II and III and members of their immediate families were far more often the recipients of civic honors than Ptolemy I, Ptolemy IV, Ptolemy V, or Ptolemy VI, and this correlates with the heyday of the Lagid thalassocracy.

Approval of Seleukid or Ptolemaic rule can also be inferred from honorary decrees for royal officials, which in some cases were promulgated by polities from which we have no attested civic honors for the ruling house. These civic honors to officials come from the same context as those for the kings and their families, a context of negotiation in which the cities sought to obtain and reward the good will of those with power over them.

Dedications by individuals and non-civic groups give the impression of being voluntary expressions of loyalty or gratitude. The commanders and the Macedonian soldiers stationed in Thyatira, Lydia, a Seleukid foundation, made a dedication to Seleukos I.<sup>1</sup> After the same king, near the end of his life, returned the island of Lemnos to Athens, Athenian kleruchs on Lemnos built a temple dedicated to Seleukos and his son Antiochos.<sup>2</sup> The corporate character of these honors makes them somewhat comparable to the civic honors, though the case of the Lemnian kleruchs is a pure expression of gratitude without the expectation of influencing future relations that is explicit or implicit in civic honors. At Smyrna a dedication to Anubis on behalf of Queen Stratonike was offered by a religious association devoted to the Egyptian underworld god.<sup>3</sup> The leaders in this effort were almost certainly ethnic Egyptian emigrants and their motive will have been to ensure Stratonike's well-being in the afterlife.

<sup>1</sup> *OGIS* 211 = Kotsidu 2000, no. 226.

<sup>2</sup> Phylarch., *FGrH* 81 F29 = Athen. 6.254F–255A = Kotsidu 2000, no. 184[L].

<sup>3</sup> *ISmyrna* 765.

It was only after four generations of Seleukid rule that the first individual dedications were offered to a Seleukid king. On the island of Delos a dedication to Great King Antiochos, son of Seleukos Kallinikos the Macedonian, was offered by Menippos, son of Pannias.<sup>4</sup> This Menippos led an embassy to the Roman senate and served the king both militarily and diplomatically in Greece.<sup>5</sup> In Pergamon a dedication to Great King Antiochos, son of Seleukos Kallinikos, was erected by Protas, son of the aforementioned Menippos, while holding the office of *nomophylax*.<sup>6</sup> A statue of King Antiochos, son of Great King Antiochos, was dedicated in the sanctuary of Apollo at Klaros by a certain Dioskourides son of Chares.<sup>7</sup> At Soloi in Kilikia Ptolemaios son of Thraseas, *strategos* and high priest of Koile Syria and Phoinike, made a dedication in the gymnasium to Hermes, Herakles, and Great King Antiochos.<sup>8</sup> Three of these four dedications to Antiochos III were offered by officials, in two cases by high officials. This follows a pattern established earlier by Ptolemaic officials who offered ostentatious dedications to their ruler in Egypt and in the great Panhellenic cult centers of Greece.<sup>9</sup>

We do not always know the occupations of those who offered individual dedications to or for the Ptolemies in the islands and Asia Minor, but the cost of the larger offerings ensures that the dedicators were members of the elite. We can cite six examples, with a surprising peak in the reign of Ptolemy IV. In Halikarnassos, the son of Chairemon, a civic magistrate, dedicated a temple on behalf of Ptolemy son of Soter, to Sarapis, Isis, and Arsinoe Philadelphos.<sup>10</sup> On Thera the retired elephant hunter Artemidoros, a citizen of Perga in Pamphylia, dedicated a roofed temenos to Sarapis, Isis, and Anubis on behalf of Ptolemy III and his ancestors.<sup>11</sup> At Sestos, a Pergamene woman dedicated an altar to the gods of Samothrace on behalf of Ptolemy IV, Arsinoe III, and their son.<sup>12</sup> On Kos cult statues of Ptolemy IV were erected in the Asklepieion and the gymnasium and an over-lifesize bronze statue of Arsinoe III was also placed in the Asklepieion by the Koan people; these public honors were supplemented by a private dedication, a statue of Arsinoe Thea Philopator dedicated by Kallimachos son of Antiphilos, an Alexandrian citizen, in his capacity as *agonothetes* (of an uncertain contest).<sup>13</sup> On the island of Rhodes a bronze statue group of Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III was dedicated in the sanctuary of Athena Lindia by Leonidas son of Archinas.<sup>14</sup> At Xanthos Euphainetos, an Aitolian military officer born of a Xanthian mother, dedicated a *naos* and *temenos* to Artemis, with all the cult statues and ritual paraphernalia, on behalf of Ptolemy V.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>4</sup> IG 11.4.1111 = OGIS 239.

<sup>5</sup> Grainger 1997, 105.

<sup>6</sup> OGIS 240.

<sup>7</sup> Ma 1999, no. 42.

<sup>8</sup> OGIS 230.

<sup>9</sup> OGIS 26 and 27; Paus. 6.17.3; Athen. 7.318D; Pos. AB 39, l. 2; AB 116, ll. 6–7; AB 119, l. 2.

<sup>10</sup> OGIS 16 = IHalikarnassos 39.

<sup>11</sup> IG 9.3.421, 422; PP 15188.

<sup>12</sup> OGIS 88.

<sup>13</sup> Höghammar 1993, 112, no. 2; for the statues erected by the city, SEG 40.682 = Höghammar 1993, 173, no. 63 = Kotsidu 2000, no. 161[E] and Höghammar 1993, 173, no. 63 = Kotsidu 2000, no. 160[E].

<sup>14</sup> Blinkenberg 1941, 417, no. 61.

<sup>15</sup> OGIS 91.

More modest private dedications to the Ptolemies in Asia Minor and the islands have no apparent Seleukid counterparts. At Herakleia Latmia a sundial signed by the Alexandrian craftsman Themistagoras son of Meneskos was dedicated to King Ptolemy (assumed to be the second Ptolemy) by a certain Apollonios son of Apollodotos.<sup>16</sup> The finest extant Ptolemaic cult oinochoe, inscribed for Queen Berenike and the Theoi Euergetai, is from Xanthos in Lycia and may simply reflect citizen participation in the local cult of the Theoi Euergetai and their son.<sup>17</sup> On the other hand, the common altar plaques and small altars naming Arsinoe Philadelphos, which seemingly could represent dedications by relatively ordinary individuals, are scarcely attested from Asia Minor.<sup>18</sup>

Ptolemy II, by establishing and promoting cults for his parents, for himself and his sister-wife Arsinoe II, and for the latter after her death, made clear his desire for honors and worship, for himself and for the members of his dynasty.<sup>19</sup> His courtiers and officials took the hint and modeled admiration for the rulers through their own dedications. The apparent absence of comparable phenomena under the early Seleukids may well imply that they did not engage in self-promotion, but merely accepted honors as they were offered in the normal course of affairs, that is, in their relations with subordinate governments. This situation changed with Antiochos III, who clearly did crave the sorts of honors enjoyed by the Ptolemies; this is demonstrated by his foundation of a Seleukid dynastic cult and by his attempt to found a state cult to his wife.<sup>20</sup> It is no accident that he was the first Seleukid to be honored by dedications offered by individual donors.

### III. Honors in (Koile) Syria and Phoinike

The province of Koile Syria and Phoinike, known as Syria and Phoinike under the Ptolemies, provides an opportunity for a different sort of comparison involving precisely the same region under different rulers. In view of the prevalence of honors for the Ptolemies in Asia Minor and the islands, and for that matter in Egypt, it is quite striking that there are very few known from Syria and Phoinike. In fact, prior to the victory of Ptolemy IV at Raphia, there are only two certain examples. Very recently a plaque inscribed for Arsinoe Philadelphos was excavated in Bet Yerah (ancient Philoteria, a Macedonian colony on the southwest shore of the Sea of Galilee, almost certainly founded by Ptolemy II).<sup>21</sup> A small altar plaque inscribed for King Ptolemy son of Ptolemy and Arsinoe, Theoi Adelphoi, was unearthed at Tyre, and its modest dimensions suggest that it, too, was a private dedication rather than evidence for a civic cult.<sup>22</sup> In the grotto of Wasta outside Tyre a Greek dedication to King Ptolemy and Aphrodite Epekoos was offered by

<sup>16</sup> *SEG* 37.961 = *IHerakleiaLatmia* 9.

<sup>17</sup> Thompson 1973, no. 75.

<sup>18</sup> See Caneva 2020, nos. 59–60 (*IKaunos* 54; *SEG* 61.867).

<sup>19</sup> On the role of Ptolemy II, see Hölbl 2001, 94–95.

<sup>20</sup> *IMagnesia* 13 = *OGIS* 233; *OGIS* 224 = Welles 1934, no. 36; *IK EstOr* 271–272, 278–279.

<sup>21</sup> Tal 2019. On Philoteria, see Cohen 2006, 273–274.

<sup>22</sup> Rey-Coquais 2006, 99–101, no. 1 = *SEG* 6.1880; Caneva 2016, 213.

Imilkos, a Phoenician.<sup>23</sup> The king in question has been identified both as Ptolemy I and as Ptolemy IV.<sup>24</sup> After Philopator's unexpected victory at Raphia there was a relative burst of dedications. At Tyre statues of Ptolemy IV were dedicated by Thraseas son of Aetos, *strategos* of Syria and Phoinike, and by Dorymenos, an Aitolian commander of cavalry.<sup>25</sup> Another statue of Philopator was dedicated in Ioppe by Anaxikles, priest of the king.<sup>26</sup> While the existence of a priest would normally be taken as evidence for civic honors, in this case it is assumed that the king organized his own cult during his sojourn in Syria and Phoinike after the Raphian victory. Finally, a dedication to Sarapis and Isis Soteris, the patrons of the victory, was offered on behalf of King Ptolemy and Queen Arsinoe, Theoi Philopatores, by Marsyas son of Demetrios, Alexandrian citizen and *archigrammateus* (chief secretary of the army).<sup>27</sup> It is usually attributed to Libo in the Beqaa Valley, but J. Aliquot has suggested an origin at Tyre where there was a temple of Sarapis and Isis.<sup>28</sup> Two striking patterns emerge. Of these seven dedications at least four, and perhaps five, were made in Tyre or its *chora*. This concentration of honors at Tyre must in part reflect the city's role as a Ptolemaic administrative center, but the altar plaque and the inscription in the grotto at Wasta hint that individual Tyrians were more inclined than other residents of Syria and Phoinike to offer tangible honors to their Lagid rulers. Second, conspicuous honors to Ptolemy IV were offered by royal officials, a priest, and an officer in service to the Ptolemaic king, at least two of whom were present because of the war effort and had no personal connection to the province. Prior to Raphia the few dedications to the rulers were far more modest and apparently the work of private individuals.

After the Seleukid conquest of Syria and Phoinike, an agonistic victor of the ephebic class dedicated an altar in the gymnasium of Tyre to Great King Antiochos and his son King Seleukos [and] Hermes and Herakles.<sup>29</sup> A statue of a King Antiochos was erected at Tyre by the priest of the king, implying the existence of a Tyrian cult in his honor.<sup>30</sup> According to the first editor, the absence of the title *Megas* excludes Antiochos III. If we accept this argument, the statue most likely honored the fourth Antiochos, who actively promoted civic identity in Phoenicia, or else Antiochos VII. Antiochos IV and his family were definitely honored by Hagemonidas son of Zephyros, who erected their statues in his native city of Dyme, Achaia, and was subsequently appointed *strategos* over the region extending from Ptolemais-Ake to Gerrha by Antiochos V.<sup>31</sup> Three more individual dedications are known from Koile Syria and Phoinike. An altar was dedicated on behalf of King Demetrios, Queen Laodike, and their children to Aphrodite Epekoos by the priest

<sup>23</sup> SEG 20.389. The reading Himilkas was proposed by Aliquot 2009, 132, n. 33 and endorsed by Bonnet 2015, 282.

<sup>24</sup> See Bonnet 2004; Bonnet 2008, assuming an attribution to Ptolemy I, and *ead.* 2015, 282, preferring a more cautious approach.

<sup>25</sup> SEG 39.1596b; SEG 7.326.

<sup>26</sup> SEG 20.467.

<sup>27</sup> SEG 38.1571.

<sup>28</sup> Aliquot 2004, 218.

<sup>29</sup> Rey-Coquais 2006, no. 1.

<sup>30</sup> Rey-Coquais 2006, no. 19.

<sup>31</sup> OGIS 252 = SEG 14.368. On his appointment, 2 Macc. 13.2.

Apollophanes son of Apollophanes.<sup>32</sup> The edition of J.-L. Gatier suggests an origin at Sidon because of the theophoric name of the priest, but we should not forget that Aphroditite Epekoos was also worshiped in the Tyrian *chora*. A fragmentary inscription from the sanctuary of Eshmun at Sidon appears to be a dedication by a priest and a high priest to a king, queen, and their son Antiochos, Soteres and Euergetai.<sup>33</sup> The restitutions in the *editio princeps* identify the king and queen as Great King Antiochos and Queen Laodike, i.e., as Antiochos III and his wife. This identification of the rulers is unpersuasive, as the epithets are unknown for Antiochos III and point instead to Antiochos VII. The application of the *epiklesis* of the royal couple to their heir is without Seleukid parallels, with but a single parallel in the large dossier of Ptolemaic dedications.<sup>34</sup> A dedication on behalf of Great King Antiochos Soter Euergetes Kallinikos, son of King Demetrios Soter Megistos, and Queen Kleopatra Thea and their children was offered to Zeus Soter by a First Friend and *archigrammateus* of the forces at Ptolemais-Ake in 130/29, on the eve of the king's departure for his eastern campaign.<sup>35</sup> Antiochos VII thus appears perhaps as many as three times in this small dossier, a possible testament to his high standing in Koile Syria and Phoinike. Three of the six dedications were offered by priests, but only at Tyre is the dedicator identified as a priest of royal cult. Only two dedications can be attributed to officials, one certainly a Greek of the diaspora, the other probably also a Greek introduced to the province in connection with a military campaign.

Priests lists from Scythopolis and Samaria, both military colonies, attest royal and dynastic cults under Demetrios I.<sup>36</sup> The two cults are closely related by the association of the deified Seleukids with Zeus Olympios and by the similar titles of the priests. We can infer that these cults were coordinated from above and were not civic cults with local origins. They were probably transplantations of the state royal and dynastic cult attested at Seleukeia in Pieria under Seleukos IV.<sup>37</sup> We shall see below that in the Seleukid east the scanty evidence for royal and dynastic cult is again associated with military colonies and royal foundations.

While no evidence survives that Lagid kings were honored in the interior of Palestine by native peoples, Judahites loyal to the Seleukids may have offered sacrifices and prayers for the king's well-being in the temple. 1 *Maccabees* 7.33 reports that the elders and priests of Jerusalem, when menaced with an attack by Nikanor, the general of Demetrios I, wished to show him the burnt offering that was being made for the king in the temple. It is not clear whether this was a desperate expedient to avert an imminent attack, or a normal practice similar to that of Babylonia (see below). In contrast, Judahites who emigrated to Egypt adapted to the culture of conspicuous displays of loyalty they encountered there. Already during the reign of Ptolemy III the Ioudaioi of Schedia and Krokodilonpolis in the Arsinoites erected inscriptions dedicating their *proseuchai*

<sup>32</sup> Gatier 2004, 139–144.

<sup>33</sup> Stucky 2005, Gr4.

<sup>34</sup> *OGIS* 86, a dedication to King Ptolemy [IV] and Queen Arsinoe [III] and Ptolemy their son, Theoi Philopatores, by a group of royal elephant hunters.

<sup>35</sup> *SEG* 19.904.

<sup>36</sup> *SEG* 8.33, 8.96.

<sup>37</sup> *OGIS* 245.

(houses of prayer) on behalf of the king and queen and their children.<sup>38</sup> We have six similar dedications from later reigns.<sup>39</sup> In seven cases the cult epithets of the rulers are omitted entirely, and in the eighth the epithet Euergetai is used, but without Theoi. This pattern shows that ruler worship, though a cultural norm, was not obligatory and that Egyptian Ioudaioi could participate in the culture of loyalism without violating their religious laws.

#### IV. Honors in Ptolemaic Kyrenaika

Kyrenaika presents a profile somewhat like that of Syria and Phoinike, with relatively few honors offered to the Ptolemies over more than two centuries of Lagid rule. A dedication to the gods of the agora was offered at Kyrene by Jason, priest of King Magas, implying an official cult for the king.<sup>40</sup> A dedication was offered to Ptolemy II by an individual at Kyrene, and the city of Ptolemais erected a statue of Arsinoe Philadelphos.<sup>41</sup> A cult oinochoe inscribed for Queen Berenike and the Theoi Euergetai was found at Berenike (Euesperides), again implying cult, possibly private cult but more likely participation in a public cult.<sup>42</sup> The city of Ptolemais dedicated statues to the brothers Ptolemy VI and Ptolemy VIII during their coregency.<sup>43</sup> At Kyrene a dedication was offered on behalf of Ptolemy VIII, probably during his reign as king in Kyrenaika, and after his departure for Egypt he was honored together with Apollo by a group of elite soldiers.<sup>44</sup> Finally, in 108 the city of Kyrene established a cult and festival in honor of King Ptolemy and Queen Kleopatra, Theoi Soteres, and their son Ptolemy, in gratitude for a *psephisma* regulating police actions by royal officials.<sup>45</sup> It was probably at this same time that Stolos, a First Friend and *archedeatros*, offered a personal dedication to Soter II, erasing a public dedication previously offered to Kleopatra III by the Kyreneans.<sup>46</sup> Another dedication to a second-century King Ptolemy was erected at Olympia by the Kyreneans.<sup>47</sup>

The gaps in this record are partially filled by honors offered by the Kyreneans to officials who are commended for their good will toward Ptolemy III and Berenike II, Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III (two instances), Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II, and two uncertain second-century Ptolemies.<sup>48</sup> Despite its notorious penchant for revolts, it appears that the ancient and proud polis of Kyrene reconciled itself to Ptolemaic rule very soon after its unification with Egypt, even if it never exhibited the same enthusiasm as Cyprus or Egypt.

<sup>38</sup> *IDelt* 414.4; *IFay* 1.1.

<sup>39</sup> *OGIS* 96; 101; 942; *IDelt* 525.1; 960.1; *IAlex* 62.

<sup>40</sup> *SEG* 9.112.

<sup>41</sup> *IGCyr* 629 = *OGIS* 22; *IGCyr* 337 = *OGIS* 33.

<sup>42</sup> Thompson 1973, no. 29.

<sup>43</sup> *IGCyr* 843 and *IGCyr* 338 = *OGIS* 124.

<sup>44</sup> *SEG* 18.738; 31.1574.

<sup>45</sup> *SEG* 9.5; 9.62.

<sup>46</sup> *SEG* 18.730.

<sup>47</sup> *IOlympia* 314.

<sup>48</sup> *SEG* 18.732–736; 20.729.

## V. Honors in the Seleukid and Lagid Heartlands

It is remarkable that Syria Seleukis, which we consider the heartland of the Seleukid empire, has yielded only two documents reflecting honors offered to the rulers. One is the well-known priest list from Seleukeia in Pieria dating from the reign of Seleukos IV.<sup>49</sup> It informs us that there was an annual priesthood for Seleukos Zeus Nikator and Antiochos Apollo Soter and Antiochos Theos and Seleukos Kallinikos and Seleukos Soter and Antiochos and Antiochos the Great, and another priesthood for the reigning King Seleukos. This was a state cult, so in itself it tells us nothing of the attitudes of the subjects of the kingdom. No dedications survive by the priests of the dynastic or royal cult. The only personal dedication, from Larisa on the Orontes, is an *ex voto* to Artemis adorned with the portrait of a Seleukid king, probably Tryphon, offered by a certain Pandemos in gratitude for escaping grave dangers twice.<sup>50</sup>

The paucity of honorary inscriptions in Syria Seleukis does not necessarily reflect tepid support for Seleukid rule. Immigration to the region was largely Macedonian, and the Macedonians did not have the same “epigraphic habit” or the same obsequious attitude toward their kings as did the ethnic Greeks. Furthermore, continuous habitation of many sites in Syria has limited excavation—though Fergus Millar did suggest the hypothesis that “the remarkable absence of tangible evidence from Syria in the Hellenistic period may not be an accident which further discovery would correct, but the reflection of a real absence of development and building activity in an area dominated by war and political instability.”<sup>51</sup>

We can get a better perspective on the silence of Syria from a comparison with contemporary sources from Egypt, the heartland of the Ptolemaic empire. There the state dynastic cult was older. It first began to take form in 272, when Ptolemy II associated himself and his sister-wife Arsinoe II in the cult of the deified Alexander, and truly became a dynastic cult under Ptolemy III, so that by the time of Seleukos IV it had been in existence for at least three generations. In contrast, the Seleukid state dynastic cult had been established by Antiochos III and was only one generation old. Here we consider only the honors offered to Ptolemy V, whose reign overlapped that of Seleukos IV and was troubled by the secession of Upper Egypt and revolts in various parts of the Delta. Despite this violent and widespread rejection of Lagid rule, the fifth Ptolemy received divine honors from a synod of Egyptian priests assembled at Memphis in 197, who ordered erection of his cult statue in the most public part of every Egyptian temple.<sup>52</sup> After the final suppression of the Great Revolt of Upper Egypt Ptolemy V was honored again by a synod of Egyptian priests assembled in Alexandria.<sup>53</sup> In the following year yet another synodal decree was enacted at Memphis, granting divine honors to the queen, Kleopatra I, and increasing the honors to the king.<sup>54</sup> The fifth Ptolemy was also the recipient of numerous honors from individual subjects. At some point before his marriage to Kleopatra I

<sup>49</sup> *IGLS* 3.2.1184 = *OGIS* 245 = Austin 2006, no. 207.

<sup>50</sup> *SEG* 44.1392; Fleischer 1991, 69–70.

<sup>51</sup> Millar 1987, 130.

<sup>52</sup> *OGIS* 90 = Austin 2006, no. 293.

<sup>53</sup> *Philensis* II; Eldamaty 2005.

<sup>54</sup> *Philensis* I.



in 194/3, two Egyptian officers of the elite *machimoi* of the court dedicated a statue of the king and his parents at Kanopos.<sup>55</sup> Another dedication to Ptolemy alone was offered in the Arsinoite nome.<sup>56</sup> At Leontopolis a scribe and a priest of the temple of the Lion offered a dedication to King Ptolemy Theos Epiphanes and Eucharistos and Queen Kleopatra.<sup>57</sup> And at Philae, in 187, a statue group was dedicated to the king, queen, and Isis.<sup>58</sup> No less than eleven dedications, most of altars, temples, and architectural elements, were offered on behalf of the rulers who, as was customary in such dedications, were always mentioned first. Three of them came from the Delta, of which two concerned a synagogue at Athribis while the third was an altar and persea tree at Taposiris Parva, dedicated to Ororis, Sarapis, Isis, Anubis and all the gods and goddesses by two associations of performers at religious festivals.<sup>59</sup> Five more dedications on behalf of the rulers were made in the Arsinoite nome, including an altar to the gods Stotoetes and Sokometis and Pnebtynis and their *synnaoi*, of behalf of the king and queen, as an *ex voto* by Petesouchos son of Phatres;<sup>60</sup> and a dedication at Magdola to Zeus Soter and the Dea Syra and their *synnaoi theoi*, on behalf the the royal couple and their son, by Apollonios and Machatas, Macedonians and priests of the gods.<sup>61</sup> A last example is of particular historical interest because it was offered at Akoris by an important Egyptian notable whose support was critical in the first campaign against the Great Revolt: On behalf of King Ptolemy the Great God Epiphanes Eucharistos, a rock cut shrine to Isis Mochias Soteira by Akoris son of Erges.<sup>62</sup> These examples demonstrate that war and political instability did not stifle expressions of loyalty in a culture in which such expressions were the norm.

## VI. Honors in the Seleukid East

Babylonia, and the city of Babylon in particular, has also been considered as a major center of the Seleukid kingdom. As already emphasized by Sherwin-White and Kuhrt, honors to the Seleukid kings conformed to the old Babylonian practice of offering prayers, dedications, and sacrifices to traditional gods, for the life of the king.<sup>63</sup> The earliest evidence is from Uruk. In 244 the Seleukid governor of the city, Anu-uballit-Nikarchos, left a clay cylinder foundation inscription in the temple of Anu and Antum describing his restoration work and dedicating the rebuilt temple for the life of Kings Antiochos

<sup>55</sup> *IAlex* 26 = *OGIS* 731.

<sup>56</sup> *IFay* 3.195.

<sup>57</sup> *OGIS* 732.

<sup>58</sup> *IthSy* 314.

<sup>59</sup> *OGIS* 96 and 101 (Athribis); *OGIS* 97 (Taposiris Parva).

<sup>60</sup> *IFay* 3.196.

<sup>61</sup> *IFay* 3.150 = *OGIS* 738. The other dedications from Arsinoites are *IFay* 1.4; *IFay* 2.132 (Euhemereia); *IFay* 2.137 (Dionysias). *OGIS* 92 and 95 are unprovenanced.

<sup>62</sup> *IAkôris* 1 = *OGIS* 94.

<sup>63</sup> Sherwin-White – Kuhrt 1993, 200. As demonstrated by Pfeiffer 2020, similar prayers for the well-being of the Ptolemaic royal family were also offered in Egyptian temples along with rites performed for them as divinities; the two forms of religious expression were not seen a mutually exclusive.

and Seleukos.<sup>64</sup> In 201 another governor of Uruk, Anu-uballit-Kephalon, left a similar building inscription commemorating his (re)foundation of the temple of Anu ‘for the life of Antiochos the king, my ruler.’<sup>65</sup>

For the city of Babylon the evidence centers on state visits by the kings or officials of the highest rank, who participated in cultic rituals on these occasions. On 7 April 224 Seleukos II and his sons shared in the sacrifices to Bel and Beltiya, the Great Gods, during the celebration of the *Akitu* or New Year festival.<sup>66</sup> Antiochos III returned to Babylon on the homeward leg of his eastern anabasis and again celebrated the *Akitu* festival; on 7 April 205 a sacrifice was offered to Ishtar of Babylon and for the life of King Antiochos.<sup>67</sup> Antiochos III visited Babylon for a third time in 187, as he launched his final eastern campaign. On 15 April the administrator of Esagila and the assembly of the temple presented him with a gold crown weighing 1,000 shekels, and the governor of the city also offered gifts of gold.<sup>68</sup> In 171 a Seleukid general, perhaps a newly appointed governor of the Upper Satrapies, offered sacrifices in Esagila to Bel and Beltiya, the Great Gods, for the life of the kings, and in the *Akitu* temple he offered sacrifices to Bel, Beltiya, and Ishtar of Babylon for the life of the kings.<sup>69</sup>

Babylon has yielded a single personal dedication to a Seleukid ruler, an altar or statue dedicated to King Antiochos Theos Epiphanes on the occasion of thanksgiving games, erected by a certain Philippos son of Dia...<sup>70</sup> The dedication is dated to the year 166 and in the dating formulary Antiochos IV is called savior of Asia and founder [and benefactor] of the city. According to a restoration in *SEG* 26.1624, the thanksgiving games were those celebrated at Daphne. Another personal dedication from the Mesopotamian region is a Greek inscription recently discovered in Duhok province near Erbil, offered by a *strategos* to Demeter Karpophoros, on behalf of a King Seleukos, presumably Seleukos IV.<sup>71</sup> Though offered to a Greek deity, this dedication follows the pattern observed in the Babylonian temples, of honoring traditional gods for the benefit of the ruler.

A priest list from Seleukeia on the Tigris seems to attest a civic cult much like those at Scythopolis and Samaria.<sup>72</sup> More certain evidence for a civic dynastic cult comes from Antiocheia in Persis. In 205, at a time when Antiochos III was wintering in Antiocheia, the city responded favorably to an invitation from Magnesia on the Meander to attend the festival of Artemis Leucophryene.<sup>73</sup> The dating protocol of the response names the priest,

---

<sup>64</sup> *YOS* I 52. Sherwin-White – Kuhrt 1993, 200, characterize the dedication as applying only to the gold bolt and gold gate post for the Exalted Gate.

<sup>65</sup> Falkenstein 1941, 6–8; translation of Sherwin-White – Kuhrt 1993, 202.

<sup>66</sup> *BCHP* 12 I.

<sup>67</sup> Del Monte 1997, AD 2, no. 204.

<sup>68</sup> Del Monte 1997, AD 2, no. 187.

<sup>69</sup> Sachs – Hunger 1989, no. 171.

<sup>70</sup> *IK EstOr* 103 = *OGIS* 253. Sherwin-White – Kuhrt 1993, 157, emphasize that this inscription is not provenanced archaeologically. It was acquired from a dealer in Baghdad who claimed it came from the vicinity of Babylon.

<sup>71</sup> Reported on the website *Kurdistan 24*, <https://www.kurdistan24.net/en/news/6938f3c3-94dc4c2f-b929-18e557ffaa2a> (consulted 2 November 2020). I thank Stefano G. Caneva for drawing this find to my attention.

<sup>72</sup> McDowell 1935, 258; Van Nuffelen 2001.

<sup>73</sup> *IMagnesia* 13 = *OGIS* 1.233.

for the first half of the year, of Seleukos Nikator, Antiochos Soter, Antiochos Theos, Seleukos Kallinikos, King Seleukos, King Antiochos and his son Antiochos. The king's presence very probably inspired the organization of this cult. Under the reign of Antiochos IV Ikaros (Failaka) in the Persian Gulf, a military installation, celebrated games in honor of the king and his ancestors.<sup>74</sup>

In the Seleukid east the most common attestations of personal honors to the rulers are manumission documents freeing slaves by dedicating them to traditional gods, for the salvation (*soteria*) of the king and other members of the royal family. The earliest and most northerly attestation, from Gurgan (Hyrcania), is a letter reporting an act of manumission on behalf of King Antiochos and Queen Stratonike and their children.<sup>75</sup> The most southerly and westerly is from Uruk, and the freed slave is dedicated to Anu and Antu for the salvation of King Antiochos and Seleukos his son, the kings (i.e., Antiochos III and the future Seleukos IV).<sup>76</sup> The main corpus of such acts of manumission is from second-century Susa under its poliad name Seleukeia on the Eulaios.<sup>77</sup> The most informative is a dedication to Apollo and Artemis Dattais for the salvation of King Seleukos and Queen Laodike his mother and Laodike his wife, offered by Kalliphon son of Diodoros, cavalryman.<sup>78</sup> Otherwise the dedications are offered to Nanaia and the rulers honored are Antiochos III and his eldest son; Seleukos IV and the two Laodikai (again); King Antiochos and Queen Laodike (three times); and Demetrios I and his queen (neither named explicitly). The dedicators who reference the Seleukid rulers have Greek names exclusively and include another cavalryman.<sup>79</sup> A dedication by a woman with the evidently Babylonian name Beltibanatis is unfortunately fragmentary and it cannot be determined whether she, too, offered her slave for the salvation of the rulers.

These acts of manumission are not dated according to the Seleukid era, but by the regnal year of the reigning king. This practice gives the reigning king a sort of precedence, but the normal order of the names in the texts is dedicator(s), slave(s), the deity or deities to whom the dedication is offered, and last the royal family members. In only two of the eight cases are the rulers mentioned before the deity,<sup>80</sup> and they never precede the dedicator(s). This is much in contrast to Ptolemaic *hyper* dedications, which also involve the Lagids as indirect beneficiaries of dedications to traditional deities. Of more than 130 such dedications, the overwhelming majority give precedence to the ruler(s); two name the god(s) first;<sup>81</sup> three name the dedicator(s) first;<sup>82</sup> and at least one begins with the object dedicated followed by the name of the dedicator.<sup>83</sup> It would perhaps be going too far to suggest that the Seleukid manumission dedications imply less fervent support for the rulers; the Ptolemaic formula reflects a cultural norm in which the royal family was constantly invoked. Yet patriotic exercises may indeed influence sentiment and behavior.

<sup>74</sup> *IK EstOr* 422.

<sup>75</sup> *IK EstOr* 280 = *SEG* 49.1973.

<sup>76</sup> *YBC* 11633.

<sup>77</sup> *IK EstOr* 189 (ca. 200), 190 (183/2), 191 (177/6), 192, 193, 194, 197 (142/1).

<sup>78</sup> *IK EstOr* 190 = *SEG* 7.17 (183/2).

<sup>79</sup> *IK EstOr* 192.

<sup>80</sup> *IK EstOr* 193, 280.

<sup>81</sup> *IAlex* 1 = *OGIS* 21; *SEG* 58.1501 (Amathous).

<sup>82</sup> *IG* 12.3.468 = *OGIS* 112 (Thera); *OGIS* 170 (Delos); *IPhilae* 52 = *OGIS* 186.

<sup>83</sup> *IG* 12.3.463 (Thera).

The Seleukid east has yielded several other dedications which imply support for Seleukid rule because they honor members of the administrative hierarchy. In Susa, around 200, Leon, commander of the garrison, and the officers and soldiers under him, erected a statue to Arete, daughter of Timon who is in charge of the court of the king.<sup>84</sup> The rulers are explicitly mentioned in a dedication at Laodikeia in Media/Nihavand, dated 182/1.<sup>85</sup> It is a dedication to Menedemos, the one responsible for the Upper Satrapies, offered by Python, son of Python, on account of his *eunoia* toward the kings and their affairs. A rock-cut relief of a reclining Herakles in Behistun, Kermanshah province, was dedicated to Herakles Kallinikos by a certain Hyakinthos, son of Pantauchos, for the salvation of Kleomenes, the one responsible for the Upper Satrapies.<sup>86</sup> It is dated to 148, a time of rising Parthian power, and this suggests that the prayer for *soteria* was something more than a mere convention, especially since it was addressed to Herakles Kallinikos, who was invoked as the tutelary god of the Seleukid garrison in the Karafto caves in an apotropaic inscription above the entrance.<sup>87</sup>

## VII. More on Honors for Officials

Of 28 inscriptions honoring Seleukid officials or officers, fifteen, slightly more than half, cite the official's devotion to the king, specific services performed for the royal family, or the king's friendship for the official. Devotion to the king is cited in a similar proportion of texts honoring Ptolemaic officials, but the proportion is larger if we take into account the mention of aulic titles implying personal closeness to the king. The offering of honors to officials and their family members is especially characteristic of Ptolemaic Cyprus but this practice emerged only after the creation of the position of *strategos* of the island under Ptolemy IV, and more often it took the form of erecting statues in the sanctuary of Aphrodite Paphia rather than issuing honorary decrees. Among the earliest are two dedications offered to Myrsine, wife of the first *strategos* Pelops son of Pelops, one at Palaipaphos by the city of Paphos and the other at Salamis by the soldiers of the island, both citing her *eunoia* toward the king and queen.<sup>88</sup> Cypriote inscriptions honoring officials and their family members are especially numerous from the reign of Ptolemy VIII, when the formula mentioning *eunoia* was usually reserved for the *strategos* alone. Out of a total of 105 inscriptions honoring Lagid officials and their family members (of which 48 are from Cyprus), roughly half cite goodwill toward the rulers or execution of their policies or personal services to the royal family. It is especially noteworthy that the 48 inscriptions honoring Cypriote officials and their family members rival the 52 Cypriote dedications to the Lagid rulers.<sup>89</sup> Of these latter, eighteen are minor artifacts of

<sup>84</sup> *IK EstOr* 183 = *SEG* 37.1401. Also from Susiana, but not certainly of the Seleukid period, is *OGIS* 747, a dedication to Arreneides son of Arreneides, *strategos* of Susiana, by his bodyguard and friend Pythagoras son of Aristagoras.

<sup>85</sup> *IK EstOr* 279.

<sup>86</sup> *IK EstOr* 274.

<sup>87</sup> Sherwin-White – Kuhrt 1993, 77.

<sup>88</sup> *ABSA* 56, 1961, 15, no. 39; *ISalamine* XIII.74.

<sup>89</sup> The total rises to 55 if we include the few Cypriote dedications on behalf of Lagid rulers.

mediocre quality—small altars, altar plaques, small stelai—associated with the private worship of Arsinoe Philadelphos, which can hardly be compared with the 34 formal public dedications. In the heyday of dedications to Cypriote officials under Ptolemy VIII, only one dedication was offered directly to the rulers and another on their behalf.<sup>90</sup> But they were honored in cult by the priest of the Theoi Euergetai, the priestess of Queen Kleopatra Thea, and the Artists of Dionysos and the Theoi Euergetai.<sup>91</sup>

Another point of comparison between the dossiers of honors to Seleukid and Ptolemaic officials is the identity of those offering the honors. Military men were probably responsible for all three such dedications in the Seleukid east, though this is explicit in only one case; and importantly, the dedication was made in the name of an entire garrison. Of the above-mentioned dedications to Cypriote officials and their family members, insofar as the identities of the dedicators are known, at least eighteen dedications were offered by cities, three by members of the gymnasium, two by scribes of the Artists of Dionysos, and at least sixteen by military groups, usually ethnic subgroups within the garrison of the island, but in one case the garrison of Crete.<sup>92</sup> The phenomenon of dedications by military *koina* was limited almost entirely to the reign of Ptolemy VIII.

### VIII. Late Honors and Dedications to Seleukid Kings

The dedication to Antiochos VII at Ptolemais-Akko was the last anywhere on Seleukid soil, but honors continued to be offered abroad, especially at the panhellenic cult center on Delos. A statue to Antiochos Euergetes was erected in the Athenian agora during his lifetime.<sup>93</sup> Antiochos VIII Epiphanes was honored by three statues on Delos, one erected by the people of Laodikea in Phoinike, the holy and *asylos*, in 110/09; another by the priest Helianax, an Athenian citizen; and a third by a courtier holding the office of *epistolographos* (private secretary).<sup>94</sup> Antiochos Epiphanes' half-brother and rival Antiochos IX was also honored on Delos by one of his courtiers, a First Friend and citizen of Samos.<sup>95</sup> Seleukos VI too received two statues on Delos but of the dedicators we know only that one was named Dionysios.<sup>96</sup>

### IX. Overviews and Comparisons

The following comparison excludes the civic honors offered to Seleukid and Lagid kings by Greek *poleis* in Asia Minor and the Aegean islands.

---

<sup>90</sup> *ISalamine* XIII.68; *SEG* 38.1501 (Amathous).

<sup>91</sup> *OGIS* 134, 159, 164.

<sup>92</sup> On the dedications by military *koina* on Cyprus, see most recently Fischer-Bovet (forthcoming).

<sup>93</sup> *SEG* 24.135.

<sup>94</sup> *IDélos* 1551; *OGIS* 258, 259.

<sup>95</sup> *OGIS* 255.

<sup>96</sup> *IDélos* 1553; *OGIS* 261.

The Seleukid dossier of dedications offered by individuals and non-civic groups includes seventeen offered directly to Seleukid rulers and seventeen offered on their behalf or for their *soteria*. Insofar as the names or ethnics of the dedicators are known, seventeen are Greek, one is probably a Hellenized Phoenician, and two are Hellenized Babylonians, the latter two being the well-known Anu-uballit-Nikarchos and Anu-uballit-Kephalon, both governors of Uruk. Greeks thus comprise 85% of the dedicators we can identify, a higher proportion than for the Ptolemies, as we shall see below. Insofar as the occupation or social status of the dedicators is known, nine dedications were offered by officials or courtiers, three by military men or units, four by priests, two by religious associations, one by a victor in the ephebic games of the gymnasium, and one by a relative of the king. Several of these occupations represent groups whose loyalty was essential to the functioning and stability of the state: officials, the military, the priesthood, and royal kinsmen. In the case of officials and military men, they also represent groups who depended on the state for their careers and social prestige. These results are unsurprising, since the administration of the core territories of the Seleukid empire was dominated by Greco-Macedonians from western Asia Minor and Greece, while local elites were involved only marginally in the power structure.<sup>97</sup>

The Lagid dossier comprises more than 150 honorary inscriptions offered directly to the rulers and more than 125 offered on their behalf. Mainly they come from Egypt and Cyprus. Of 180 personal dedications whose donors are named, 140 inscriptions identify dedicators with Greek names, and among these dedicators more than twenty Greek ethnics are represented. Thus Greeks would appear to represent 78% of the dedicators, a percentage only slightly lower than in the Seleukid empire. But in Ptolemaic Egypt onomasty is not reliable evidence of ethnicity. A dedication on behalf of Ptolemy III and his family to the birth goddess Thoueris provides a vivid and explicit illustration of this point. It was offered by two women, Eirene and Theoxena, daughters of a Kyrenean, who stipulate that their Egyptian names are Nephersouchos and Thaues.<sup>98</sup> More typical of the problem is the dedication offered on behalf of Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III to Demeter, Kore, and Dikaiosyne by Apollonios son of Ammonios, who is known from other sources as an infantryman of Egyptian descent.<sup>99</sup> Dedicators with Egyptian names or titles appear on 25 other dedications, sometimes in collaboration with co-dedicators with Greek names.<sup>100</sup> Eight dedications were offered by Ioudaioi, three by Phoenicians, three by Romans, and one by Pisidians. In addition, six dedications were offered by polities, namely cities of Kyrenaika and Cyprus.

As with the Seleukid dossier, groups essential to the functioning of the state are prominent among the dedicators, but there is more diversity, due in part to the large number of sources. To cite a few of the more memorable examples, Totoes, an Egyptian

---

<sup>97</sup> Capdetrey 2007, 389–392. This is not to deny the existence of other administrative structures, notably the delegation of authority in peripheral areas to vassal kings, local dynasts, or even priest-dynasts, see Capdetrey 2007, 112–130; Chrubasik 2021. But such peripheral areas do not appear to have yielded dedications to Seleukid rulers.

<sup>98</sup> *IFay* 1.2; see also *IFay* 3.209.

<sup>99</sup> *PP* 3169.

<sup>100</sup> Of the 25 dedications offered by subjects with Egyptian names or titles, only four were offered directly to the rulers; the others employed the *hyper* formula.

*pastophoros* (priest) and sailor of Arsinoe, left a bilingual dedication in Upper Egypt to Arsinoe Thea Philadelphos.<sup>101</sup> The *chrematistai* (judges) of the Prosopites and surrounding nomes for the eighth and ninth years of Ptolemy VI made a dedication at Rosettana to the king and queen; all the judges had Greek names and other official functions including *eisagogeus* (usher), *grammateus* (scribe), and *hyperetes* (assistant).<sup>102</sup> Farther south, Ptolemy VI and Kleopatra II were honored together with Pan Epekoos and Eucharistos and Apollo-Haroeris by an amethyst quarrying party (workers subject to the royal monopoly on precious stones).<sup>103</sup> In the Arsinoites, in the first decade of the first century, it was apparently customary for classes of epebes in the gymnasium to donate gifts of land to the crocodile gods Souchos and Soknebtunis on behalf of King Ptolemy called Alexander.<sup>104</sup> At Soknopaiou Nesos in the same decade, the *oikonomos sitikon* (financial officer for grain) of Herakleides Meros and his office gave annual gifts of wheat to the local crocodile god Soknopaios on behalf of King Ptolemy called Alexander.<sup>105</sup>

Any attempt to quantify the occupations of those who offered dedications to the Ptolemies is necessarily approximate because some offices combined both civil and military functions, and because of the tendency to accumulate both secular offices and priesthoods. With these caveats, I count 34 dedications offered by officials and courtiers, 49 offered by military men or units (including elephant hunters), and three by police. Members of gymnasia offered twelve dedications, while four were offered by persons involved in organizing *agones*. Seventeen dedications were offered by priests (excluding the seven synodal decrees of the assembled priesthood of Egypt), and five were offered by private religious associations. Four dedications were offered by Lagid family members or in-laws, a reminder that the solidarity of the royal family was essential to stability. The most humble of the dedicators were the Egyptian elders of the koinon of *olyra* millers of Alexandria and an association of goose breeders in Theadelphia.<sup>106</sup>

Officials, military men, and priests stand out among those who honored both the Seleukids and the Ptolemies. For the Seleukids, officials and courtiers appear dominant among those offering dedications, followed by priests and religious associations, but we must treat these observations with caution because of the small size of the sample. For the Ptolemies the military appears to have been most active in offering dedications, followed by officials and courtiers, then priests and religious associations, with members of the gymnasia in fourth place and royal kinsmen in a distant fifth place.

The Ptolemaic dedications are quantifiable manifestations of a pervasive culture of honoring the rulers: daily sacrifices and libations to them or on their behalf in most or all Egyptian temples; similar offerings at the regular meetings of private religious associations; games in honor of the king and other observances in the gymnasia. Administrative correspondence from the Herakleopolite nome under Ptolemy XII gives the impression that officials regularly participated in sacrifices and libations offered to or on behalf of

<sup>101</sup> SEG 48.2037.

<sup>102</sup> OGIS 106.

<sup>103</sup> IPan du désert 59.

<sup>104</sup> IFay 3.200 = OGIS 176 (98 BC); IFay 3.201 = OGIS 178 (95 BC); IFay 3.202 (94 BC).

<sup>105</sup> IFay 1.70 = OGIS 177 (97 BC); IFay 1.71 = OGIS 179 (95 BC).

<sup>106</sup> OGIS 729 = IAlex 24 = SB 5.8924; IFay 2.109 = SB 3.6254.

the rulers.<sup>107</sup> It may be that such participation was compulsory, and compulsory participation in ceremonies of loyalty are even more likely for the military. This cultural milieu would tend to encourage the offering of dedications by individuals from the official and military spheres, who could expect these gestures to enhance their careers and their social standing.<sup>108</sup>

The main diachronic developments in the Seleukid dossier are the great reduction in honors to the rulers after the loss of Asia Minor beyond the Taurus; the relative prevalence of dedications at Susa from c. 200, which must be related to its refoundation as Seleukeia on the Eulaios and the introduction of Greco-Macedonian *politai*; and the emergence of Delos as the preferred site for dedications after the reign of Antiochos VII.

In the diachrony the Ptolemaic dossier is characterized by an explosion of direct dedications under the reign of Ptolemy II, to be connected with his energetic promotion of royal and dynastic cult. After the reign of Ptolemy VI there was a gradual decline in the popularity of dedication *to* the rulers, whereas dedications *on behalf of* Lagid rulers remained in favor.<sup>109</sup> The great surprise is the paucity of dedications to Kleopatra VII. No direct dedications have survived, though a retainer of Antony erected a statue in Alexandria to his ‘god and benefactor.’<sup>110</sup> Only four dedications were offered on behalf of Kleopatra, as compared with 23 dedications (of both kinds) for her father Ptolemy XII, generally considered to be a bad ruler, and 20 for Ptolemy X, who was also driven from his throne. Evidently the great Kleopatra, who fascinates modern historians, did not inspire much loyalty among her subjects.

## X. Conclusions

Honors offered to the Seleukid and Ptolemaic kings range from civic honors to state-organized cults to prayers and offerings in traditional temples to dedications offered by individuals and non-civic groups. Eventually this study focused its analysis on the last category of honors. Individual and small-group dedications for both Seleukid and Ptolemaic rulers emanated primarily from persons whose careers and social status depended on the kings. The honors are thus not reflective of the reception of Seleukid or Ptolemaic rule by their subjects at large, but of the ambition, loyalty, and/or enthusiasm of members of their administrations. In the Seleukid case, those who offered dedications were usually of Greco-Macedonian ethnicity and most seem to have been members of the highest elite. In the Ptolemaic dedications we see a broader range of the elite, from cosmopolitan officials and courtiers who retained ties and power bases in their countries of origin, to members of more modest local elites whose welfare depended entirely on the king.

As this survey makes clear, there are important regional differences in the expressions of loyalty to the two ruling houses. One highly significant factor was the organization

---

<sup>107</sup> *BGU VIII.1767*: sacrifices and libations to the lord king and his children in the temple of Herakles; *BGU VIII.1768*: sacrifices on behalf of the lord king and his children and close associates.

<sup>108</sup> The social motives for participation in ruler cult are emphasized by Paganini 2020.

<sup>109</sup> It is probably less accurate to infer an increase in *hyper* dedications corresponding to the decline of direct dedications; see Iossif 2005, 248–249.

<sup>110</sup> *OGIS 195 = IAlex 36*.



and financing of royal cult by Ptolemy II and its continued development by his successors.<sup>111</sup> The Ptolemaic policies stimulated a culture of loyalism in Egypt and Cyprus, but had minimal success in Syria and Phoinike and in Kyrenaika. The Seleukids, in contrast, were tardy and less persistent in adopting comparable policies of self-promotion. But the sparseness of evidence from the Seleukid east must be related in part to the vast geographic expanse of the Seleukid kingdom. Pockets of Greco-Macedonians in service to the crown were scattered in garrisons and in the second-century *politeumata* established in indigenous cities like Babylon and Susa—and these are the contexts that have yielded most personal dedications to Seleukid kings. This is much in contrast to the situation in Ptolemaic Egypt, where the bureaucracy and the military were both ethnically integrated, a process that is especially visible in the second century BC.<sup>112</sup> Somewhat surprisingly, however, dedicators with identifiably Egyptian names are not more common in the second century; their numbers barely fluctuate across the reigns of Ptolemy III through XII. The probable explanation is the use of Greek names by Hellenized Egyptians in contexts they considered “Greek.”

In addition to policy and cultural explanations for the regional differences, we should also consider the survival and accessibility of evidence. Most major Seleukid sites lie below contemporary cities and the Hellenistic levels are often elusive. Even sites that have been extensively excavated, like Seleukeia on the Tigris and Susa, remain imperfectly understood because the political tensions and wars of the last decades have hindered further exploration. Phoenicia, where finds from the Hellenistic period are notoriously scanty, has yielded relatively few dedications for either the Ptolemies or the Seleukids. As mentioned previously, Millar suspected that the meager Hellenistic finds from Syria may reflect the destruction of evidence in ancient times rather than insufficient excavation, and this could conceivably be true for other parts of the Seleukid east as well.

## ABBREVIATIONS

*BGU* – *Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen (Staatlichen) Museen zu Berlin. Griechische Urkunden*, Berlin 1895–

*IAkôris* – É. Bernand, *Les inscriptions grecques et latines d’Akôris*, Le Caire 1988.

*IAlex* – É. Bernand, *Inscriptions grecques d’Alexandrie ptolémaïque d’Alexandrie ptolémaïque*, Le Caire 2001.

*IDélos* – F. Durrbach et al., *Inscriptions de Délos*, Paris 1926–1972.

*IDelt* – A. Bernand, *Le Delta égyptien d’après les textes grecs*, 1. *Les confins libyques*, 1–3, Le Caire 1970.

*IEstOr* – F. Canali de Rossi, *Iscrizioni dello estremo oriente greco: un repertorio*, Bonn 2004.

<sup>111</sup> On the financing of royal cult, see Lorber 2020.

<sup>112</sup> The literature on multiculturalism in the Ptolemaic administration is large. On the integration of the military, see Fischer-Bovet 2014.

- IFay* – É. Bernand, *Receuil des inscriptions grecques du Fayoum*, Leiden–Le Caire 1975–1981.
- IGCyr* – C. Dobias-Lalou, *Inscriptions of Greek Cyrenaica*, Bologna 2017.
- IGLS* – L. Jalabert et al., *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*, Beyrouth – Paris 1929–
- IHalikarnassos* – D. F. McCabe, *Halikarnassos Inscriptions, Texts and Lists*, The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, Packard Humanities Institute CD #6, 1991.
- IHerakleiaLatmia* – M. Wörrle, *Inchriften von Herakleia am Latmos*, *Chiron* 18, 1988, 421–476; 20, 1990, 19–58; 33, 2003, 121–143.
- IKaunos* – Ch. Marek, *Die Inschriften von Kaunos*, München 2006.
- IMagnesia* – O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, Berlin 1900.
- IOlympia* – W. Dittenberger, K. Purgold, *Die Inschriften von Olympia*, Berlin 1896.
- IPan du désert* – A. Bernand, *Pan du Désert*, Leiden 1977.
- IPhilae* – A. Bernand, *Les inscriptions grecques de Philae*, I: *Époque ptolémaïque*, Paris 1969.
- ISalamine* – J. Pouilloux, P. Roesch, J. Marcillet-Jaubert, *Salamine de Chypre*, vol. XIII: *Testimonia Salamina*, 2: *Corpus épigraphique*, Paris 1987.
- ISmyrna* – G. Petzl, *Die Inschriften von Smyrna*, 3 vols., Bonn 1982–1990.
- IThSy* – A. Bernand, *De Thèbes à Syène*, Paris 1989.
- OGIS* – W. Dittenberger, *Orientalis graeci inscriptiones selectae*, 2 vols., Leipzig 1903–1905.
- Philensis I* – K. Sethe, *Hieroglyphische Urkunden der griechische-römischen Zeit*, Leipzig 1904, no. 37, pp. 199–214.
- Philensis II* – K. Sethe, *Hieroglyphische Urkunden der griechische-römischen Zeit*, Leipzig 1904, no. 38, pp. 214–230.
- PP* – W. Peremans, E. van't Dack, *Prosopographia Ptolemaica*, Leuven 1950–1981.
- SB* – F. Preisigke et al., *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten*, Strassburg–Berlin–Heidelberg–Wiesbaden 1913–
- SEG* – *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*.
- YBC* – *Yale Babylonian Collection*, New Haven.
- YOS* – *Yale Oriental Series, Babylonian Texts*, New Haven.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aliquot, J. (2004), *Aegyptiaca et isiacae de la Phénicie et du Liban aux époques hellénistique et romaine*, *Syria* 81: 201–228.
- Aliquot, J. (2009), *La vie religieuse du Liban sous l'Empire romain*, Beirut.
- Austin, M. M. (2006), *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*, 2nd edition, Cambridge.
- Blinkenberg, C. (1941), *Lindos: Feuilles et recherches, 1902–1914*, vol. I: *Inscriptions*, Copenhagen–Berlin.
- Bonnet, C. (2004), Le roi et la déesse: à propos de la dédicace grecque à Ptolémée et Aphrodite de la grotte de Wasta, près de Tyr, *Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino Oriente antico* 21: 125–140.
- Bonnet, C. (2008), La déesse et le roi: Nouveaux regards sur le rôle d'Astarté dans les rites d'investiture en Phénicie, *Mythos* 1: 11–23.

- Bonnet, C. (2015), *Les enfants de Cadmos: Le paysage religieux de la Phénicie hellénistique*, Paris.
- Caneva, S. G. (2016), Short Notes on 3rd-Century Ptolemaic Royal Formulae and Festivals, *ZPE* 200: 207–214.
- Caneva, S. G. (2020), La importance de la matérialité. Le rôle des petits autels, plaques et bases inscrits dans la compréhension des cultes pour les souverains, in: S. G. Caneva, L. Lorenzon (eds.), *The Materiality of Hellenistic Ruler Cults*, Liège: 21–64.
- Caneva, S. G., Lorenzon, L. (eds.) (2020), *The Materiality of Hellenistic Ruler Cults*, Liège.
- Capdetrey, L. (2007), *Le pouvoir séleucide: Territoire, administration, finances d'un royaume hellénistique (312–129 avant J.C.)*, Rennes.
- Chrubasik, B. (2021), Sanctuaries, Priest-Dynasts and the Seleukid Empire, in: S. Honigman, C. Nihan, O. Lipschits (eds.), *Times of Transition: Judea in the Early Hellenistic Period*, Tel Aviv–University Park, PA: 161–176.
- Cohen, G. M. (2006), *The Hellenistic Settlements in Syria, the Red Sea Basin, and North Africa*, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London.
- Del Monte, G. (1997), *Testi della Babilonia, I: Testi Cronografici*, Pisa–Rome.
- Eldamaty, M. (2005), *Ein ptolemäisches Priesterdekret aus dem Jahr 186 v. Chr. Eine neue Version von Philensis II in Kairo*, Leipzig.
- Falkenstein, A. (1941), *Topographie von Uruk, Teil 1: Uruk zur Seleukidenzeit*, (Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka 3), Leipzig.
- Fischer-Bovet, C. (2014), *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*, Cambridge.
- Fischer-Bovet, C. (forthcoming), Ptolemaic Mercenaries and Local Populations in Egypt and Cyprus: Trust, Social Capital and Dedicatory inscriptions, in: S. Scheuble-Reiter, P. Sängler (eds.), *Shaping Politics and Society: Mercenaries in the Greek World*, Halle.
- Fleischer, R. (1991), *Studien zur Seleukiden Kunst, I: Herrscherbildnisse*, Mainz.
- Gatier, J.-L. (2004), Inscriptions grecques et latines du Proche-Orient: Questions de provenance, *ZPE* 147: 139–144.
- Grainger, J. D. (1997), *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer*, Leiden.
- Höghammar, K. (1993), *Sculpture and Society: A Study of the Connection between Free-Standing Sculpture and Society on Kos in the Hellenistic and Augustan Periods*, Uppsala.
- Hölbl, G. (2001), *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, transl. T. Saavaera, London–New York.
- Iossif, P. (2005), La dimension publique des dédicaces ‘privées’ du culte royal ptolémaïque, in: V. Dasen, M. Piérart (eds.), *Idia kai dêmosia: Les cadres “privées” et “publics” de la religion grecque antique*, Actes du IX<sup>e</sup> colloque du Centre International d’Étude de la Religion Grecque Antique (CIERGA), tenu à Fribourg du 8 au 10 septembre 2003, Liège: 235–257.
- Kotsidu, H. (2000), TIMH KAI ΔΟΞΑ. Ehrungen für hellenistische Herrscher im griechischen Mutterland und in Kleinasien unter besonderer Rücksichtigung der archäologischen Denkmäler, Berlin.
- Kuhrt, A., Sherwin-White, S. (1987), *Hellenism in the East*, Berkeley–Los Angeles.
- Lorber, C. C. (2020), Who Pays the Bill? Monetary Aspects of Royal Cult in the Ptolemaic Kingdom, in: S. G. Caneva, L. Lorenzon (eds.), *The Materiality of Hellenistic Ruler Cults*, Liège: 167–193.
- Ma, J. (1999), *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford.
- McDowell, R. H. (1935), *Stamped and Inscribed Objects from Seleucia on the Tigris*, Ann Arbor.
- Millar, F. (1987), The Problem of Hellenistic Syria, in: A. Kuhrt, S. Sherwin-White (eds.), *Hellenism in the East*, Berkeley–Los Angeles: 110–133.
- Paganini, M. C. D. (2020), Cults for the Rulers in Private Settings: The Gymnasia and Associations of Hellenistic Egypt, in: S. G. Caneva, L. Lorenzon (eds.), *The Materiality of Hellenistic Ruler Cults*, Liège: 125–145.
- Peristianes, H. K. (1910), *Geniké historia tês nêsou Kyprou apo tôn achaiotatôn chronôn mechri tês Anglikês katochês*, Leucosia.
- Pfeiffer, S. (2020), Offerings and Libations for the King and the Question of Ruler-Cult in Egyptian Temples, in: S. G. Caneva, L. Lorenzon (eds.), *The Materiality of Hellenistic Ruler Cults*, Liège: 83–102.

- Rey-Coquais, J.-P. (2006), *Inscriptions grecques et latines de Tyr*, Beirut.
- Sachs, A. J., Hunger, H. (1989), *Astronomical Diaries and Related Texts from Babylonia*, II: *Diaries from 261 B.C. to 165 B.C.*, Vienna.
- Sherwin-White, S., Kuhrt, A. (1993), *From Samakhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleukid Empire*, Berkeley–Los Angeles.
- Stanwick, P. E. (2002), *Portraits of the Ptolemies: Greek Kings as Egyptian Pharaohs*, Austin.
- Stucky, R. (2005), *Das Eschmun-Heiligtum von Sidon: Architektur und Inschriften*, Basel.
- Tal, O. (2019), Arsinoë II Philadelphia at Philoteria/Bet Yerah, *ZPE* 209: 181–184.
- Thompson, D. B. (1973), *Ptolemaic Oinochoai and Portraits in Faience: Aspects of the Ruler-Cult*, Oxford.
- Van Nuffelen, P. (2001), Une culte royal municipale de Séleucie du Tigre à l'époque séleucide, *EA* 33: 85–87.
- Welles, C. B. (1934), *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy*, New Haven.