



TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Herausgegeben von

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer
Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Band 17, 2002

2002

H O L Z H A C H S E N



**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

Band 17

2002

H O L Z H A U S E N

Herausgegeben von:

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Gemeinsam mit:

Wolfgang Hameter, Bernhard Palme und Hans Taeuber

Unter Beteiligung von:

Reinhold Bichler, Herbert Graßl, Sigrid Jalkotzy und Ingomar Weiler

Redaktion:

Franziska Beutler, Sandra Hodeček, Bettina Leiminger, Georg Rehrenböck
und Patrick Sängler

Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an:

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1,
A-1010 Wien. Eingesandte Manuskripte können nicht zurückgeschickt werden.
Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden angezeigt.

Auslieferung:

Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Kaiserstraße 84/1/4, A-1070 Wien
maggoschitz@holzhausen.at
Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Umschlag: IG II² 2127 (Ausschnitt) mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Epigraphischen Museums in
Athen, Inv.-Nr. 8490, und P.Vindob. Barbara 8.

© 2003 by Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Wien

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der
Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind
im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar

Eigentümer und Verleger: Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Kaiserstraße 84/1/4, A-1070 Wien. Herausgeber:
Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber,
c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien.
e-mail: hans.taeuber@univie.ac.at oder Bernhard.Palme@onb.ac.at
Hersteller: Holzhausen Druck & Medien GmbH, Holzhausenplatz 1, A-1140 Wien.
Verlagsort: Wien. — Herstellungsort: Wien. — Printed in Austria.

ISBN 3-900518-03-3

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

I N H A L T S V E R Z E I C H N I S

| | |
|--|-----|
| Petra A m a n n (Wien): Das konstantinische „Reskript von Hispellum“ (CIL XI 5265) und seine Aussagekraft für die etrusko-umbrischen Beziehungen (Tafel 1–3) | 1 |
| Roger S. B a g n a l l (New York), Klaas A. W o r p (Amsterdam): The Receipt for Wheat from Abusir | 29 |
| Michel C h r i s t o l (Paris), Thomas D r e w - B e a r (Lyon): Le <i>*tutor cessionarius</i> de Tralles | 31 |
| Gerhard D o b e s c h (Wien): Caesars Urteil über Ciceros Bedeutung — Gedanken zu Cic. <i>Brut.</i> 253 und Plin. <i>n. h.</i> 7, 117 | 39 |
| Gerhard D o b e s c h (Wien): Noch einmal der Tod des Kaisers Claudius in der <i>Apokolokyntosis</i> | 63 |
| R. Malcolm E r r i n g t o n (Marburg): A Note on the Augustal Prefect of Egypt | 69 |
| Hans F ö r s t e r (Wien): „Ich habe gehört: Du bist betrübt“ — Ein Text aus dem Schenute-Archiv (P.Vindob. K 4716) (Tafel 4) | 79 |
| Nikolaos G o n i s (Oxford): Studies on the Aristocracy of Late Antique Oxyrhynchus (Tafel 5) | 85 |
| Hermann H a r r a u e r , Federico M o r e l l i (Wien): Eine bisher unerkannte mathematische Aufgabe (Tafel 6) | 99 |
| Elisabeth K o s m e t a t o u (Leuven): Remarks on a Delphic Ptolemaic Dynastic Group Monument | 103 |
| Barnabás L ő r i n c z (Budapest): <i>Amici</i> in Pannonien | 113 |
| Fritz M i t t h o f (Wien): Munatidius Merula, ritterlicher Procurator und stellvertretender Dioiket der Provinz Ägypten im Jahre 201 n. Chr.? (Tafel 6–7) | 121 |
| Marjeta Š a š e l K o s (Ljubljana): The Festival of Carna at Emona (Tafel 8) | 129 |
| Marjeta Š a š e l K o s (Ljubljana): The Noarus River in Strabo's <i>Geography</i> | 145 |
| Paul S c h u b e r t (Neuchâtel): P.Gen. II 99 et les archives d'Eutychidès fils de Sarapion | 155 |
| Giacomo S c i b o n a (Messina): Due note a I.G XIV 352 | 159 |
| Alexander S i m a (Heidelberg): Plinius <i>nat. hist.</i> XII 63 und das Steuerwesen im antiken Ḥaḍramawt | 165 |
| Gábor S z l á v i k (Budapest): Althistorische Forschungen in Ungarn von der zweiten Hälfte des Jahres 2000 bis Ende 2001 | 175 |
| Dieter W e b e r (Göttingen): Eine spätsassanidische Rechtsurkunde aus Ägypten | 185 |
| Franz W i n t e r (Wien): Die dokumentarischen Papyri Ägyptens und die Septuaginta: Studien zu 2Kön | 193 |
| Franziska B e u t l e r , Martina P e s d i t s c h e k , Ekkehard W e b e r (Wien): <i>Annona epigraphica Austriaca 2001–2002: Text</i> | 205 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Index | 231 |
| Konkordanzen | 235 |
| Bemerkungen zu Papyri XV (Korr. Tyche 397–489) | 241 |
| Buchbesprechungen | 263 |
| Ernst B a l t r u s c h, <i>Sparta. Geschichte, Gesellschaft, Kultur</i> (Beck'sche Reihe 2083), München 1998 (P. Siewert: 263) — Walter B u r k e r t, <i>Kulte des Altertums. Biologische Grundlagen der Religion</i> , München 1998 (P. Siewert: 263) — Claude E i l e r s, <i>Roman Patrons of Greek cities</i> , Oxford 2002 (K. Harter-Uibopuu: 267) — Günter G r i m m, <i>Alexandria. Die erste Königsstadt der hellenistischen Welt. Bilder aus der Nilmetropole von Alexandrien dem Großen bis Kleopatra VII</i> (Sonderhefte der Antiken Welt — Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie), Mainz am Rhein 1998 (G. Dobesch: 268) — Christoph H o r n, <i>Antike Lebenskunst. Glück und Moral von Sokrates bis zu den Neuplatonikern</i> (Beck'sche Reihe 1271), München 1998 (P. Siewert: 270) — Georges K i o u r t z i a n, <i>Recueils des inscriptions grecques chrétiennes des Cyclades de la fin du III^e au VII^e siècle après J.-C.</i> Paris 2000 (Travaux et Mémoires du Centre de Recherche d'Histoire et de Civilisation de Byzance. Collège de France. Monographies 12) (H. Harrauer: 273) — Stephan L ü c k e, <i>Syngeneia. Epigraphisch-historische Studien zu einem Phänomen der antiken griechischen Diplomatie</i> (Frankfurter Althistorische Beiträge 5), Frankfurt am Main 2000 (S. B. Zoumbaki: 274) — Dorothee R e n n e r - V o l b a c h, <i>Die sogenannten koptischen Textilien im Museum Andreasstift der Stadt Worms. Bestandskatalog</i> , Wiesbaden 2002 (H. Froschauer: 277) — Ulrich S i n n, <i>Sport in der Antike. Wettkampf, Spiel und Erziehung in der Antike</i> (Nachrichten aus dem Martin-von-Wagner-Museum, Bd. 1), Würzburg 1996 (P. Siewert: 278) — Heike N i q u e t, <i>Monumenta virtutum titulique. Senatorische Selbstdarstellung im spätantiken Rom im Spiegel der epigraphischen Denkmäler</i> (HABES 34), Stuttgart 2000 (E. Weber: 278) | |
| Index (H. Förster: koptisch; B. Leiminger: griechisch und lateinisch) | 281 |
| Eingelangte Bücher | 285 |
| Richtlinien für die Abfassung der Manuskripte | 289 |
| Tafeln 1–8 | |

Remarks on a Delphic Ptolemaic Dynastic Group Monument*

Five non-joining inscribed fragments, all plausibly associated with the base of a Ptolemaic royal *Familiengruppe*, were discovered separately at the Delphic sanctuary of Apollo between 1893 and 1923¹. Nothing is known about the monument's original setting, but we may reconstruct its form to some extent on the basis of similarities it shares with its presumably contemporary „twin“ from Thermos². Both groups were set up during an undetermined period during which Ptolemaic and Aitolian interests dovetailed: the Delphic monument was sponsored by a high-ranking individual whose name may have been Lamios, while the other one was financed by the *Koinon* itself. The occasion for their dedication remains unclear and is unsurprisingly under dispute. In characteristically summarily fashion the Thermos inscription honors the Ptolemaic

* Dorothy Thompson is gratefully acknowledged for making available an advance copy of her forthcoming paper entitled ‚*Posidippus, Poet of the Ptolemies*‘ in which she convincingly identifies princess Berenice in Poseidippos AB 78–80, and AB 82 as the Syrian queen, sister of Ptolemy III and wife of Antiochos II (see *infra*). Thanks are also due to Hans Beck and Hans Hauben for discussing with me aspects of this paper. The 10th Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities of Delphi graciously granted me permission to see the inscriptions discussed here. As ever, I remain responsible for all errors and flaws.

References to the work of Poseidippos follow the system established by the *editio minor*: C. Austin and G. Bastianini, *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia*, Milano 2002, abbreviated as AB. On Hellenistic, especially Ptolemaic, dynastic group monuments, their origins, and typology see B. Hintzen-Bohlen, *Die Familiengruppe. Ein Mittel zur Selbstdarstellung hellenistischer Herrscher*, *JdI* 105 (1990) 109–154; E. Kosmetatou, *Constructing Legitimacy: The Ptolemaic Familiengruppe as Means of Self-Definition in Posidippus' Hippika*, in: B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou, M. Baumbach (eds.), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves. Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus*, Cambridge, Mass. 2003 (forthcoming). Both articles list previous bibliography.

¹ FD III 4. 2 no. 233 (IG IX I² I 202); Ch. Bennett, *The Children of Ptolemy III and the Date of the Exedra of Thermos*, *ZPE* 138 (2002) 144f. Not all dimensions of the fragments are given by Flacelière in FD: a) l. 0.35, h. 0.259 (inv. 3329); b) l. ca. 0.17 (inv. 4334); c) l. 0.34, h. 0.265 (inv. 5561); d) l. 0.65, h. 0.259 (inv. 924); e) l. 0.35, h. 0.262 (inv. 3367). All fragments, with the exception of b, whose context remains undisclosed, were discovered out of context, far from each other, a fact that excludes even an educated guess as to the original location of the monument.

² IG IX I² I 56 = ISE II 86. The most recent studies of it are: W. Huß, *Die zu Ehren Ptolemaios' III. und seiner Familie errichtete Statuengruppe von Thermos (IG IX I² I 56)*, *CdE* 50 (1975) 312–320; Hintzen-Bohlen, *Die Familiengruppe* (s. n. *), 144–146; J. B. Scholten, *The Politics of Plunder: Aitolians and their Koinon in the Early Hellenistic Era, 279–217 B. C.*, Berkeley 2000, 138 n. 31; Bennett, *The Children of Ptolemy III* (s. n. 1), 141–145.

royal family for their virtue (ἀρετᾶς ἕνεκεν) and benefactions (καὶ εὐεργεσίας) to the Aitolian *Koinon* (ἔθνος) and the other Greeks. Preserved portions of the Delphic text ([ἄ]ρετ[ᾶ]ς [ἕνεκεν]) suggest that it bore a similar inscription honoring the king of Egypt for services rendered to the elusive dedicant and the Aitolians. The *exedra* from Thermos was pi-shaped, the length of its long side has been persuasively restored to 5 meters, and it carried at least eight bronze portraits of Ptolemy III and his family. The exact shape of its Delphic counterpart is unknown at the current state of the evidence, and Flacelière cautiously restored an oblong base to at least 8 to 9 meters in length, carefully avoiding to draw further conclusions on the monument's type. It carried at least three presumably bronze statues, but its dedicatory inscription, as plausibly restored by the same scholar, is good indication that, like the Thermos group, it comprised portraits of the entire royal family³.

This paper will propose a restoration of the Delphic dedicatory inscription that differs to some degree from Flacelière's and more significantly from Bennett's. It will also review the conclusions that Bennett drew from his recent discussion of the base. The text of the inscription is reproduced below with my own restorations. Sublinear dots, omitted in Flacelière's edition, have also been introduced to indicate letters that are not preserved in their entirety.

Block I (Frgs. a+b)

Βασίλισσαν Ἀρ[σινόην βα]σιλέ[ως Πτολεμαίου]
καὶ βασιλίσσης [Βερενί]κης
Λ α μ ί ο [υ] Ο[---]

The association of the non-joining fragments a and b is plausible taking into account considerations such as letter-spacing and the fixed number of missing characters.

l. 3 Flacelière apud FD III 4. 2, 277 Λάμιο[ς] (patronymic and ethnic) or [ὁ δεῖνα] Λαμίο[υ] Ο[---] (ethnic); Bennett, *The Children of Ptolemy III* (s. n. 1), 144 Λάμιο[ς] Ο[---] (patronymic).

Block II (Frg. c)

[Λυσίμαχον ? βασι]λέω[ς Πτ]ολεμ[αίου]
[καὶ βασιλί]σσης [Βερε]νί[κης]
[ἄ] ρ ε τ [ᾶ] ς [ἔ ν ε κ ε ν]

l. 1 Flacelière apud FD III 4. 2, 277 [Πτολεμαῖον ?] (*exempli gratia*); Bennett, *The Children of Ptolemy III* (s. n. 1), 144 [Πτολεμαῖον].

³ FD III 4. 2, 277.

Block III (Frgs. d+e)

Βα[σίλισσαν Βερενίκην βασι]λέως Πτολε[μαίου]
καὶ β[ασιλίσσης Βερενίκης]

[Α] ἰ τ ω λ ῶ ν [Ἄ π ό λ] λ ω ν ι [Π υ θ ί ω ι]

Again, the association of the non-joining fragments d and e is plausible if we take into account considerations such as letter-spacing and the number of missing characters.

Flacelière restored the last line of the dedicatory inscription which spanned several royal portraits *exempli gratia* stressing the fact that no certainty is possible at the current state of the evidence⁴:

Λαμι[.] Ο [---] [ἄ]ρετ[ᾶ]ς [ἔ]νεκεν καὶ εὐεργεσίας τᾶς εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ
Κοινὸν τῶν Α]ἰτωλῶν [Ἄπόλ]λωνι [Πυθίωι]

Although he chose to restore the dedicant of the group monument in the main text as Lamios, it is evident from his commentary that Flacelière avoided drawing definite conclusions on him. He therefore discussed briefly both possibilities: if the dedicant's name was Lamios, his patronymic, starting with an O, followed, possibly his ethnic as well. However, the fragmentary state of the inscription did not exclude the possibility that Lamios may have been the dedicant's father, in which case his ethnic followed beginning with an O⁵. This second proposition was a real possibility given the fact that the part of the stone immediately preceding the surviving portion of the text is sadly broken, and a *sigma* could have been carved there. A glance through the index of IG IX 12, as well as through Grainger and Funke's recent studies on the history of Aitolia listing in passing names and localities in that region beginning with an O, shows how hopeless any restoration of the inscription is based only on these three fragmentary blocks⁶. Nor are ancient literary sources more helpful in this case.

In a valuable recent study Bennett drew conclusions on Ptolemaic and Aitolian chronology based largely on information provided by the „twin“ dynastic group monuments of Thermos and Delphi⁷. In particular, he suggested among other things a sequence of birth dates for the six attested children of Ptolemy III and Berenice II which in the opinion of this author, though not impossible, cannot be proved by the evidence. Additionally, a number of suggestions that Flacelière put forward in his *exempli gratia* reconstruction of the monument are taken by Bennett as certainties and

⁴ His exact phrase is: „On ne peut restituer avec certitude la dédicace, mais l'on doit penser à une rédaction de ce genre.“ (The restored text follows.)

⁵ Flacelière, FD III 4. 2, 277.

⁶ Cf. P. Funke, *Polisgenese und Urbanisierung in Aitolien im 5. und 4. Jh. v. Chr.*, in: *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community*. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 4, hrsg. v. M. H. Hansen, Copenhagen 1997, 144–188, esp. 156f.; J. D. Grainger, *The League of the Aitolians*, Leiden 1999. Flacelière's exercise in speculation offers one possibility: [ὁ δεινα] Λαμίου Ο[ικυλειεύς?]. Other possible ethnics include Ὀρειύς, Οἰνιάδας, and Ὀπούντιος.

⁷ Bennett, *The Children of Ptolemy III* (s. n. 1), 144f.

then used as premises based on which conclusions are drawn. A review of Bennett's reconstruction of the Delphic *Familiengruppe* and of its implications for Ptolemaic chronology is in order:

As has been established by scholars studying the Thermos monument, the narrative context of its portraits stresses continuity in dynastic succession. Meant to be read from left to right, it opens with the ruling monarch, Ptolemy III Euergetes who stood on the left wing of the pi-shaped base. The long side of the base supported a statue of his heir apparent, the later Ptolemy IV Philopator, and of the queen consort Berenice II. The rest of the royal children came after their mother, presumably grouped according to sex starting with the girls, both of whom bore the title of *basilissa*⁸: Arsinoe III and Berenice, identified with the princess who died at a very young age and was immediately deified with a lot of fanfare, details of which are preserved in the Kanopos decree (238 BC)⁹. Three boys come after the two princesses: a son whose name does not survive, but which may have been Lysimachos, according to Reinach and Bennett's very convincing suggestion¹⁰; Alexander, and Magas. One more statue was set up on the right wing of the monument, a position that Weinreich plausibly considered as prominent enough to have belonged to a counterpart of Ptolemy III who shared equal status. Apollo or Ptolemy I are good candidates, but our evidence does not allow any conclusions¹¹.

The arrangement of the royal portraits on the Delphic base appears to differ from that of Thermos, and Bennett has suggested that it summarizes the biographic data of the honorees reflecting the order of their birth, rather than any other consideration such as status or sex. He therefore draws the following conclusions:

— The surviving blocks from Delphi supported statues of Arsinoe III (Block I), the heir apparent, the later Ptolemy IV (Block II), and the prematurely deceased princess Berenice (Block III) who was alive at the time when the monument was set up. Arsinoe III's inscription was the leftmost of the monument, Berenice's the rightmost.

— Ptolemy IV's portrait came immediately after Arsinoe III who was his eldest sister and later became his wife. Between him and Berenice stood the three younger brothers: [Lysimachos?], Alexander, and Magas.

— The Delphic base was also an *exedra*, much similar to the one from Thermos, pi-shaped as well. From this follows that the parents' portraits stood on the wings,

⁸ On the title of *basilissa* signifying unmarried female (*παρθένος*) members of the Ptolemaic royal family, besides the queen consort, see D. J. Thompson, *Posidippus, Poet of the Ptolemies*, in: K. Gutzwiller (ed.), *The New Posidippus. A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, Oxford 2004 (forthcoming). We know of the following unmarried princesses that were declared *basilissai*: Philotera, the sister of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II (OGIS 35), Berenice, sister of Ptolemy III and wife of Antiochos II of Syria (Poseidippos AB 78–80, and AB 82), Arsinoe III (IG IX I² I 56; FD III 4. 2 233), and princess Berenice, the prematurely deceased daughter of Ptolemy III and Berenice II (IG IX I² I 56; FD III 4. 2, 233; OGIS 56).

⁹ OGIS 56.

¹⁰ A. J. Reinach, *Bulletin épigraphique: Grèce du Nord (Etolie)*, REG 20 (1907) 46–48; Bennett, *The Children of Ptolemy III* (s. n. 1), 144. Bennett reviews earlier suggestions in his article.

¹¹ Weinreich apud IG IX II I² I p. 40.

while statues of the six children were set up along the adjoining base section at intervals of ca. 1.5 m.

— The statues of the royal children were arranged according to their order of birth (assuming that Berenice II never gave birth to twins): Arsinoe III (November 246–June 245), Ptolemy IV (May/June 244), [Lysimachos?] (July/August 243), Alexander (September/October 242), Magas (November/ December 241), and Berenice (January/February 239).

— Although there is no information to date of Ptolemaic and Aitolian involvement before the 220's BC, we may assume that relations were especially cordial around 238, Bennett's proposed date for the setting up of both the Thermos and the Delphic dynastic group monuments.

Bennett's conclusions with regard to the Delphic base are shaky because they depend on a number of hypothetical premises, and his proposed revised Ptolemaic chronology remains unproved as a result. The three surviving blocks are so fragmentary that one can only determine their relative position in the monument. Based on the text, we may safely say that Arsinoe III came before her unidentified brother whose portrait may well have stood next to hers. Berenice's block seems to be bearing the last part of the long inscription which mentions the dedicant. However, the existing epigraphical and archaeological evidence cannot establish the limits of the monument; also, the long inscription may or may not have been carved in the middle of the long base. Whether this base was, like its Thermos counterpart, long or pi-shaped is also unknown, but enough of the three blocks survives to allow us to assume safely that it was not u-shaped. One may also wonder whether the Delphic base bore portraits of other Ptolemies, or their protector deities, as has been plausibly suggested for the Thermos monument.

Bennett's arrangement of portraits of Ptolemaic children on the Delphic base depends on Flacelière's two assumptions which are here taken as certainties: a) that the long base bearing portraits of Arsinoe III, Ptolemy IV, Lysimachos, Alexander, Magas, and Berenice was 8–9 m. long, and that b) we know the exact length and contents of the dedicant's inscription. To begin with, Flacelière did not restore the entire length of the base because it is impossible to do so based on three fragmentary blocks. What he plausibly suggested is that the base was „at least 8 to 9 m. long“ (my translation, my emphasis). His commentary is unfortunately vague, and he did not cite his arguments for this restoration, but the numerous exact measurements of the spacing between the letters indicated on his *apographa* allow for some interesting calculations. 74+ letters may have comprised the long inscription, and these are set at an average of about 0.105 to 0.11 m. from each other. We can be more or less certain that one or two more words were there that we cannot restore: if Lamios was the name of the dedicant, it should be followed by his patronym, very likely also by his ethnic. If the surviving name is a patronym, then the name of the dedicant and his ethnic on either side are missing. Whatever the case, the long inscription may have comprised between 80 and 90 letters and have therefore been about 9 m. long, while the length of the entire base was at least 10 m.

Further calculations have been proposed in the quest for the reconstruction of the portraits flanked by Arsinoe and Berenice. Bennett, seeking an average, places the statues of the six Ptolemaic children at about 1.5 m. from each other, stating that the inscriptions honoring the unidentified prince and Berenice were approximately 6 m. apart¹². However, the latter calculation can be correct only if Flacelière's *exempli gratia* restoration is accurate. There is not much evidence that may lead us to establish with some degree of certainty the intervals in which the Ptolemaic princes were placed on the base because the number of portraits that the base supported remains unknown. Additionally, if Lamios was the dedicant's patronymic, and the inscription was not carved directly under the text identifying the now-missing leftmost portrait, but rather off to the right, as is the case at Thermos, we may assume that at least one more portrait was placed to the left of Arsinoe.

The exact type of the base also remains unknown. Bennett's restoration of it as pi-shaped is pure speculation based on presumed similarities with the Thermos monument. There is no reason to suppose that dynastic monuments followed a specific type: as a matter of fact the contemporary Antigonid and Attalid *progonoï* monuments on Delos suggest otherwise¹³. At any rate, even if the Delphic base was also an *exedra* similar to the one from Thermos, we cannot conclude with Bennett that the royal parents' portraits stood on the wings, the long base carrying the portraits of the six children¹⁴. Last, but not least, in the Thermos monument the wings are occupied by the ruling monarch and his unidentified counterpart, while the queen stands among her children on the long base.

While the evidence admittedly does not solve the problem of the exact reconstruction of the Delphic monument under discussion, tradition associated with this type of dynastic commemoration is probably a good indicator for the arrangement of the royal portraits on the monument. Dynastic group monuments, featuring the reigning monarch and members of his immediate family, sometimes alongside his illustrious predecessors, were set up in major sanctuaries and cities. Their purpose was to provide a visual expression of the history, power, and continuity of a dynasty, mainly focusing on the ruling monarch and his heir apparent. This form of representation, an extension of the usual gift of statue to an influential patron, was not new. It had already developed among Greek aristocracy in the mid-sixth century BC,

¹² Bennett, *The Children of Ptolemy III* (s. n. 1), 144f.

¹³ F. Courby, *Le portique d'Antigone ou du nord-est et les constructions voisines*, Delos V (1912) 74–83; J. Ducat, *Guide de Délos*, Athens 1983, 143f.; R. R. R. Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, Oxford 1988, 22–26; Hintzen-Bohlen, *Die Familiengruppe* (s. n. *), 138–141; B. Hintzen-Bohlen, *Herrscher-Repräsentation im Hellenismus*, Bonn 1992, 87–89, 227, n. 15. On the antecedents of the Ptolemaic *Familiengruppen* of Thermos and Delphi and their connection to monuments like the Daochos and Geneleos groups see Kosmetatou, *Constructing Legitimacy* (s. n. *).

¹⁴ Bennett, *The Children of Ptolemy III* (s. n. 1), 145.

had declined with the rise of democracy in the Classical period, and had been revived in late 4th century BC by rulers such as Mausolos and Philip II of Macedonia¹⁵.

In this context, singling out the heir to the throne in all these, and later monuments, aimed at establishing and securing his position within the kingdom and outside its borders. This was a necessary policy, especially within troubled families like the Ptolemies and during turbulent periods: Ptolemy I had already dealt with serious problems arising from his usurpation of parts of Alexander's empire and his subsequent favoring of his children by Berenice I for succession. As a result, all *Familiengruppen* that he set up focused on dynastic continuity as expressed by the proximity of the heir to his predecessor: he declared himself an illegitimate son of Philip II and sponsored sculptural groups featuring himself alongside his „half brother“ and predecessor Alexander the Great¹⁶. Similarly, Ptolemy II's group monuments mainly focused on associating himself and his sister-wife Arsinoe II with their parents to the exclusion of any other member of the family, including their apparently beloved sister Philotera¹⁷. Court poetry created virtual „dynastic group monuments“ which stressed the links of living members of the royal family with their glorious ancestors and supported the same line of propaganda¹⁸. Later, Ptolemy VIII's confusing family situation led him to sponsor dynastic group monuments featuring himself, his primary wife and sister Cleopatra II, and their son, the ill-fated Ptolemy Memphites, since favoring his children by his other wife and niece Cleopatra III increased his unpopularity¹⁹. Political and personal circumstances also led Eumenes II of Pergamon to promote the succession of his brother Attalos II, rather than his under-age son, the later Attalos III, and dynastic monuments focused on joint portraits of the two. Later, Attalos II himself actively promoted the succession of that same son of Eumenes II to the exclusion of any other blood relatives, including his own children. Again, contemporary Attalid *Familiengruppen* depicted the old king and his designated

¹⁵ For an overview of the evidence see Hintzen-Bohlen, *Die Familiengruppe* (s. n. *), 109–154; C. B. Rose, *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period*, Cambridge 1998, especially 3–10; Kosmetatou, *Constructing Legitimacy* (s. n. *).

¹⁶ See Satyrus in FGrH 631 F 1; P.Oxy. 2465; Curtius IX 8. 22; Pausanias I 6. 2. Cf. also OGIS 54, l. 5. For modern discussion on the subject see: A. B. Bosworth, *Arrian and the Alexander Vulgate*, in: E. Badian (ed.), *Alexandre le Grand: Image et réalité*, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens 22 (1976) 1–46; R. M. Errington, *Alexander and the Hellenistic World*, *ibid.* 137–179, esp. 154 ff.; A. F. Stewart, *Faces of Power. Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Polis*, Berkeley 1993, 229; Kosmetatou, *Constructing Legitimacy* (s. n. *).

¹⁷ Especially during the Alexandrian Ptolemaia. Cf. E. E. Rice, *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, Oxford 1983; D. J. Thompson, *Philadelphus' Procession. Dynastic Power in a Mediterranean Context*, in: L. Mooren (ed.), *Politics, Administration, and Society in the Hellenistic and Roman World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Bertinoro, 19–24 July 1997*, Leuven 2000 (*Studia Hellenistica* 36) 365–388. There are two types of Ptolemaic dynastic group monuments: those which, like their Egyptian predecessors, focus on portraying the king and his queen-consort, and those which include the heir, sometimes his siblings as well. For Ptolemaic portraits see P. E. Stanwick, *Egyptian Royal Sculptures of the Ptolemaic Period*, Diss. NYU (Ann Arbor) 1999.

¹⁸ Cf. Poseidippos AB 78 and 88; Theokritos XVII 13–26.

¹⁹ Stanwick, *Egyptian Royal Sculptures* (s. n. 17), 66.

successor together in an attempt to establish the latter's legitimacy and discourage potential usurpers who may have been lurking for a chance at the Pergamene throne²⁰.

Pre-occupation with the establishment of succession may account for the fact that while the Ptolemies awarded the title of *basilissa* to unmarried female members of the royal family, the same courtesy was not extended to princes during their father's lifetime, unless one of them became a co-ruler. None of the Ptolemaic princes portrayed at Thermos and Delphi bears any royal title, and the only indication of Ptolemy IV's status as heir to the throne is his proximity to his father in isolation from his siblings. Tradition would therefore dictate that, in Delphi, just like in Thermos, this under-aged prince would be portrayed next to his father regardless of his seniority. His statue may have been followed by his mother's and then his siblings'. Block II that was placed next to Arsinoe III's Block I, would support the statue of the elusive prince that Reinach and Bennett plausibly identified as Lysimachos, and Flacelière restored as Ptolemy *exempli gratia* without any corroborating evidence. He was followed by statues of Alexander and Magas, each portrait placed at about 2 m. from each other. Berenice's portrait was then placed last, the only point of divergence from Thermos, and that position may not reflect the order of birth, but rather indicate that the honoree was already deceased and deified, especially if the Delphic monument also featured deified illustrious ancestors of Ptolemy III at its end who functioned as visual representation of the dynastic ἀρετή commended by the inscription²¹.

The date for the dedication of the Thermos and Delphic monuments at Delphi has yet to be established. Bennett has made an attractive case for the dating of both groups to ca. 238 BC, but evidence on Ptolemaic involvement in Aitolian affairs at so early a date has yet to surface²². What the evidence allows us to surmise in the case of the Delphic *Familiengruppe* is that a grateful Aitolian, whose name may have been Lamios, probably set it up upon receipt of a lavish gift from Ptolemy III in support of the Aitolian League. A similar incident occurred around 250 BC, when Aratos, leader of the Achaian League, received 150 talents from the same king for his war effort

²⁰ H. Swoboda, J. Keil, F. Knoll, *Denkmäler aus Lykaonien, Pamphylien und Isaurien*, Prag, Leipzig, Wien 1935, 34f. no. 75; E. Kosmetatou, *Pisidia and the Hellenistic Kings from 323 to 133 BC*, *Ancient Society* 28 (1997) 26. On possible conflicts surrounding Pergamene succession in the 140's BC see J. Hopp, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der letzten Attaliden*, München 1977, 107–120; C. Mileta, *Eumenes III. und die Sklaven. Neue Überlegungen zum Charakter des Aristonikosaufstandes*, *Klio* 80 (1998) 47–65.

²¹ Indeed there is no information as to the date of birth of Berenice. All we can deduce from the Kanopos decree is that she died at a young age, which does not exclude that she was older than [Lysimachos?], a fact that may be reflected on the Thermos monument. If this were the case she could have died at the age of about five. Again, it is not possible to draw safe conclusions as to the birth order and dates for the children of Ptolemy III as suggested by Bennett because we lack important data. The royal couple may also have had twins.

²² Cf. A. Jacquemin, *Aitolia et Aristaineta: Offrandes monumentales étoliennes à Delphes au III s. av. J.-C.*, *Ktéma* 10 (1985) 31f.; Scholten, *The Politics of Plunder* (s. n. 2), 103. Walbank and Habicht support a date in the 220's during the conflict against Antigonos III Doson. Cf. N. G. L. Hammond and F. W. Walbank, *A history of Macedonia. III: 336–167 B.C.*, Oxford 1988, 325 n. 2; 340 n. 1–2; C. Habicht, *Athen in hellenistischer Zeit: gesammelte Aufsätze*, München 1994, 180.

against mutual enemies²³. The monument stood on a base which may have been oblong, and which, like its counterpart at Thermos, probably carried at least eight, possibly more royal portraits featuring the regnant king and his family, living and deceased, alongside some deified predecessor.

Departement Klassieke Studies
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Erasmushuis
Blijde Inkomststraat 21
B-3000 Leuven

Elizabeth Kosmetatou

²³ Plutarch, *Aratos*, XIII 6. On the activities of Aratos and the Achaian League and the involvement of Ptolemy in the affairs of Greece at the time see K. Haegemans and E. Kosmetatou, *Aratus and the Achaean Background of Polybius*, in: G. Schepens, J. Bollansée (eds.), *The Shadow of Polybius. Intertextuality as a Tool in Ancient Historiography*, Leuven 2003 (forthcoming).

