



---

Ptolemies in a List of Deified Seleucids from Teos, OGIS 246

Author(s): Francis Piejko

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 49 (1982), pp. 129-131

Published by: [Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn \(Germany\)](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20183701>

Accessed: 29/11/2012 03:44

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn (Germany)* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## PTOLEMIES IN A LIST OF DEIFIED SELEUCIDS FROM TEOS, OGIS 246

We are concerned here with an inscription on a small marble basis copied by G.Hirschfeld in Teos and published in Arch. Zeitung 33 (1876), p.26 n.22, of an undetermined monument whose present fate is unknown. The text in question may be consulted in Dittenberger's edition cited in the title above, and it consists mainly of names of deified rulers of the Seleucid dynasty in the genitive case in the fashion of many "cult calendars", as they are called. Except for the fact that Antiochus the Great appears twice (at the head of the list after Seleucus I and in his own place) all other names are scheduled in their proper chronological sequence of deification.<sup>1)</sup> The lines discussed are 11-15.

Dittenberger's text	My proposal:
11 Δημητρίου θεοῦ Σωτήρος	Δημητρίου θεοῦ Σωτήρος vacat
12 ----- θεοῦ Φιλί[ππου]	Δημητρίου θεοῦ Φιλα[δέλφου]
13 ----- αλλη -----	[Νικᾶτορος·] ἄλλη[ν συντελες-]
14 ----- θεοῦ Πτο[λεμαίου]	Θῆβαι ἦπ[ε]ρ θεοῦ Πτο[λεμαίου]
15 [----- θε]οῦ [Πτολε] (μ)αίου κ(α)[ὶ ---	[τοῦ ἐγ θε]οῦ [Πτολε]μαίου κα[ὶ] [Κλεοπάτρας ---

For line 12 Hirschfeld's copy shows: ΟΥ<sup>Α</sup>ΙΤΗΟΙ ΟΤΘΕΟΥΦΙΑΙ<sup>Α</sup>, which I think reflects the original: ΔΗΜ ΗΤΡΙ ΟΥΘΕΟΥΦΙΑΑ.

In the whole series only the second letter is seriously misrepresented.<sup>2)</sup> Demetrius of line 11 is of course Demetrius I Soter, 162-150 B.C.

In line 12-13 we recognize Demetrius II Nicator, who ruled in two periods divided by his Parthian captivity, 145-140 and 129-125, and was occasionally styled on his coins ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΟΥ ΝΙΚΑΤΟΡΟΣ with some variations.<sup>3)</sup> The brother to whom he thus publically proclaims his good feelings was probably his elder Antigonos, murdered by adherents of Balas. The evocation of his memory was to serve as a rallying motto for the revenge party.<sup>4)</sup> Sub-

1) Cf. however P.Herrmann's suggestion, Anadolu 9 (1965), p.150 n.240 that Seleucus of 1.4 is not the son of Antiochus I, but Seleucus III transposed out of his place. Actually S. III and certain other names are missing from the list, and S. who had met his death in a campaign against Attalus, the master of Teos at that time, could not be included for obvious reasons.

2) In a coin of Antiochus I reproduced by Th.Fischer, "Eine seleukidische Münze für die Sammlung der Ruhr-Universität", Jahrb. der R.-U. Bochum, 1981, p.4, the signum ΔΙ appears to all practical visual effects as ΟΙ.

3) See Bouché-Leclercq, Histoire des Séleucides, (Paris 1914), 658. E.Bikerman, Institutions des Séleucides, (Paris 1938), 22. B.Head, Historia numorum<sup>2</sup> (1911), 768. Cf. N.Davis and C.M.Kraay, The Hellenistic Kingdoms: Portrait Coins and History, (London 1973), no.93,97: ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΟΥ ΝΙΚΑΤΟΡΟΣ. The ypsilon in the king's name is virtually indistinguishable from tau.

4) So E.R.Bevan, The House of Seleucus II (London 1902), p.301-302 (Appendix P).

sequently the predicate may have included the younger brother Antiochus Sidetes in recognition of his secondary rights to succession. Both titles Philadelphos and Nikator appear from the commencement of his reign on certain coins of Demetrius II.<sup>5)</sup>

For the beginning of line 14 Hirschfeld's copy shows ΟΕΙ ΑΕΤΕ Ι,  
which I interpret: ΘΗΝ ΑΙΥΠΕΡ.

Although the letters in this group are consistently distorted and partly effaced they still follow the reconstructed original reading closely enough. Since sufficient space must be reserved in l. 13 for the necessary restoration Νικάτορος it seems that the immediately following phrase was elliptic from the beginning, instead of e.g. καὶ θυσίαν] ἄλλη[ν συντελεσ]θῆναι. The constructions with the "itemizing" ἄλλος, ἄλλως, where thus qualified ideas may be implied but not necessarily expressed, are perfectly normal in Greek.

In line 15 Hirschfeld had copied ]ΟΥ [-----] ΝΑΙΟΥΚΑ. Dittenberger referred this to another unidentified Ptolemy, the conclusion which in fact is unavoidable. I add to his restoration the short formula τοῦ ἐγ and recognize in l. 14 Ptolemy VI Philometor and in l. 15f. the mention of his parentage as a normal part of his own identification.<sup>6)</sup> Philometor is the only Ptolemy of whom we know for sure that he was crowned as a king of the Seleucid Empire.<sup>7)</sup> Although that ephemeral act proved of little consequence in further history of the two empires the Egyptian king was indeed symbolically invested by the agency of certain influential figures in Antioch and recognized by detachments of the army and groups of populace as "the king of Asia". The fear of Rome induced him to confine his role to that of the protector and senior partner of his young son-in-law. The direct testimonies about this event are brief and few. I Mac. 11.13: καὶ εἰςῆλθεν Πτολεμαῖος εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ περιέθετο διαδῆμα περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ, τὸ τῆς Αἰγύπτου καὶ Ἀσίας. Diod. 32.9c (Fischer): (Ἀντιοχεῖς) τὸν Πτολεμαῖον εἰς τὴν πόλιν δεξάμενοι διαδῆμα περιέθησαν καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν ἐνεχείρισαν. Josephus, A.J. 13.113: ἐλθὼν δὲ πρὸς Ἀντιοχεῖς Πτολεμαῖος βασιλεὺς ὅπ' αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν στρατευμάτων ἀναδείκνυται καὶ ἀναγκασθεὶς δύο περιτίθεται διαδήματα, ἓν μὲν τὸ τῆς Ἀσίας, ἕτερον τὸ τῆς Αἰγύπτου.

It must have been for this reason that Ptolemy was admitted (145 B.C.) to the official dynastic cult of the Seleucid rulers. Nothing certain is known

5) Bickerman, *Institutions*, p.221. Appian's assertion (Syr. 76) that the title Nikator is a commemoration of the victory over Balas must (as all his information on cult epithets) be taken cum grano salis. Demetrius probably assumed his epithets right from the outset as a good omen for his enterprise.

6) Cf. e.g. OGI 123: Βασιλέα Πτολεμαῖον Θ[εὸν Φιλο]μήτορα, τὸν ἐγ βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖου καὶ βασιλῆ[ς] Κλεοπάτρας θεῶν Ἐπιφανῶν. Similar style *ibid.*, no.106.

7) The fullest and best discussion is W.Otto, *Zur Gesch. der Zeit des 6. Ptolemäers* (München 1934. Abh. Bayer.Akad. der Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Abt., N.F., 11), 124-131. Cf. E.Will, *Hist. politique du monde hellénistique II* (Paris 1967), 319 and H.Bengtson, *Griech.Gesch.*<sup>5</sup> (1977), 419.

about the character of the monument in Teos, but it is obvious that the list names beneficiaries of a royal cult and was probably initiated under the Seleucid regime. We know today that even public cults of the Seleucids continued in some places quite for a time after Apamea.<sup>8)</sup> If the list continued we may surmise that it would revert to the Seleucids.

Our conclusion on this disconcerting presence of Ptolemies among Seleucids obtains a further support from another mutilated inscription from Paphos in Cyprus, edited by T.B.Mitford,<sup>9)</sup> which reads:

[Βασιλέα Πτ]ολεμαῖον θεδ[ν Φιλομήτορα]  
 [βασιλεῦς] Δημήτριος θεδς [Νικάτωρ καὶ]  
 [Φιλάδελ]φος τὸν πατέρα τῆς γυναικὸς  
 [εὐνοίας] ἔνεκα τῆς εἰς ἐ[αυτόν.]

Utica, N.Y.

Francis Piejko

---

8) Erythrae maintained in the second century very elaborate cults of the Seleucids. Cf. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie mineure* (Paris 1955), no.26; I.K.II, no.207.

9) The text is reprinted in SEG XIII, 585, but I add καὶ in line 2. Possibly it continued in l. 4-5 to include καὶ τὰ | πράγματα.]