Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

_____ _____

Katherine Cupello Date

Reconstructing Marcus Antonius:
Rethinking the Representation of a Roman Triumvir in the Hellenistic East

By

Katherine E. Cupello
Doctor of Philosophy

Art History

_____

Dr. Eric R. Varner
Advisor

_____

Dr. Gay Robins
Committee Member

_____

Dr. Bonna D. Wescoat
Committee Member

Accepted:

_____

Lisa A. Tedesco, Ph.D.
Dean of the James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies

_____

Date

Reconstructing Marcus Antonius:
Rethinking the Representation of a Roman Triumvir in the Hellenistic East

By

Katherine E. Cupello
M.A., University of Calgary, 2009

Advisor: Dr. Eric R. Varner

An abstract of
A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Art History
2018

Abstract

Reconstructing Marcus Antonius:
Rethinking the Representation of a Roman Triumvir in the Hellenistic East
By Katherine E. Cupello

The identification of Marcus Antonius with the Hellenic god Dionysos has long been defined in terms of alienation from Rome and Roman cultural ideals, a perception born from an ancient literary record shaped by the victory narrative of the Augustan age. During the triumviral period, Antonius's enemies distorted his associations with Dionysos to impugn his character, and remnants of these invective attacks are evident in the largely non-contemporaneous literary reports that Antonius publicly declared himself *neos* (new, young) Dionysos and imitated the god in his mode of life. Frequently cited in support of these literary reports are two inscriptions attesting to divine honors for Antonius in Athens, *IG* II^2 1043 and *Agora* XVIII H273 (= Agora Inv. I 3071), and the issues of *cistophori* (*RPC* 2201-2202) from Asia bearing the portrait of Antonius crowned with the ivy wreath of Dionysos. A lack of effort to analyze these objects outside the literary narrative has led to a limited view of the relationship between Antonius and Dionysos, a view that has not adequately accounted for the role of the honorific traditions connected with Hellenistic ruler cults. This study evaluates the Athenian inscriptions and the *cistophori* as independent documents generated within an environment where cities and groups routinely offered *isotheoi timai* (divine honors) to worthy benefactors like Antonius in the kind of euergetic exchange familiar from the Hellenistic rulership model. Consideration of the evidence from this perspective suggests that Antonius became associated with Dionysos as part of honors bestowed upon him on account of the victories of his armies over the Parthians in 39-38 B.C.E., the protocols surrounding the ritualized reception of important persons in cities, and possible benefactions afforded to at least one association of *technitai* (artists) of Dionysos. These connections between the development of Antonius's identification with Dionysos and the bases for honorific treatment through ruler cult are informed by, but not directly expressed in, the literary sources. Expanding the conversation in this way demonstrates that a more nuanced and multi-dimensional assessment of Antonius and his career in the Hellenistic East is achievable on a much larger scholarly scale.

Reconstructing Marcus Antonius:
Rethinking the Representation of a Roman Triumvir in the Hellenistic East

By

Katherine E. Cupello
M.A., University of Calgary, 2009

Advisor: Dr. Eric R Varner

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Art History
2018

Contents

Illustrations

Figures
beginning page 158

13. Silver denarius of M. Barbatius Pollio depicting Marcus Antonius (*RRC* 517/2), 41 B.C.E., moving mint, 3.98 g, 18 mm, Münzkabinett der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, 18215792, coin reproduced 2:1 (courtesy Münzkabinett - Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 DE: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/de/deed.en).

14. Silver tetradrachm of Attalos (I) Sōtēr depicting Philetairos, 241-197 B.C.E., Pergamon, 17.03 g, 32 mm, Münzkabinett der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, 18203102, coin reproduced 1:1 (courtesy Münzkabinett - Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 DE: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/de/deed.en).

15. Silver cistophorus of Marcus Antonius (*RPC* 2201), ca. 39/8 B.C.E., Ephesos (uncertain), 12.24 g, British Museum, G.2204, coin reproduced 2:1 (courtesy Trustees of the British Museum, CC BY-NC-SA 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0).

16. Gold octodrachm of Ptolemy (II) Philadelphos, 285-246 B.C.E., Alexandria, 27.79 g, 28 mm, British Museum, 1964,1303.3, coin reproduced 1:1 (courtesy Trustees of the British Museum, CC BY-NC-SA 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0).

17. Silver tetradrachm of Kleopatra (VII) depicting Marcus Antonius on the reverse, ca. 36 B.C.E., Antioch-on-the-Orontes (uncertain), 14.72 g, 28 mm, Münzkabinett der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, 18204040, coin reproduced 1.5:1 (courtesy Münzkabinett - Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 DE: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/de/deed.en).

Tables

Abbreviations

Agora XVIII	D. J. Geagan, *The Athenian Agora. Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Volume XVIII. Inscriptions: The Dedicatory Monuments* (Princeton 2011)
BMCRR	H. A. Grueber, *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum* (London 1910)
CH	*Coin Hoards* I-X (New York 1975-2010)
FD	*Fouilles de Delphes*
ID	*Inscriptions de Délos*
IG II	U. Koehler, *Inscriptiones Atticae aetatis quae est inter Euclidis annum et Augusti tempora* (Berlin 1877-1895)
IG II^2	J. Kirchner, *Inscriptiones graecae II et III. Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno posteriors*, 2nd ed. (Berlin 1913-1940)
IGCH	M. Thompson, O. Mørkholm, C. M. Kraay, *An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards* (New York 1973)
IGRR	R. Cagnat, *Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes* (Chicago 1901-1927)
OGIS	W. Dittenberger, *Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae* (Leipzig 1903-1905)
RPC	A. Burnett, M. Amandry, P. P. Ripollès, *Roman Provincial Coinage. Part I: From the death of Caesar to the death of Vitellius (44 BC – AD 69)* (London 1992)
RRC	M. H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* (New York 1974)
RRCH	M. H. Crawford, *Coin Hoards of the Roman Republic* (RNS Special Publication 4, London 1970)
SEG	*Supplementum epigraphicum graecum* (Leiden 1923-)
SIG^3	W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*, 3rd ed. (Leipzig 1915-1924)

Chapter 1

Introduction

Behind the haze of a legendary liaison with a foreign queen and an unflattering reputation as a *bon vivant* impersonating the convivial god Dionysos lies the career of a man charged with the herculean task of solidifying Rome's hold over the Hellenistic East, a geo-politically complex region stretching east and south from Roman Macedonia to the borders of the Parthian Empire. When Marcus Antonius took charge of the East following the triumviral settlement at Philippi late in 42 B.C.E.,[1] he entered a world in which the apex of the power structure now occupied by the Roman state had belonged to the royal dynasties who inherited the conquests, kingship, and legacy of Alexander III of Macedon (356-323 B.C.E.).[2] Although, from the late second century onward, Rome gradually dismantled the dynasties and their kingdoms, aspects of the Hellenistic rulership model remained intact and formed the basis of how *poleis* (cities or city-states) and other communities and sub-groups interacted with representatives of

[1] Rome was at the time officially ruled by a triumvirate, commonly designated as the Second Triumvirate, consisting of Marcus Antonius, Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus, and Marcus Aemilius Lepidus. A triumvirate refers to a sort of coalition government whereby three men agree to share power and rule collaboratively. What we refer to as the "First Triumvirate" in modern terminology is the private, unofficial arrangement between Gaius Julius Caesar, Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus, and Marcus Licinius Crassus formed in 60 B.C.E. This coalition was not described as a triumvirate in antiquity. The "Second Triumvirate" was a legal magistracy brought into effect for an initial term of five years by the tribunician *lex Titia* of 43 B.C.E. as the *triumviri* [or *tresviri*] *reipublicae constituendae* (committee of three for the establishment of the state). The use of first and second in reference to these two alliances is entirely modern.

[2] The vast empire that had once belonged to Alexander was initially divided into the kingdoms of the Antigonids (Macedonia, mainland Greece), Ptolemies (Egypt, Cyprus, parts of North Africa), and Seleukids (Asia Minor, ancient Near East). The inability of the Seleukids to maintain control over the large span of territory under their control led to the rise of the Attalids in western Asia Minor and several other non-Macedonian dynasties in areas like Pontos and Baktria.

Roman hegemony. A defining characteristic of relations between the Hellenistic *poleis*[3] and the rulers to whom they were subject was the practice of ruler cult, an honorific system founded upon the long-standing civic institution of euergetism that utilized the reciprocal exchange of *isotheoi timai*/divine honors, defined as "honours [*sic*] equivalent to those paid to the gods"[4] or "godlike honors attributed to mortals whose power may assimilate them to gods, but who still remain mortals,"[5] for the extraordinary level of goodwill and protection that Hellenistic rulers could provide. This system functioned as a means of communication between subject populations and the royal court. Once Roman magistrates stepped into the benefactor role previously ascribed to kings and queens, cities transferred the ruler cult tradition to these men invested with the authority of the Roman state.

The deification of living mortals was not part of Roman cultural norms in the first century B.C.E. and was among the corrupting influences that, according to members of the senatorial class who, at least publicly, opposed the growing popularity of Hellenic culture and learning among their countrymen, threatened the Republican *mores maiorum* (ancestral customs and morals).[6] In the fierce competition between those who possessed political power in Rome, to have received divine honors and to be known for philhellenic tendencies were prime ammunition for the publicly waged campaigns of vituperation among rivals. These are the conditions under which Antonius became closely identified with the Hellenic deity Dionysos, a notorious artefact of his twelve-year supremacy over

[3] Reference to the "Hellenistic *poleis*" or "the Greek *poleis*" or "the Greek cities" of this period means a city belonging to one of three categories: (i) the "old" Greek cities (e.g., Athens, Ephesos, Miletos); (ii) communities that, having adopted the Greek language and a Greek political structure, came to consider itself a *polis* and was acknowledged as such by other *poleis* (e.g., Sardeis in Lydia); and (iii) the cities founded or refounded by the kings (e.g., Alexandria, Antiocheia on the Orontes, Ptolemaïs-Ake); see Ma (2002) 2005, 3-4. "The *polis* was a corporate body of citizens, organized in a decision-making community, structured by norms and essentially democratic institutions whose authority regulated the common life; by nature, the polis was a state. It was many other things: a monumental urban centre and a territory; a descent group with its myths; a system of participatory rituals; a sense of place and of past, and hence an identity; a locus of human interaction, and hence a society" (Ma [2002] 2005, 150-51).

[4] Price 1984a, 88.

[5] Chaniotis 2011, 181.

[6] A comprehensive summation of the issue may be found in Edwards 1993, 1–32.

the Hellenistic East (42-30 B.C.E.) thanks to ancient literary representations unfavorably disposed towards Antonius. Whereas this divine parallel was surely a function of Hellenistic ruler cult practices, Antonius's enemies were able to distort the relationship so as to impugn his character using the god's more unbecoming facets, primarily the kind of self-indulgence, licentiousness, and effeminacy that the Romans associated with Hellenism and other foreign cultures.[7] This censorious sentiment, still perpetuated today in scholarly circles and popular culture, has saturated the image of Antonius taking on his divine persona as known from literary reports that he imitated Dionysos in lifestyle and dress and publicly declared himself *neos* (new, young) Dionysos.[8] Given the predilection within classical studies to privilege works of literature, material evidence such as inscriptions and coins that have the potential to inform our understanding of the relationship of Antonius to Dionysos, and indeed of Antonius and Rome to the Hellenistic world, beyond the skewed perspective of the literary record have gone underexploited.

When it comes to the deification of Antonius in the East generally and his identification with Dionysos specifically, there is a small but significant corpus of evidence from the archaeological record frequently encountered by those well acquainted with the triumviral period. This corpus consists of two inscriptions and a series of coins briefly described as follows: *IG* II^2 1043, an inscribed civic decree from Athens that refers to an eponymous festival, the Antonieia, held in ca. 38/7 in honor of Antonius, who has received the acclamation Theos Neos Dionysos;[9] *Agora* XVIII H273 (Agora Inv. I 3071), an altar fragment from Athens dating to ca. 39/8-32/1 that attests to divine honors for Antonius and his wife Octavia as Theoi Euergetai (Figure 1);[10] and

---

[7] Swain 1990; Russell 1998, 131–35.

[8] Sen., *Suas*. 1.6; Vell. Pat., 2.82.3-4; Plut., *Ant*. 24, 26, 54, 60, 75; Cass Dio, 48.39.2, 50.5.3, 50.25.3; Athen., *Deip*. 147f-148c.

[9] This honorific title, literally translated as God New/Young Dionysos, in its basic sense designated Antonius as a second Dionysos capable of replicating the god's qualities and achievements (see Chapter 3).

[10] Benefactor Gods, an honorific title often given to Hellenistic royal couples (see Chapter 3).

RPC 2201-2202,[11] the two issues of *cistophori* struck for Antonius in the province of Asia (likely at Ephesos) in ca. 39/8, which bear his portrait crowned with the ivy wreath of Dionysos (Figure 2, Figure 3).[12] These physical objects have been subsumed under the mantle of the ancient literary sources so that their significance has remained confined within the limits of the literary frame. Marginalization has led to decontextualization, whereby the historical perception of the Dionysos connection as a manifestation of Antonius's base impulses and alienation from Rome has supplanted the original temporal, social, cultural, and geographical contexts from which the inscriptions and coins derived their meanings and functions. This isolation has resulted in missed opportunities to highlight evidence that is undoubtedly contemporary with Antonius's lifetime, which much of the literary evidence is not.

Historical reconstruction of the triumviral period and its protagonists relies heavily on authors who lived one or more centuries after Antonius and his paramour-ally Kleopatra (VII) Thea Philopatōr met a legendary but ignominious end as enemies of Rome in the war against Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus, who went on to establish the Augustan Principate (27 B.C.E.-14 C.E.). Consequently, invective levelled at Antonius (and at the "real" enemy Kleopatra) had a much greater chance of survival next to anything that could contradict the victory narrative of the posthumously deified Augustus and the golden age he established. The paucity of sources is all the more challenging given that, among the few extant contemporary notices of Antonius, by far the most extensive is Marcus Tullius Cicero's collection of vitriolic speeches called the *Philippics*

---

[11] *RPC* 2201: Obv. M·ANTONIVS·IMP·COS·DESIG·ITER·ET·TERT·, around; head of Antonius wearing ivy wreath, r.; below, lituus; ivy wreath border. Rev. III·VIR·, l., R·P·C·, r; draped bust of Octavia, r., on a cista mystica, flanked by twisting serpents. *RPC* 2202: Obv. M·ANTONIVS·IMP·COS·DESIG·ITER·ET·TERT·, around; head of Antonius, wearing ivy wreath, and draped bust of Octavia, jugate, r.; border of dots. Rev. III·VIR·, l., R·P·C·, r; Dionysos standing, l., on a cista mystica, holding a kantharos and a thyrsos, flanked by twisting serpents.

[12] The *cistophorus* was the primary silver denomination that circulated in the Attalid kingdom and then the Roman province of Asia (see Chapter 4).

(*orationes Philippicae*).[13] With these speeches Cicero attempted on several occasions in late 44 and early 43 to convince the Senate to declare Antonius a *hostis* (enemy) of the state by discrediting him through an exaggeration of faults and misdeeds.[14] Cicero, who at one point accuses Antonius of being to the Republic what Helen was to the Trojans (*Phil*. 2.55), served as source material for later authors.[15] Also available to later authors were sources now lost, including: Augustus's autobiography, which was intended to refute the accusations of his political enemies in the period between 44 and 31;[16] and two critical histories by Gaius Asinius Pollio, who covered the broader period of the civil wars from 60 down to the 30s, and Quintus Dellius, who certainly wrote of the expedition to Media Atropatēnē (36 B.C.E.) in which he participated and perhaps much more.[17]
The most plentiful sources for the triumviral period are interdependent works of the first and second centuries C.E.: Plutarch's *Life of Antony* (dated ca. 98-120 C.E.), the only biography of the *triumvir* to have survived from antiquity; and the fragmentary narrative histories of Appian and Lucius Cassius Dio written in the mid-second and the early third century, respectively. All three authors were Greek-speaking natives of the eastern Roman Empire and were looking back upon history having experienced imperial rule, albeit in very different ways, in a world where one's "identity" had become a socio-cultural complexity (e.g. Roman/Greek, Roman/provincial) with the imperial center as the only

---

[13] The title, provided by Cicero himself, is a direct link to the speeches delivered by the Athenian orator Demosthenes against Philip II of Macedon in the mid-4th century B.C.E. Cicero's speeches were delivered in the Senate between 2 September 44 and 21 April 43 B.C.E. The speeches circulated in written form soon after delivery. The well-known *Second Philippic*, perhaps the most scathing, was never actually delivered, but did circulate along with the other speeches. The modern corpus consists of 14 speeches, and there may have been at least three more that are no longer extant. It is thought that *Philippics* 3-14 in the modern reckoning represent the originally intended collection of a dozen speeches with the *First* and *Second Philippics* being later additions (Ramsey 2003, 16–7; Shackleton Bailey 2009, 1: xviii-xxii).

[14] For a chronology of the *Philippics* and related events, see the Loeb Classical Library edition (2009), lix-lxvii. The introductions provided for each individual speech provide further details. See also Ramsey 2003, 1–10.

[15] E.g., Plut., *Ant*. 6.1.

[16] Suet., *Aug*. 85; Pelling 1988, 26; Mellor 1999, 177–79.

[17] Pelling 1988, 27–8.

universal point of convergence.[18] These and other factors contributed to the subjectivity and personal agendas that led these authors to selectively include or exclude information and highlight or suppress details in shaping their representations of what led to the founding of the Augustan Principate and, in turn, the iterations of empire they witnessed first-hand.[19]

The great advantage of physical evidence like inscriptions and coins is their nature as "immediate historical documents, rather than an author's elaboration of events."[20] Although not unimpeachably true and objective, these and other types of visual objects represent historical circumstances, motivations, ideologies, and socio-cultural interconnections in action. What this dissertation aims to do is separate the two Athenian inscriptions and the *cistophori* from the version of Antonius constructed after his death and consider how this evidence informs his identification with Dionysos as a function of the situation on the ground, so to speak. I am not suggesting a reversal of circumstances in which the literary evidence is marginalized in favor of the material; it is rather a matter of allowing the epigraphic and numismatic evidence to differ from, augment, and/or inform the literary tradition, if object-focused analyses yield details and contextual connections unknown to and/or misrepresented or misunderstood by ancient authors. The flow of information should be as a multi-lane highway, not a one-way street.

That Antonius developed an identification with Dionysos was not necessarily a problem in and of itself, as a prominent feature of late republican political rhetoric was "the special relationship that individual leaders claimed to enjoy with the gods, an idea which served to enhance the leader's position in the state and to validate his acts."[21] Claims of divine descent, favor, and patronage was a means of establishing a public

---

[18] Kemezis 2014, 42.

[19] Select bibliography for these authors: Gabba 1956; Millar 1964; Jones 1971; Huzar 1978; Pelling 1988; Reinhold 1988; Gowing 1992; Swain 1997; Duff 1999; Bucher 2000; Goldhill 2001; Humble 2010; Kemezis 2014; Stadter 2014.

[20] Ma (2002) 2005, 19.

[21] Pollini 1990, 334.

image meant to outdo the competition in the contest for political power and personal glory and, not surprisingly, came to affect increasingly the self-perception of those men who cultivated direct associations with the divine sphere.[22] Gaius Julius Caesar and his vigorously advertised claims of ancestral descent from Venus Genetrix is a very clear example.

Unfortunately for Antonius, his affiliation with Dionysos was a two-edged sword. Whereas Dionysos was extremely popular in the Hellenistic world as the symbol of royal *tryphē* (magnificence, luxury) and the divine parallel for Alexander's conquests, he was also a god of contradictory dualities (e.g., masculine-feminine/androgynous, joy-suffering, fertility-death) who liberated humans in ways that subverted social norms through the transformative mechanisms of wine and dramatic performance.[23] In Rome and Italy, where Antonius was not physically present for most of the triumviral period, his enemies could accuse Antonius of distancing himself from Rome and giving himself over to the mollifying allures of eastern *tryphē* and point to his deification as Dionysos as proof positive. By stark contrast, Octavianus, ensconced in Rome and the western provinces, played the part of the defender of hallowed Roman *mores* and the Latin West. After the battle at Actium (2 September 31 B.C.E.), Octavianus deliberately cultivated links with the oracular god Apollo, a deity of reason and restraint, in his efforts to mend the wounds of civil war and construct his identity as Augustus, the harbinger of Roman renewal.[24] The fallout of the so-called propaganda, the concept of which is controversial in its applicability to antiquity,[25] of both the triumviral period and the Augustan age galvanized the dichotomy between Antonius the vanquished and Octavianus/Augustus the victor. This dichotomy could be expressed in many ways, including Hellenic East

[22] Zanker 1988, 11–8, 44–65

[23] Distrust and the perceived threat of the Dionysiac cult imported from the East led the Roman Senate to enact five years' worth of serious measures against worshippers beginning in 186 B.C.E. (Livy, *Ab urbe cond*. 39.17.4-18.9; Cic., *Leg*. 2.15.37).

[24] Zanker 1988, 47–53; Gurval 1995, 87–136. Nothing was more explicit than the physical attachment of Augustus's house on the Palatine to the Temple of Apollo he constructed shortly after Actium.

[25] See the latest discussion in Borgies 2016, 24–7.

versus Latin West, Hellenic/Egyptian versus Roman, corruption of character versus defense of morality, and Dionysos versus Apollo.[26] The ongoing assessment of Antonius as Octavianus's opposite has had much to do with the influence of late nineteenth-century philosophical and psychological thinking, which brought the Dionysos-Apollo duality to the fore,[27] and the focus on the conflict between the pair as a war of propaganda in the post-World War I sense, which began with the foundational articles of 1933 by K. Scott and M. P. Charlesworth.[28]

The publication of *Inscriptiones Graecae* (*IG*) II in the late nineteenth century (1877-1895) and the appearance of the multi-part second edition in the first four decades of the twentieth (1913-1940) gave scholars interested in late republican Rome a proverbial smoking gun in relation to Antonius's divine alter ego. Among four fragmentary civic decrees inscribed on a stele dated to 37/6 and discovered in Athens in 1861 was an exceptional reference to Antonius, whose name does not appear alongside his Roman titles but the title Theos Neos Dionysos.[29] Here now was an inscription that could corroborate the testimony of authors like Plutarch and Cassius Dio (especially Dio 48.39.2) that Antonius had declared himself *neos* Dionysos (a second Dionysos)[30] around the time that he arrived in Athens late in 39 and proceeded to imitate the god in lifestyle and dress over the years.[31] From that point forward, *IG* II^2 1043 became a standard citation for Antonius's deification. Then, in 1946, A. E. Raubitschek (*TAPA* 77: 146-

---

[26] Hercules/Hērakles, from whom the Antonii claimed descent, was also associated with Antonius (e.g., Plut., *Ant*. 4, 36, 60; *Comp. Demtr. et Ant.* 3.3-4). The terra cotta reliefs from the Palatine sanctuary of Apollo depicting Apollo and Hērakles in the struggle over the Delphic tripod seems to be an allusion to Octavianus and Antonius.

[27] Beginning with Friedrich Nietzsche's *Birth of Tragedy* (1872). For an overview, see Seaford 2006, 5–11.

[28] Charlesworth 1933; Scott 1933; also Scott 1929. Summary of the study of propaganda in the triumviral period with bibliography in Borgies 2016, 15-24.

[29] The stele is dated to 37/6 by archontal year and refers to the festival in honor of Antonius as an event of the previous archontal year (38/7). As will be discussed in Chapter 3, the dating is not secure and many publications maintain that the festival occurred in 39/8.

[30] Plut., *Ant*. 60.3; Cass. Dio, 48.39.20.

[31] Sen., *Suas*. 1.6; Vell. Pat., 2.82.3-4; Plut., *Ant*. 24, 26, 60, 75; Cass. Dio, 50.5.3, 50.25.4; Athen., *Deipn*. 147f-148c.

50), the noted scholar of Athenian dedications, published for the first time an inscribed altar fragment (*Agora* XVIII H273), the text of which demonstrates that Antonius and Octavia had received divine honors as a couple. Raubitschek concluded, on the basis of a certain passage from Seneca the Elder (*Suas*. 1.6), that this inscription indicated Octavia's deification as the poliad deity of Athens, Athena Polias. Since its publication, Raubitschek's article has served as the sole authoritative study of *Agora* XVIII H273 and remains as such despite its age and the subsequent advances in research.

About the same time that the *IG* II^2 volumes were beginning to appear, H. A. Grueber published *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum* (*BMCRR*) in 1910, which included entries for the *cistophori* of Antonius now referred to as *RPC* 2201 and 2202. *BMCRR* was the standard reference for coinages of the Roman Republic until the 1974 publication of M. H. Crawford's *Roman Republican Coinage* (*RRC*) and the appearance of the first volume of *Roman Provincial Coinage* (*RPC*) in 1992. The principal purpose of these catalogues is to accurately describe, and to some extent explain, the content of coinages, to provide chronological frameworks, and to identify the mints at which coinages were produced. In addition to their value as reference works for numismatists, these catalogues are critical tools in the use of coins as historical sources and have made necessary information available and accessible to non-numismatists. The isolation of numismatics from the fields of classical studies considered more mainstream has created a divide between concerns particular to specialists, such as quantification, circulation, and economic function, and the myriad of ways in which the iconographic, textual, chronological, and geographic evidence of coins appears in historical, art historical, socio-cultural, and archaeological discussions. Some crossover does, of course, occur, particularly in relation to dating and the significance of obverse and reverse types. Within numismatics, the Antonian *cistophori* sometimes appear as the sole topic of interest,[32] but are more frequently part of larger discussions of Antonius's coinages and

[32] E.g., Hiltmann 2014.

of issues within Roman coinage.[33] A key debate that may never reach a definitive and unanimous conclusion concerns the dating of the *cistophori*, which by necessity must depend upon Antonius's acclamations as *imperator* (commander), a part of his official Roman titulature for which there are uncertainties of chronology. This matter has, for the most part, belonged to the realm of numismatics, and a number of numismatists have proposed schemes for Antonius's imperatorial acclamations from H. Bahrfeldt to M. Amandry.[34] Beyond numismatic circles, the iconographical elements of the *cistophori* have attracted the most attention. The portrait of Antonius crowned with an ivy wreath is the primary focus for the obvious reasons of connecting the visual representations with reports that the *triumvir* thought of himself as Dionysos incarnate. The inclusion of Octavia's portrait, unprecedented in an official Roman coinage up to that point, draws interest in relation to her role in triumviral politics.[35] And, because coins are instrumental to portraiture studies, the *cistophori* also serve as evidence for Antonius's likeness, one of several since instances of his image on coins are plentiful, and as some of the best representations of Octavia's likeness among much fewer options.[36]

The relationship between Antonius and Dionysos does not belong to any one field or genre of scholarship. Since Antonius lends himself as an historical figure to study from many disciplinary directions—biography, history, critical source commentary, art history, numismatics, gender studies, and so forth—so too his connections with Dionysos are approached from many directions and discussed, or at the very least noted, in service of a sundry of individual scholarly agendas. The use of evidence also varies for the same reason. At times only the ancient literary sources are deployed without any reference to the epigraphic and numismatic evidence; at other times the Athenian inscriptions (*IG* II^2 1043 and *Agora* XVIII H273) may appear without the *cistophori* from Asia (*RPC*

[33] E.g., Buttrey 1953; Sutherland 1970; Bernareggi 1973; Walker 1976; Amandry 1990.

[34] Bahrfeldt 1904; Amandry 1990.

[35] Kleiner 1992, 361–63.

[36] Holtzman and Salviat 1981 (Antonius); Pollini 2002 (Octavia).

2201-2202) and vice versa. There is, therefore, no cohesive group of published work nor even a single article or monograph that one can discuss as an authoritative corpus of existing work in a broad sense; rather, the point of entry will vary according to the intent and scope of the inquiry as well as familiarity with certain disciplines over others. That said, some of the more frequently encountered references, such as C. B. R. Pelling's commentary on Plutarch's *Life of Antony* (1988) and P. Zanker's *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (1988), are widely consulted.

Among such diversity in scholarship, the tie that binds is the absence of marked efforts to reverse the marginalization of the epigraphic and numismatic evidence and allow the routine honorific traditions and ruler cult practices characteristic of the Hellenistic East to better inform the connections Antonius developed with Dionysos. As a consequence of this lag in research proliferation, opportunities to cultivate interpretations of the early stages of the Antonius-Dionysos pairing according to the available contemporaneous material evidence, which does not share the same biases and motivations as a largely non-contemporaneous and hostile literary record, have gone underexploited. Since *IG* II^2 1043, *Agora* XVIII H273, and *RPC* 2201-2202 have so far been glossed over as a homogenous group that supports literary representations of Antonius and Dionysos, these sources must be pulled apart and investigated as standalone documents with their own stories to tell. The results produced from individual evaluation should then lead the way in terms of how the inscriptions from Athens and the *cistophori* from Asia relate or do not relate to each other and to the ancient literary sources. Antonius operated within an environment where the standard form of interaction between *poleis* and an external ruling power was the reciprocal euergetic dialogue of ruler cult whereby the *triumvir* played his part as an extraordinary benefactor worthy of *isotheoi timai*. As such, it is quite possible that, whatever may have ensued in the later 30s, the associations with Dionysos began not with Antonius but with cities and groups who benefitted from his goodwill. The discussion to follow will argue that: (i) the divine honors in Athens

attested by *IG* II^2 1043 and *Agora* XVIII H273 could have been prompted by the victories of Antonius's armies over the Parthians in 39-38 B.C.E. and the ritual celebration of the arrival and reception of important persons in cities (known as *apantēsis* and *apodochē*); and (ii) the depiction of Antonius crowned with an ivy wreath on the obverses of the *cistophori* (*RPC* 2201-2202) may reflect euergetism directed at the powerful guilds of dramatic and musical performers called the *technitai* (artists) of Dionysos in addition to any allusions to the god's eastern conquests as a parallel to Antonius's campaigns against the Parthians.

A crescendo of interest in Antonius and his involvement with the Hellenistic East is currently underway, and the tides are changing for the better where appreciation for his administrative efforts and achievements are concerned. Revision of past opinions is being driven by trends in scholarship over the last two decades, namely, a surge in publications related to the diversity of the Hellenistic kingdoms,[37] broader interdisciplinary perspectives on cultural phenomena like ruler cult,[38] and the economic insights arising from changing foci in numismatics. These and other trends, such as the popularity of gender studies, initially generated a renewed awareness of Kleopatra,[39] which is now spilling over onto Antonius as a result of their relationship. However, Antonian scholarship will only progress so far without challenging the heretofore unidimensional view of Antonius's identification with the god Dionysos as a self-driven agenda symptomatic of a man accused of failing to live up to Roman moral ideals. It is for this reason that the scope of this study is limited to the small corpus of epigraphic and numismatic evidence (*IG* II^2 1043, *Agora* XVIII H273, and *RPC* 2201-2202) so often cited but long misunderstood and misrepresented. Because this evidence belongs to the earlier stages of Antonius's administration of the East, the chronological scope is largely

---

[37] E.g., Ma (2002) 2005; Eckstein 2013; Thonemann 2013a; Troncoso and Anson 2013; Kosmin 2014.

[38] E.g., Chaniotis 2005; Iossif et al. 2011; Buraselis 2012; Muccioli 2013; Erskine 2014; Caneva 2016.

[39] E.g., Walker and Higgs 2001; Walker and Ashton 2003; Kleiner 2005; Strootman 2010; Miles 2011.

limited to the period between 42/1 and 38/7 B.C.E.[40]

The three chapters that constitute the body of this dissertation are meant to situate Antonius and his identification with Dionysos within the landscape of Hellenistic ruler cult and provide an object-centered approach to the matter. Chapter 2 introduces ruler cult and the concept of mortal deification as a function of euergetism, a civic responsibility fundamental to both the Greek *polis* system and the institution of Hellenistic rulership. Use of the divine cult model to honor a living mortal allowed *poleis* to express gratitude for the exceptional level of benefactions received from kings and queens, particularly in relation to the freedom of cities. The role of the ruler as benefactor was central to *polis*-ruler relations; this system continued to operate under Roman rule so that the mantle of benefaction fell to Roman magistrates, who then became the new subjects of divine honors and ruler cult. Chapter 3 provides individual assessments of *IG* II^2 1043 and *Agora* XVIII H273, taking into consideration the euergetic basis of divine honors. Although the precise circumstances cannot be determined, Antonius had a distinct relationship with Athens and spent time in the city with his wife Octavia. The appellations Theos Neos Dionysos (*IG* II^2 1043, line 23) and Theoi Euergetai (*Agora* XVIII H273) are clearly borrowed from Hellenistic royal titulature and the types of honors offered to kings and queens. The latter recognizes Antonius and Octavia as co-benefactors deified in their own right and the former invites comparison between Antonius and Dionysos, perhaps in response to the military successes against the Parthians in Asia Minor and Syria. Chapter 4 discusses the *cistophori* (*RPC* 2201-2202) struck in Roman Asia Minor and the depiction of Antonius wearing the ivy wreath, which does not appear in any other of his portraits on coins. These coins had first and foremost a function as currency, and issues like the quantity produced and the circulation patterns must be considered when thinking about the messaging and impact of the iconographical components. The choice to add the

[40] After 37/6, the year of the territorial grants to Kleopatra, Antonius invested himself more heavily in his eastern power base and moved toward what looked very much like a dynastic policy dependent upon his children with Kleopatra. The exclusion of this later period means that Kleopatra will not figure heavily in this study.

ivy wreath to his portrait certainly invokes the idea of Antonius embodying the traits of Dionysos, but there is also a possibility that the wreath signifies that the triumvir acted as benefactor to one or more associations of the *technitai* of Dionysos, who had a marked presence in this region and elsewhere.

The spelling of Greek and Latin names and terms follows the original language throughout, except where common English usage is preferable for certain people and places (e.g., Alexander, Cilicia). Most Greek names and terms are transliterated, but the original Greek is occasionally retained for the sake of accuracy. Translations of Greek and Latin literary passages are my own except where otherwise indicated.

Chapter 2

More Than Men, Less Than Gods

Before specifically addressing Antonius and the honorific treatment he received as *triumvir* in the East, a brief sketch of ruler cult as a mode of interaction between Hellenistic *poleis* and a dominant external power, first the Hellenistic monarchies and then Rome, is first necessary. As we have come to realize, a key factor in understanding the phenomenon of Hellenistic ruler cults is euergetism, a civic virtue highly valued in the Greek *polis* system in centuries previous and a foundational ideal of the institution of Hellenistic rulership.[1] Recourse to the divine cult model to honor a living mortal at the *polis* level was the answer to the question of how to adequately express gratitude for the exceptional level of benefactions received from kings and queens.[2] The benefactions that engendered this level of gratitude were typically connected with the ability of cities to gain and maintain freedom. The role of the ruler as benefactor was, therefore, central to *polis*-ruler relations, which allowed euergetic exchange to function as a standard mode of communication rooted in cultural norms.

Roman intervention in the politico-military conflicts between and within the Hellenistic kingdoms, particularly in the first half of the second century, shifted the balance of power in the eastern Mediterranean from the competing Hellenistic monarchies to the new superpower emerging from the west. The end of the Antigonid

---

[1] For discussion of euergetism with more extensive bibliographies, see P. Veyne, *Le pain et le cirque. Sociologie historique d'un pluralism politique* (Paris: Seuil, 1976); Gauthier 1985; Bringmann 1993; Stevenson 1996; Ma (2002) 2005 Ma 2013; Gygax 2016.

[2] This way of honoring mortals within Hellenic culture did occur prior to the fourth century, but not on a scale anywhere near that witnessed in the Hellenistic age on the basis of the substantial amount of extant evidence. In earlier periods extraordinary individuals such as heroes, founders of cities (*ktistai*), and athletes could be afforded divine honors, but only after their deaths. The case of the Spartan admiral Lysandros on Samos at the end of the Peloponnesian War (ca. 404 B.C.E.) is the first known instance of the offering of divine honors to a mortal during his own lifetime (Douris, FGrHist 76 F71 and 26; Habicht 1970, 3–7, 243–44; Versnel 2011, 456–57 and nn. 68, 69).

dynasty of Macedon in 168, the expulsion of the Seleukids from Asia Minor in 188, and Attalos (III) Philomētōr Euergetēs' bequest of the kingdom of Pergamon to the *populus Romanus* in 133 established Rome's dominance and added new *provinciae* to the burgeoning empire.[3] The annexation of territory continued through the first century and was largely complete with the conquest of Ptolemaic Egypt after the deaths of Antonius and Kleopatra VII in 30. The euergetic discourse between *poleis* and Hellenistic rulers was, consequently, disrupted because the well-established role of the ruler as benefactor could no longer exist. Into this void stepped the Roman, individual Roman magistrates (a category that includes generals), and individual citizens of cities. These entities had the power to affect the freedom of *poleis* in ways equivalent to the former kings and queens. As such, cults of royal benefactors gave way to cults of Roman power (represented by the goddess Roma and the Romans as common benefactors, Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ κοινοὶ εὐεργέται), of Roman magistrate-benefactors[4] (governors, consuls, proconsuls, etc.), and prominent citizen-benefactors who performed significant services, such as diplomatic negotiations with Rome, to better the interests of their native *poleis*.[5] These later non-royal ruler cults were not vastly different in form, language, and objective, but rather differed in the power relations behind the offering of *isotheoi timai*.[6] The later cults, therefore, preserved the memory of their royal origins in the process of adapting to the shifting social, political,

[3] The term *provincia* is not here restricted to its meaning as an imperial province managed through provincial administrative institutions. In earlier periods, a *provincia* outside the city of Rome was primarily a geographically-limited military command assigned to a magistrate or pro-magistrate, who then also had the responsibility of political relations with communities within the designated region. Thus, in the latter part of the republican period, an area of territory could be called a *provincia* without being a province proper. See Richardson 1994; Drogula 2007, 131–81, 295–344.

[4] A term borrowed from Thériault (2001, 92): "le culte des magistrats-bienfaiteurs romains."

[5] Cults for Romans and Roman power: *SEG* 51-2351; Raubitschek 1954; Cerfaux and Tondriau 1957; Price 1984, 40–6; Sherk 1984; Thériault 2001; Hoff 2005; Thériault 2012. Cults for citizens of *poleis*: Price 1984b, 47-51; Sherk 1984; Thériault 2011; Ma 2013; Gygax 2016. For an example of a citizen-benefactor, see *IGRR* IV 1682 (Mithradatēs of Pergamon, an associate of Julius Caesar) with Ma 2013, 90.

[6] The argument for differentiation among the different types of cults dedicated to living mortals is that of Price (1984, 24, 40-52), who argued against the common view that the cults of Hellenistic rulers were the direct precursors of the Roman imperial cult. Herein the term ruler cult refers to the entire phenomenon, regardless of the status of the recipient of the cult.

and geo-political landscapes of the late Hellenistic period. It is within this framework of the honorific habit of ruler cult that the treatment of Antonius must be resituated.

2.1. Mortal Deification

As stated in the introductory chapter, *isotheoi timai* may be defined as "honours equivalent to those paid to the gods"[7] or, alternatively, "godlike honors attributed to mortals whose power may assimilate them to gods, but who still remain mortals."[8] It follows that the primary intent behind divine honors and ruler cults was not the true apotheosis of a living mortal, but rather an assertion that the mortal honorand, male or female, was *godlike* and thus worthy of *godlike* honors.[9] So, to borrow the title of a recent edited volume of conference proceedings, deified rulers were "more than men, less than gods."[10] At the same time, ruler cult adopted and adapted the traditional divine cult model for its own purposes with the result that *isotheoi timai* included many of the same honors afforded to the gods. Among other things, these honors could include the establishment of a *temenos* (sacred enclosure or precinct), the erection of a *bōmos* (altar), the dedication of an *agalma* (cult statue), and the celebration of a festival, (defined as *pompē kai thysia kai agōn*/procession, sacrifice, and contest of the musical, dramatic, or athletic variety).[11]

Mortal deification is a difficult concept to grasp from a modern point of view. (Although, consider today's cult of celebrity and the elevation of athletic heroes to a superhuman level, even to the point of saying that so-and-so is a god.) Apart from the foreignness of the concept, most people would undoubtedly judge the two states of being as contradictory. After all, at a fundamental level, to be divine is to be immortal. Or is it? The essential principle that defined the relationship between humankind and the gods

[7] Price 1984a, 88.

[8] Chaniotis 2011, 181.

[9] Chaniotis 2005, 433.

[10] Iossif, Chankowski, and Lorber 2011.

[11] Chaniotis 2013, 25; also Buraselis 2012.

in religious belief, *do ut des*, "I give so that you may give," also defined the euergetic relationship between recipients and human benefactors. What set royal benefactors apart was the perception of the deeds and achievements encompassed within the benefaction category as lying beyond the standard limits of humanity. If one thinks of deification "as an expression of praise, gratitude and the acknowledgment of achievements exceeding human measure,"[12] then immortality is not an essential quality and the expansion of divine honors to include mortal rulers as *the way* to address royal euergetism becomes less abstruse. Consider also that, in addition to reciprocity, deified rulers and traditional gods must have shared some sort of common ground where the former possessed qualities and/or fulfilled roles or functions typically ascribed to the latter in order for ruler cult to reach the level of popularity and widespread implementation achieved in the Hellenistic age.

Angelos Chaniotis has persuasively argued that the bridge between mortal divinity and traditional divinity may be best thought of in terms of efficacy, putting into action the ability to protect and care for humans.[13] The immortal nature characteristic of traditional deities seems not to have been a requirement of deification of humans, but rather the possession of the earthly equivalent of divine power. Since "true divine power is power that makes a difference to the lives of humans"[14] and power is in a basic sense the "ability to influence the outcome of events,"[15] Hellenistic rulers affected human lives in a very real way and incurred the same obligations as expected of the gods. What truly mattered was a god's affability, the willingness to hear prayers, and the capacity to help to

---

[12] Versnel 2011, 464. Contained within the expression of praise, gratitude, and the acknowledgment of achievements beyond normal human ability are the two primary agents in what Versnel calls the "construction of a god," language and performance, which are also cornerstones of ritual (Versnel 2011, 460–80).

[13] Chaniotis 2005, 432-33; Chaniotis 2011, 173. The argument as presented in the 2011 article refers specifically to the ithyphallic hymn for Dēmētrios Poliorkētēs discussed below.

[14] Chaniotis 2011, 173.

[15] D. Lee Bowen, "Power VS. Authority," *BYU Magazine*, Winter 2003, http://magazine.byu.edu/article/power-vs-authority/.

those in need, which relied upon the physical presence of a god.[16] Rulers, physically and thus visibly present in the world, had the responsibility to protect and care for the human populations subordinate to their absolute power and to hear the prayers of their subjects. The efficacy of the benefactions and achievements through which Hellenistic rulers provided for the needs of the people under their care was therefore of the same kind as that expected of the gods. In this way, living rulers were eligible to receive *isotheoi timai*. The godlike magnitude of a ruler's euergetism required honors worthy of his or her benefactions and achievements; divine honors fulfilled this need and served as the appropriate, and eventually the standard and expected, response of *poleis* to the deeds and accomplishments of rulers. A *polis* could also grant divine honors on its own initiative in order to elicit future goodwill and encourage rulers to behave euergetically.

The modern conceptualization of mortal divinity in antiquity also requires an openness and willingness to accept that the Greek term *theos/thea* has a certain ambivalence. Although its usual translation as "god" gives the impression of exactness, *theos* is actually rather nebulous in its meaning(s). Because a semantic explanation of the word does not appear in any ancient source, we must "tease out assumptions which were not normally made explicit."[17] S. R. F. Price has argued that *theos* is a predicate, a unit that functions to assert something about the subject of a sentence, without any clear criteria for its use.[18] If we compare the sentences "This is a *theos*" and "This is a person," the two predicates "is a *theos*" and "is a person" share a similar uncertainty in their applications. Price explains as follows:

> "The paradigm case of 'is a person' is an adult human being of 'normal' intelligence and physique, who has both rights and responsibilities. But when one or more of the features of the paradigm are absent (as with a foetus immediately after conception, or a patient suffering from irreparable brain damage) it ceases to

[16] Chaniotis 2005, 432; Chaniotis 2011, 173-78.

[17] Price 1984a, 80.

[18] Price 1984a, 79-85. Price makes this point in a contrast between *theos* and the Latin term *divus*, which did have a specific institutionalized designation.

> be clear that the predicate still applies. Irresolvable arguments arise because the predicate 'is a person', like 'is a Saint' [a status that requires a decision made by the Roman Catholic Church after a prolonged investigative procedure], claims to recognize the way things are; but, unlike 'is a Saint', it has no institutional control."[19]

Then, as an illustration of *theos* in common Greek usage, Price draws upon a passage from Cicero's *de natura deorum* (3.43) relating an argument presented by the second century B.C.E. philosopher Karneadēs of Cyrene:

> If gods [Lat. *dei*, Gk. *theoi*] exist, are the nymphs also goddesses? If the nymphs are, are the Pans and Satyrs also gods? But they are not gods; therefore the nymphs are not gods. Yet they possess temples vowed and dedicated to them by the nation. Therefore the other gods who have had temples dedicated to them are not gods either.

In other words, either all of these beings are gods or none of them are gods. Price's point is that, in Karneadēs's attempts to discredit a tenet of Stoic theology through its failure to distinguish between beings who were certainly not gods and undisputable divinities like Zeus, the philosopher demonstrated that "there were no uncontroversial criteria for the predication of *theos*" and "the boundaries of the concept were not unequivocally defined."[20] Thus, the predication of *theos* could be unproblematic, as for a god whose divine status was unimpeachable, and troublesome at the periphery where beings of less absolute divinity, including human recipients of cult, existed. The essential point is that, in antiquity, the flexibility and potential for ambivalence in *theos* allowed for the inclusion of mortal divinities without any particular preoccupation with or awareness of the types of contradictions or blurred boundaries that have become the focus of modern scholarly investigation. "In attributing divine predicates and cultic privileges to a mortal ruler, and thus 'making him [or her] *theos* [or *thea*]', people were focusing [*sic*] on a selection of predicates, with no necessary urge to complete the whole gamut of divine qualities usually attributed to gods. Qualities such as (im)mortality, changing positions in (in)visibility, and various forms of miraculous behaviour simply remain

[19] Price 1984a, 80.

[20] Price 1984a, 80.

out of scope, just as … [they did] in communication with 'real' gods when a context required it."[21] For a contemporary participant in Hellenistic ruler cult, directing prayers and offering sacrifices to a ruler did not necessarily involve a full rationalization of why that ruler was a *theos* or *thea*; such is the realm of totalizing comparisons, which carry the threat of overinterpretation in situations where ambivalency precludes, and perhaps renders irrelevant, a concrete formulation of what defined a living mortal ruler's divinity in every instance where he or she was declared a *theos*/*thea*. Together, the impreciseness of *theos*, the alignment of the roles and functions of rulers with those of traditional gods as the basis for offering *isotheoi timai*, and the definition of deification as recognition of superhuman achievement provide a basis for understanding the genesis of Hellenistic ruler cults and the treatment of living mortal rulers as divinities.

2.2. Hellenistic Ruler Cult in the *polis*

The introduction of the cult of a living king or queen in a *polis* was not, as once thought, a passive process in which the royal administration imposed the worship of a ruler upon a city. The decision to offer *isotheoi timai* came from the *polis*, or rather the *dēmos* (the people) speaking through the *boulē* (council) and *ekklēsia* (assembly), in fulfillment of a euergetic exchange with a ruler who had performed an extraordinary benefaction. Thus, unlike a dynastic cult or a cult established by a king for himself, the *polis* cult was a spontaneous reaction that generated a reciprocal euergetic dialogue between the ruled and the ruler.[22] By virtue of this dialogue, *poleis* could also offer divine honors of their own volition with the intent of urging rulers towards future benefactions

[21] Versnel 2011, 469.

[22] A dynastic cult was established by a king for the worship of one or more deceased family members and is best known from Ptolemaic Egypt beginning with the reign of Ptolemy (II) Philadelphos (283-246 BCE), who deified his parents as the Theoi Sōtēres (Savior Gods, following the epithet of his father Ptolemy [I] Sōtēr). The self-generated cult did not appear until the reign of the Seleukid king Antiochos (III) Megas in ca. 205 B.C.E. See Chaniotis 2005, 436.

and goodwill. The realization of the active role of *poleis* in the formation of *polis* cults rests primarily with Christian Habicht's landmark monograph *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*, which reversed the usual methodology and considered ruler cult from the perspective of the practitioners.[23] Habicht identified the creation, preservation, or restoration of a city's freedom as the definitive factor in the decision of a *polis* to offer divine honors and introduce a cult of the living ruler. The general categories of acts that constituted the preservation or restoration of civic freedom include deliverance from an external enemy, liberation from foreign rule or removal of one ruler by another, and the (re)foundation of a city.[24] One can also add to this list financial and material aid provided in times of need, such as the occurrence of a natural disaster or some other catastrophic event. These basic parameters qualify the extraordinary level of benefaction that elicited gratitude from cities in the form of *isotheoi timai*, which recognized the godlike efficacy of rulers as demonstrated by the services rendered.[25] The importance of the liberty of a *polis* also helps to account for the recurring designations of ruler cult recipients as *sōtēr* (savior) and *euergetēs* (benefactor) as well as *ktistēs* (founder).

The spread of Macedonian hegemony that created the Hellenistic kingdoms presented the Greek *poleis* with the challenge to somehow accommodate "a form of autocratic rule that was both external to the institutions of the city and yet at least partially Greek [in contrast to Persian rule in western Asia Minor]."[26] In addition to furnishing the means to express gratitude in a manner befitting acts of royal euergetism, divine honors may also be seen as a mechanism which facilitated the integration of Hellenistic rulers into the organizational structure of the *polis* and its constituent community. The recognition of rulers as *isotheoi* and the establishment of ruler cults,

---

[23] Habicht 1970 (first published 1956).

[24] Habicht 1970, 165–71. Habicht's insistence upon concrete benefactions as the motives for *poleis* to offer divine honors broke away from the previously held view (e.g., Nock [1928] 1972, 152) that the motives lay in a ruler's qualities and personality. Recently, Ma ([2002] 2005, 190) and Versnel (2011, 451 n. 51) have pointed out that this was not an either-or situation.

[25] Habicht 1970, 171–72.

[26] Price 1984b, 26.

which borrowed and adapted the traditional divine cult model, created opportunities for communal civic religion to function as a gateway into the *polis* structure. Through the establishment of close connections between the new deities of political origin (i.e., deified rulers) and traditional poliad deities like Dionysos and Athena, the divine cults that anchored the religious-political backbone of *polis* life were able to serve as a point of entry for the incorporation of Hellenistic rulers into the civic fabric.[27] In a sense, the gods acted "as hosts to integrate the newcomers"[28] by means of shared of space, place, and ritual, which "provided the new gods with a clear position not just beside, but inside the ancestral religion of the Greek polis."[29] With respect to space and place, a god's role as host was rather literal in that divine honors offered to a ruler could include the erection of an *agalma* or an *eikōn* (votive or other non-cult statue) of said ruler in a temple, sanctuary, or other sacred precinct. That is to say that the deified ruler was physically present in the home of a god (or gods in situations where the temple and/or sanctuary was dedicated to multiple deities). In such cases of cohabitation, the male or female ruler attained the great honor of being a *synnaos theos*, a temple-sharing god.[30]

A second type of cultic partnership much more common that *synnaos theos* status involved "the specific *connection* of cultic honours for traditional poliad deities and deified rulers inside the framework of ancient festivals."[31] K. Buraselis, in an effort to widen the discussion of the combination of ruler cults and traditional divine cults begun by A. D. Nock's study of *synnaoi theoi*, has recently devoted some much needed attention

---

[27] Buraselis 2008; Buraselis 2012.

[28] Buraselis 2012, 258.

[29] Buraselis 2012, 247.

[30] Nock (1930) 1972; Schmidt-Dounas 1995; Damaskos 1999; Buraselis 2008, 216; Steuernagel 2010, 241-42; Buraselis 2012, 247. Nock ([1930] 1972, 244-45) states that the elevation of a Hellenistic ruler to *synnaos* status was, with the exception of Ptolemaic Egypt, a relatively rare occurrence because this religious honor necessarily originated with the subjects and not the ruler. "It could not be otherwise in Greek cities, which had definite rights over their divine things [i.e., civic cults and temples]. A ruler can … found a new conjoint cult, but he does not intrude himself on a civic temple … But of course the honours which come from the ruled will in general be such as are likely to prove acceptable to the ruler" (Nock [1930] 1972, 245).

[31] Buraselis 2012, 247.

to the subject of the festivals that joined together honors for traditional deities and defied rulers.[32] Buraselis refers to these festivals as "appended festivals." While festivals devoted to multiple deities were common enough prior to the Hellenistic age, "it was a novelty of post-Alexandrian times to organize such a festival by not only combining honours for, but also naming the festival after both a traditional god of a certain polis (or league) and a deified ruler."[33] Appended festivals allowed *poleis* "not merely to allot the new gods a place in an already sacred local context, but to insert them dynamically and on a demonstratively parallel footing into the pattern of polis religion."[34] Central to Buraselis's article is the question whether we should consider an appended festival to be a joint festival comprised of two distinct parts for each of the old and new gods or a unified festival in honor of both the traditional god and the deified ruler. In the case of a joint festival, the duration of the original festival, say a Dionysia in honor of Dionysos, would be extended one or more days devoted to a particular deified ruler. Such appended days would carry the name of the ruler to be honored in adjectival form so that, for example, a festival in honor of Dēmētrios Poliorkētēs would be the Dēmētrieia. In the case of a unified festival, the appended festival was common to god and ruler in that, while the original festival might be prolonged, there was no separation into distinctive parts; the use, however, of the adjectival form of the ruler's name in the festival title remained the same.

Although two sides of the same coin, the organizational nature of an appended festival as joint or unified implies a slightly different relationship between the senior (traditional deity) and junior (deified ruler) partners, the latter conveying a sense of a closer connection than the former. As with the physical sharing of space and place of *synnaoi theoi*, "festive cohabitation" opened the way for deified rulers to enter the *polis* structure as guests of the gods. Of course there were also sensible financial

[32] Buraselis 2008; Buraselis 2012; Nock (1930) 1972.

[33] Buraselis 2012, 248.

[34] Buraselis 2012, 248.

and administrative benefits to appended festivals that undoubtedly factored into their popularity as part of ruler cult practices. Rather than mount two separate and costly events, civic authorities were able to take advantage of pre-existing festivals as a way to accommodate the extra honors for deified rulers. One should not expect every instance of a civic festival celebrated in honor of a ruler venerated through the offering of *isotheoi timai* to have occurred in appended form, especially as the honorific practices closely associated with Hellenistic rulership developed and evolved over time. Standalone festivals solely dedicated to one or more rulers and other members of the royal dynasties did exist.[35]

As part of both the civic honors due to benefactors and civic religion, the offering of divine honors by a *polis* allowed the people to represent for themselves the extra-*polis* power of Hellenistic rulers and to incorporate that power into *polis* life. At the same time, both *poleis* and rulers benefitted from the reciprocal dialogue in which either side had recourse to the language of euergetism in dealing with each other. In one way of looking at the interaction, the euergetical discourse between ruler and ruled may be described as "a rewriting of power into benefaction, and hence a process of euphemism. The essence of kingship could be defined as benefaction, rather than power—a deproblematizing image of power, which is given substance by actual benefactions presented as characteristic of the ruler's personal disposition and the nature of his rule."[36] The interaction was thus one of reciprocity rather than "a vertical relationship of control and exploitation."[37]

2.3. An Example of Hellenistic Ruler Cult in Action

Although we do not always know why the cult of a particular ruler was introduced

[35] The Ptolemaia in Alexandria is the obvious example.

[36] Ma (2002) 2005, 199.

[37] Ma (2002) 2005, 180.

at a particular *polis* at a particular time, the forms of *isotheoi timai* offered and the performance of those honors clearly followed similar patterns found in the various kingdoms throughout the Hellenistic age.[38] A representive example, therefore, will suffice here as an illustration of the interconnections between euergetism and ruler cult in real-time. One of the most detailed instances comes from the Ionian coastal city of Tēos, a site which has yielded a pair of honorific decrees of the late third century aimed at Antiochos (III) Megas (the Great) and his wife and his wife Laodikē III (*SEG* 41.1003, I and II).[39] The first of the decrees, *SEG* 41.1003, I, outlines the initial round of honors to be instituted and the worthiness of the *basileus* and *basilissa* to receive the honors so decreed.

[- - 8-9 - -]. τασθαι προαιρούμενος πολαπλασ[ι.]ν, κοινὸς [εὐ]-
[εργέτης πρ]οείρηται γίνεσθαι τῶν τε ἄλλων Ἑλληνίδωμ [πό]-
[λεων καὶ τ]ῆς πόλεως τῆς ἡμετέρας, καὶ πρότερόν τε ὑπάρ-
[χων] ἐν τῇ ἐπέκεινα τοῦ Υαύρου πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐγίνετο παραί-
τιος ἡμῖ[ν] καὶ παραγενόμενος ἐπὶ τοὺς καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς τόπους ἀπο- 10
κατέστησε τὰ πράγματα εἰς συμφέρουσαν κατάστασιν καὶ ἐ-
πιδημήσας ἐν τῇ πόλει ἡμῶν καὶ θεωρῶν ἐξησθενηκότας
ἡμᾶς κα[ὶ] ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις διά τε τοὺς συνεχεῖς
πολέμου[ς] καὶ τὸ μέγεθος ὧν ἐφέρομεν συντάξεων καὶ βουλόμενος
τά τε πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβῶς διακεῖσθαι ὧι καθιέρωσεν ἡμῶν τὴν πόλιν 15

[38] Alexander himself may, of course, have received divine honors during his lifetime on account of the unparalleled immensity of his achievements; however, there is a great deal of uncertainty concerning the question of Alexander's divinity prior to his death. The evidence for Alexander is notoriously problematic given the longevity of his memory after his death, the divinity he attained posthumously, and the poor state of evidence dated to his lifetime. The Alexander known to history is the Alexander constructed under the influence of the Successors and the Hellenistic royal dynasties. It is, therefore, rather difficult to separate contemporary fact from Alexandrian legend and unreliable anecdotes. Select bibliography: Habicht 1970, 17–36, 245–52; A. B. Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire: The Reign of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 278-90; E. A. Fredricksmeyer, "Alexander, Zeus Ammon, and the Conquest of Asia," *TAPA* 121 (1991), 199-214; Stewart 1993, 95–102, 191–209; Chaniotis 2005, 434–35; T. Howe, "The Diadochi, Invented Tradition, and Alexander's Expedition to Siwah," in V. A. Troncoso and E. M. Anson (eds.), *After Alexander: The Time of the Diadochi (323-281 BC)* (Oxford: Oxbow, 2013), 57-70; Erskine 2014, 582–83 and n. 14.

[39] First published in P. Herrmann, "Antiochos der Grosse und Tēos," *Anadolu* 9 (1965): 29-159. Discovered near the west wall of the *temenos* of the temple of Dionysos at Tēos. The text is carved on two blocks from a pilaster in the temple's entrance. The inscriptions are fragmentary. Full Greek text, bibliography, and further comments in Ma (2002) 2005, 308-17 (no. 17-18) and Appendix 2. See also Chaniotis 2007. At Tēos, Megas appears in *SEG* 41.1003, II (lines 11, 30). Antiochos was called μέγας (Great) following his expedition in the east (212-204 B.C.E.) to reassert Seleukid authority in places like Armenia, Parthia, and Baktria as attested by epigraphic and literary evidence (Ma [2002] 2005, 272-76). From ca. 200 onward, Antiochos adopted the title βασιλεὺς μέγας (Great King), which is the Greek title for the Achaimenid king of the former Persian Empire and a claim that one is master of all Asia. On Megas in Hellenistic royal titulature, see Appendix 1 in Muccioli 2013, 395–417.

Καὶ τὴν χώραν <καὶ> θέλων χαρίζεσθαι τῶι τε δήμωι καὶ τῶι κοινῶι τῶν
περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνιτῶν παρελθὼν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν αὐτός
ἀνῆκε τὴ[ν] πόλιν καὶ τὴγ χώραν ἡμῶν ἱερὰν καὶ ἄσυλον καὶ ἀφορολό-
γητον κ[αὶ] τῶν ἄλλων ὧν ἐφέρομεν συντάξεων βασιλεῖ Ἀττά-
λωι ὑπεδέξατο ἀπολυθήσεσθαι ἡμᾶς δι᾽ αὐτοῦ, ἵνα γενομένης ἐ-
παυξήσ[ε]ως τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν μὴ μόνον εὐεργεσίας λάβῃ τὴν
ἐπιγραφ[ὴν] τῆς τοῦ δήμου, ἀλλὰ καὶ σωτηρίας· ἐπεδήμησε δὲ καὶ
ἐν τῇ πόλει μετά τε τῶμ φίλων καὶ τῶν ἀκολουθουσῶν αὐτῶι δυνά-
μεων ἀπόδιξιν ποιούμενος μεγίστην τῆς προϋπαρχούσης αὐτῶι πίσ-
τεως πρὸς ἅπαντάς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν πα-
<ρ>αίτιος δ[ι]ατελεῖ γινόμενος ἡμῖν παράδειγμα πᾶσιν ἐκτιθεὶς τοῖς Ἕλλη[σι]ν ὅν
τρόπον προσφέρεται πρὸς τοὺς εὐεργέτας καὶ εὔνους ὑπάρχοντας αὐτῶι, κα[ὶ τ]ὰ
μὲν συ[ν]τελεῖ τῶν ἀγαθῶν δι᾽ ὧν εἰς εὐδαιμυνίαν παραγίνεθ᾽ ἡ πόλις ἡμ[ῶ]ν,
τὰ δ᾽ ἐ[πι]τελέσει · ἐπιστείλας δὲ πρὸς τὸν δῆμον ὑπέλαβε δεῖν πέμψαι [πρὸ]ς
[αὐτὸν π]ρεσβείαν ἡ συνλαλήσει περὶ ὧν ἔφη πεπεῖσθαι καὶ τῶι δήμ[ωι] συμ-
[φέρειν], καὶ τοῦ δήμου πρεσβευτὰς ἐξαποστίλαντος Διονύσιον Ἀπολλο-
[. . . . .], Ἑρμαγόραν Ἐπιμένου, Θεόδωρον Ζωπύρου ἐνεφάνισε τούτοις
[ὅτι πα]ραλέλυκε τὴμ πόλιν εἰς ἀεὶ καθότι ἐπηγίλατο ὧν συνετάξα-
[μεν φ]όρων βασιλεῖ Ἀττάλωι ὑπὲρ ὧν καὶ γράψας ἔφη ἐντετάλθαι τοῖς
[πρεσβευταῖ]ς ἀναγγέλλειν ἡμεῖν καὶ οἱ πρεσβευταὶ ἀνήγγ[ι]λαν ταῦ-
[τα τῶι δήμ]ωι· κατὰ ταὐτὰ δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ βασίλισσα Λαοδίκη ἔν
[τε τοῖς ἄλλ]οις τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχουσα γνώμην διατελεῖ τῶι βασιλεῖ καὶ
[- - 7-8 - -κ]αὶ ἐν τοῖς πρὸς τὴμ πόλιν φιλανθρώποις ἐκτενῆ καὶ πρό-
[θυ]μον έ[αυτ]ὴν παρέχεται πρὸς τὰς εὐεργεσίας, καὶ τὰ μέγιστα
[τῶ]ν ἀγα[θῶ]ν ὁ δῆμος εἴληφε παῤ ἀμφοτέρων ἵνα οὖν καὶ ἡμῖς ἐμ
[πα]ντὶ κα[ιρῶ]ι φαινώμεθα χάριτας ἀξίας ἀποδιδόντες τῶι τε βασι-
[λε]ῖ καὶ τῇ [βα]σιλίσσῃ καὶ ὑπερτιθέμενοι ἡαυτοὺς ἐν ταῖς τ[ιμ]αῖς ταῖς πρὸς
[τ]ούτους κα[τὰ] τὰς εὐεργεσίας καὶ φανερὸς ᾖ πᾶσιν ὁ δῆ[μος] εὐπορίσ-
τως διακίμε[ν]ος πρὸς χάριτος ἀπόδοσιν τύχῃ ἀγαθῇ π̣[α]ραστῆσαι
τῶι ἀγάλματ[ι] τ̣οῦ Διονύσου ἀγάλματα μαρμάρινα ὡς κάλλιστ[α καὶ ἰε]-
ροπρεπέστατ[α] τοῦ τε βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου καὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐ[τ]οῦ [βα]-
σιλίσσης Λαο[δί]κης, ὅπως ἀφέντες τὴμ πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν ἱερὰν
καὶ ἄσυλον καὶ [π]αραλύσαντες ἡμᾶς τῶμ φόρων καὶ χαρισ[ά]μενοι ταῦ-
τα τῶι τε δήμ[ω]ι καὶ τῶι κοινῶι τῶμ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τ̣εχνιτῶν πα-
ρὰ πάντων τ[ὰς] τιμὰς κομίζωνται κατὰ τὸ δ̣[υνατὸν] κ̣[α]ὶ ναοῦ καὶ τῶν
ἄλλων με[τέχ]οντες τῶι Διονύσωι κοιν[οὶ σωτῆρε]ς ὑπάρχωσι τῆς
[πό]λε[ως ἡ]μῶν καὶ κοινῇ διδῶσιν ἡ[μῖν τὰγ]αθά·ἵνα δὲ καὶ τὰ
[ἐψ]ηφισ[μένα συν]τελῆται ἀποδεῖξαι ἐπισ[τάτας δ]ύο ἐξ ἁπάντων
[τῶμ] π̣ο[λιτῶν οἵτιν]ες ἐπιμελήσονται τ[ῆς τε κα]τασκευῆς τῶν ἀγαλ-
[μάτ]ω[ν καὶ τῆς ἀν]αθέσεως·τὸ δὲ ἀργ[ύριον τὸ] εἰς ταῦτα διδόναι

… he (Antiochos) has resolved to become the common benefactor (*euergetēs*) of all the Greek cities and especially of ours (Tēos), and, whilst staying on the other side of the Taurus, he was responsible for many advantages [**10**] towards us, and, having come to our region, he restored the affairs to a profitable conclusion and, having stayed in our city and seen our weakness in matters both public and private, on account of the continuous wars and the size of the contributions which we paid, and wishing to be piously disposed towards the god (Dionysos) to whom he has consecrated our city and our territory, and wishing to favour the people and the corporation of the Dionysiac artists, he went into the assembly and personally granted that the city and the territory be sacred (*hiera*) and inviolate (*asylos*) and free from tribute (*aphorologetos*), and, as for the other contributions which we paid to King Attalos, [**20**] promised that we would be freed through his agency, so that on account of the increase of the affairs of the city, he should not only receive the title of benefactor of the people, but also that of saviour (*sōtēr*) . . . [**36**] in the

> same manner his sister,[40] queen Laodike consistently adopts the same disposition as the king and [- - - -] and shows h[erself] eager and zealous in benefactions towards the city, and the people [**40**] has received the greatest of benefits from both; —in order that we too may be seen to return appropriate tokens of gratitude, in every occasion, to the king and the queen, and to surpass ourselves in the honours for them in relation to their benefactions, and in order that the people (*dēmos*) may show to all that it is generously disposed towards the returning of gratitude, —with good fortune, (it seemed good) to set up, by the cult-image of Dionysos, marble cult-images, as beautiful [and] as fitting for sacred matters as possible, of King Antiochos and his sister, Queen Laodike, so that, for having granted that the city and the territory should be sacred and inviolate and having released us from the tribute and having accomplished these actions as favours to the people and the corporation of the Dionysiac artists, [**50**] they should receive from everyone the honours, as much as possible, and that they should share in the temple and the other rituals of Dionysos and be the comm[on saviours] of the city and in common bestow favours on us; in order that the content of the decree be executed, to choose [two epis]tatai out of all the ci[tizens], who will see to the making and the dedication of the statues; to provide the money for this purpose …[41]

At the end of the third century Antiochos set out to reconquer and reclaim Asia Minor, Syria, and Koile-Syria, territories where the Seleukids were in direct conflict with the Attalids and the Ptolemies, and the satrapies east of the Taurus from Armenia to Baktria/India. *SEG* 41.1003, I and II belong within the context of Antiochos's campaigns in Asia Minor, either the second expedition of 204/3 or the third expedition of 197/6. Although the exact date is not entirely certain, it is evident that the decree of *SEG* 41.1003, I was issued prior to that of *SEG* 41.1003, II because the enumerated honors of the former have been realized and additional honors added in the latter. The dating of the decrees hinges upon the motivation behind the offering of *isotheoi timai* to the royal couple: the declaration that Tēos "and the territory be sacred and inviolate" (*SEG* 41.1003, I, line 18). In order "to enjoy *asylia* [ἀσυλία], a city (with its territory) had to be declared 'holy' (ἱερά) to a deity … [an action that resulted in] a combined acknowledgment of the city's consecrated status and an agreement to refrain from spoliation against the city or on its territory."[42] In this case, Antiochos dedicated Tēos and

---

[40] Not literally. Laodikē III was the king's first cousin, the daughter of his aunt Laodikē I and Mithradatēs II of Pontos. Reference to the queen as ἡ ἀδελφή (sister) is well documented and may have been used in certain contexts to emphasize good relations between husband and wife (Ma [2002] 2005, 255).

[41] Translation is that of Ma (2002) 2005, 310-11.

[42] Ma (2002) 2005, 261.

its territory to Dionysos, a god of local importance particularly in light of the fact that Tēos served as the base of the *Koinon* (Association) of the *Technitai* (Artists) of Dionysos of Ionia and the Hellespontine region, which was one of three major organized groups of stage performers under the protection of the god. In addition to the recognition of the city as *asylia*, Antiochos also freed Tēos from the heavy financial burden of the tribute payable to Attalos (I) Sōtēr of Pergamon (*SEG* 41.1003, I, lines 19-20). On the basis of the evidence for the conferral of *asylia* status, John Ma has argued in favor of dating *SEG* 41.1003, I and II to ca. 203, the date given in the original publication of the inscriptions.[43]

Upon drawing attention to the favorable disposition of Antiochos and Laodikē towards the city, the *SEG* 41.1003, I goes on to announce how the Teians will respond to the benefactions received from the royal couple in accordance with the reciprocity agreement invoked as a result of euergetism: "in order that we too may be seen to return appropriate tokens of gratitude, in every occasion, to the king and the queen, and to surpass ourselves in the honours for them in relation to their benefactions, and in order that the people may show to all that it is generously disposed towards the returning of gratitude" (lines 40-44). The "appropriate tokens of gratitude" equate to marble *agalmata* (cult statues) of both Antiochos and Laodikē to be fashioned as beautiful as possible and placed in Dionysos's temple near the god's own *agalma*.[44] The production of cult images of the king and queen and the placement of those images in a temple as *synnaoi theoi* are precisely the sort of honorific acts that were normally reserved for the gods and, thus, belong to the category of *isotheoi timai*. Note also that *SEG* 41.1003, I stipulates that Antiochos "should not only receive the title of benefactor of the people, but also that of saviour," (lines 20-22) and that both he and Laodikē "be the comm[on saviours] of the

[43] See Appendix 2 in Ma (2002) 2005, 260-65.

[44] *Agalmata* were part of the communication process between humans and gods, and successful communication depended upon the successful attraction of a divinity's attention. Aesthetics functioned as one of the strategies utilized to draw the attention of the gods. The beauty of an *agalma* thus held great importance since an object that pleased the targeted deity would be more likely to attract his or her attention. For these principles as applied to Hellenistic festivals, see Chaniotis 2013, 32, 34–9.

city and in common bestow favours on us" (lines 51-52).[45] The application of terms such as *sōtēr*/*sōteira* and *euergetēs*/*euergetis* to men and women in power represents another major characteristic of Hellenistic rulership and ruler cults, the use of epithets as part of the official and unofficial titulatures of Hellenistic rulers (discussed in Chapter 3).

SEG 41.1003, II, which I do not reproduce here, provides the details of the Antiocheia and Laodikeia, an entirely new festival to be held annually in Leukatheon, the first month of the Teian calendar.[46] The valuable contribution of Antiochos's benefaction to civic freedom (i.e., the grant of *asylia* and release from the Pergamene tribute) may have directed the installation of the Antiocheia and Laodikeia at this point in the year, as Leukatheon was an important time for the function and structure of Tēos as a *polis*. It was at this time that the new magistrates assumed office, the latest cohort of adolescent males became citizens, and the Leukathea, a festival of the sub-tribal civic divisions called the *symmoriai*, were celebrated. The ritual patterns of the Leukathea guided the performance of the Antiocheia and Laodikeia where the *symmoriai* were concerned. Like the traditional festival, the new festival required the citizens of Tēos to sacrifice by *symmoriai* at altars erected by each *symmoria* adjacent to its own altar. The ritual activities required of the *symmoriai* were partially financed from centralized *polis* funds and supervised by a high-ranking priest, in this case the priest of Antiochos in parallel

---

[45] That Laodikē received honors alongside of and equivalent to her husband is indicative of the importance attached to the women of Hellenistic dynasties not only as queens and mothers and sisters of kings, but also as women with their own agency, able to act as benefactors and even rule in their own right in some instances. Particularly true of the Kleopatras belonging to the combined Seleukid-Ptolemaic genealogy initiated by the marriage of Kleopatra (I) Thea Epiphanēs Eucharistos, daughter of Antiochos III and Laodikē, and Ptolemy (V) Epiphanēs Eucharistos in 193 B.C.E.. Select bibliography of Hellenistic queens and queenship: G. Macurdy, *Hellenistic Queens: A Study of Woman-power in Macedonia, Seleucid Syria and Ptolemaic Egypt* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1932); I. Savalli-Lestrade," Il ruolo pubblico delle regine ellenistiche," in S. Alessandri (ed.), *Ἱστορίη. Studi offerti degli allievi a Giuseppe Nenci in occasione del suo settantesimo compleanno* (Galatina: Congedo, 1994), 415-32; J. E. G. Whitehorne, *Cleopatras* (London: Routledge, 1994); Roy 1998; S. Ager, "Familiarity breeds: Incest and the Ptolemaic dynasty," *JHS* 125 (2004): 1-34; Caneva 2012; E. D. Carney, "Oikos Keeping: Women and Monarchy in the Macedonian Tradition," in S. L. James and S. Dillon (eds.), *Companion to Women in the Ancient World* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 304-15 with useful bibliography; B. F. van Oppen de Ruiter, *Berenice II Euergetis: Essays in Early Hellenistic Queenship* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015); Coskun and McAuley 2016.

[46] Gauthier 1985, 169; Ma (2002) 2005, 220-24; Caneva 2012, 90–2.

to the Leukathea's priest of Poseidon (*SEG* 41.1003, II, lines 9-17). This alignment of the new with the traditional "illustrates how reproduction of existing ritual allowed the integration of ruler cult within existing structures."[47]

In a move that further emphasized the magnitude of Antiochos's benefaction, the Teians installed another *agalma* of the king in their *bouleutērion* (meeting place of the *boulē*), thereby making this key place of civic assembly a site of ruler cult. This cult statue of Antiochos was due a number of offerings throughout the year, including first fruits and the crowns of victorious athletes (*SEG* 41.1003, II, lines 29-63). Laodikē also received additional honors in the form of an eponymous *krēnē* (fountain), a memorial of the queen's piety, centrally located in the *agora* (market) for a grant of grain to the city. The fountain's waters were to supply libations for a variety of public and private offerings, from sacrifices in favor of the *polis* to bridal baths (*SEG* 41.1003, II, lines 64-90). Together, the *bouleutērion* with its *agalma* of Antiochos and the fountain of Laodikē became new foci of essential moments and rituals in the political, religious, and social tapestry of Tēos.[48] Ruler cult enacted through repetition of the Antiocheia and Laodikeia, offerings to the *agalma* of Antiochos, and the use of water from Laodikē's fountain expressed gratitude for the beneficence of the royal couple and perpetuated the memories of both the acts of euergetism and of Antiochos and Laodikē themselves.[49]

SEG 41.1003, I and II demonstrate how the imprint of ruler cults on communities and collective memory was effected through single or repeated instances of performative cultic action and the physical monuments created as a result of acts of euergetism and the requiting honorific decrees. Inscriptions, statues, paintings, and architectural works occupied conspicuous places of honor in spaces and places more-or-less freely accessible to the public, such as *agorai* (marketplaces or gathering places), *gymnasia* (sites of

---

[47] Ma (2002) 2005, 220.

[48] Ma (2002) 2005, 223.

[49] Caneva (2012, 90-1) notes that the *isotheoi timai* for Antiochos and Laodikē belong to two different but complimentary spheres, his to the political life of the *polis* and hers to marriage, family, and prosperity/fertility.

education and physical training), and theaters, and those defined according varying levels of restricted access, such as temples and sacred precincts. These visual-textual objects functioned both to document the worthiness of the honorands to receive *isotheoi timai* alongside the gratitude of the recipients of his/her beneficence and to fix the euergetic transaction and the identities of those involved within the topographical fabric of cities and sanctuaries in perpetuity.[50] The honorific decrees that authorized and initiated divine honors typically included a standard stipulation whereby the decree was to be inscribed on a stone stele and the stele set up in a specified location so that the inscription itself became part of the honors decreed. For example, the well-known Pergamene decree for Attalos (III) Philomētōr Euergetēs (*OGIS* 332) required that decree be inscribed on a marble stele to be set up in the sanctuary of Asklēpios in front of the temple.[51]

Apart from freestanding stele pronouncing honorific decrees, inscriptions served as the voices of works of art and architecture, allowing objects and built structures to communicate who commissioned them and for what purpose as part of regular interactions with viewers/users. Where architectural works are concerned, sponsorship of the (re)construction of buildings, gateways, and numerous other types of structures was an essential form of euergetism that addressed infrastructural necessity, economic productivity, and aesthetic enhancement, and the associated dedicatory inscriptions worked to create and maintain visual relationships between the names of the donors and their gifts.[52] Other architectural works and their dedicatory inscriptions were part of the honors decreed in response to euergetism, as with the eponymous fountain dedicated

---

[50] Or at least until such a time that the monument was removed or defaced because the honorand had fallen out of favor or there was a regime change. A famous example is the anti-Macedonian sentiment in Athens that led to a vote to expunge any reference to the Macedonian royal house in 200 B.C.E. (e.g., the tribes named for Dēmētrios Poliorkētēs and his father Antigonos Monophthalmos were abolished).

[51] *OGIS* 332, lines 59-60: ἀναγρ[άψαι] τὸ ψήφισμα εἰς στήλην μαρμαρίνην καὶ στῆσαι | ἐν τῶι το[ῦ] Ἀσκληπιοῦ ἱερῶι πρὸ τοῦ νᾳοῦ.

[52] E.g., Dedicatory inscription of the Stoa of Attalos in the Athenian Agora: Agora I 6135; *SEG* XVI 158; N. Kaye, "The Dedicatory Inscription of the Stoa of Attalos in the Athenian Agora: Public Property, Commercial Space, and Hellenistic Kings," *Hesperia* 85.3 (2016): 537-558 (with bibliography and a history of the publications).

to Laodikē at Tēos (*SEG* 41.1003, II, lines 64-90). The prescribed drawing of water for use in public sacrifices and the less public events of marriage and death meant regular, repeated contact with the fountain and the messages specific to Laodikē and her husband at various levels of the *polis* social structure.[53]

Statuary was the highest form of public honor that any person could receive, and the *eikōn* and *agalma* utilized text inscribed on the statue base as a caption that worked with the physical likeness of the subject to communicate identifying information. Benefactors honored in this way were afforded the opportunity to literally put a face on their acts of euergetism and gain an enduring corporeal presence in conspicuous and prestigious locations. So much of the honorific statuary that existed in antiquity has been irretrievably lost, and the decrees and statue bases that attest to how much is missing typically do not contain a great deal of specificity regarding the appearance of the statues. *SEG* 41.1003, I and II are rare in providing the materials of the *agalmata* of Antiochos and Laodikē, two of were to be of marble (*SEG* 41.1003, I, line 45) and the third of bronze (*SEG* 41.1003, II, line 32). *OGIS* 332 (lines 7-11) also provides rare insightful detail regarding statues decreed for Attalos (III) Philomētōr Euergetēs: an *agalma* representing the *basileus* in military kit to be installed in the Temple of Asklēpios Sōtēr so that he could be *synnaos theos* with the god; and a golden (likely gilded bronze) equestrian *eikōn* to be erected adjacent to the altar of Zeus Sōtēr in the most visible place in the *agora*.[54] While these two inscriptions demonstrate that differentiation cannot be hard-and-fast, *agalma* came to denote in the Hellenistic period a marble honorific portrait of a mortal in the context of divine honors and *eikōn* the image of a human being rendered in bronze (or the higher honor of gilded bronze), marble, or a panel painting. The standing figure, nude or armoured, and the equestrian image were the most common

---

[53] Ma (2002) 2005, 222-23.

[54] *OGIS* 332, lines 7-11: καθιερῶσαι δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄγαλμα πεντάπηχυ τεθωρακισμέ- | νον καὶ βεβηκὸς ἐπὶ σκύλων ἐν τῶι ναῶι τοῦ Σωτῆρος Ἀσκληπιοῦ, ἵνα ᾖ[ι] | σύνναος τῶι θεῶι, στῆσαι δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰκόνα χρυσῆν ἔφιππον ἐπὶ στυ- | λίδος μαρμαρίνης παρὰ τὸν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Σωτῆρος βωμόν, ὅπως ὑπάρχηι ἡ | εἰκὼν ἐν τῶι ἐπιφανεστάτωι τόπωι τῆς ἀγορᾶς.

forms.[55] Known statue types and surviving royal portraits on coins and in sculpture (where often the head has become detached from its body) can provide some idea of the appearance of honorific statues of Hellenistic rulers; hints can also be found in direct and indirect references in the writings of ancient authors like Pausanias.

2.4. Hellenistic Ruler Cult and Roman Magistrates (2nd-1st centuries B.C.E.)

Mortal deification in this discussion of ruler cult has been considered a function of providing praise, gratitude, and acknowledgement for achievements beyond human measure and the honorand's ability and willingness to demonstrate efficacy in the care and protection of subordinate populations. The actions that warranted gratitude expressed as divine honors were directly related to the tangible motivations for *poleis* to utilize ruler cult in service of preserving or restoring civic freedom—liberation from foreign rule, deliverance from an external enemy, and financial and/or material aid in the face of an imminent threat. These motivations dovetail with the view that civic religion and traditional divine cults facilitated the integration of a dominant extra-*polis* power into the *polis* structure. These aspects of ruler cult speak to the deeply-rooted interconnections of ruler cult and the institution of euergetism, connections that provided a climate in which relations between *poleis* and Hellenistic rulers occurred through a euergetic reciprocal dialogue. The shift from the Hellenistic monarchies to the Roman state as the source of extra-*polis* power did not drastically alter the mechanics of ruler cult; the part of the recipient of the honors was recast, but the idiom itself remained intact. The familiar patterns of honors in both language and action carried through to the emergent non-royal cults so that the new power dynamic was represented in ways a widespread audience could recognize and interpret. Given that ruler cult traditions were already part of the rhythms of civic life, the use and adaptation of the existing system seems a

[55] Ma 2013, 2–4; see also Smith 1988, 15–6, 32–4.

likely response to the socio-political changes of the second and first centuries. As Price has aptly point out, the situation was not one of "the Greeks … fumbling for ways to represent a non-monarchical state. The variety and changes of the cults seem rather to show clear-sighted perception of the new situation."[56]

The expansion of Rome's ascendancy in the eastern Mediterranean brought both fortune and misfortune to the peoples and cities of the Hellenistic East. On the one hand, Roman gains in Macedon, Greece, and Asia Minor liberated cities from the monarchical rule put in place by the spread of Macedonian hegemony beginning with Philip II and Alexander III. Liberation and declarations of the freedom of the Greeks afforded *poleis* the right to be ungarrisoned and restored the right of democratic self-governance, in theory if not always in the actual course of events. On the other hand, Rome's presence in the eastern Mediterranean caused further disruption and periods of hardship borne from the steady outbreaks of war and the realities of Roman governance and taxation. Besides the danger, fear, and destruction people experienced on a regular basis, active fighting and the need to secure and keep order in the *provinciae* required the presence of Roman armies, the maintenance of which put a significant strain on local resources. Worse still were the all-too-common abuses visited upon *poleis* and surrounding areas by unscrupulous governors and corrupt *publicani* (tax-farmers), who sought to profit from the time spent discharging their official duties. Governors who sought to increase their personal wealth found ways to take advantage of the system and extort money from local populations as well as plunder expensive objects like works of art from cities, temples, and sanctuaries.[57] *Publicani* were agents of the *societates publicanorum*, groups of stockholders who bid on state contracts for a variety of purposes including the collection of tithes on agricultural produce, grain in particular, and customs dues in the *provinciae*. The collection of funds over and above the contracted amount resulted

[56] Price 1984b, 43.

[57] Richardson 1994, 583, 588–89, 594–95. The quintessential case of a corrupt governor is of course Gaius Verres, whom Cicero famously prosecuted in 70 B.C.E. for plundering Sicily during governorship of the island (73-71).

in profits for the *societates*, and so there was obvious motivation to collect more than was necessary.[58] Also contributing to these financial abuses were the money-lenders and *negotiatores* (businessmen) who flocked to the east from Italy. Magistrates who took action to improve the general state of affairs for inhabitants of the *provinciae*, to provide safety and prosperity at the *provincia* and *polis* levels, and to preserve the freedom of *poleis* achieved the kinds of salvatory benefactions associated with *sōtēres*, *euergetai*, and *ktistai*. They were extraordinary benefactors worthy of *isotheoi timai*.[59] The purpose of this section is not to provide an exhaustive and comprehensive accounting of all divine honors and cultic worship for Roman magistrate-benefactors in the last two centuries B.C.E., but rather to give an impression of the honorific environment into which Antonius entered when he arrived in Asia after Philippi. Additional discussion will occur alongside the honors afforded Antonius where needed.

The earliest known case of divine honors offered to a Roman magistrate-benefactor is Titus Quinctius Flamininus in the early second century.[60] Flamininus defeated Philip V of Macedon at Kynoskephalai in 197, which forced the king to evacuate Greece, and subsequently declared the freedom of the Greeks at the Isthmian Games in 196.[61] He also brought salvation through his interventions in the wars against the Spartan ruler Nabis in the Peloponnesos (195) and Antiochos (III) Megas (192-190/89). Several surviving honorific statue bases refer to Titus as *sōtēr* and/or *euergetēs* or otherwise highlight his *aretē* (excellence/virtue/goodness), *eunoia* (goodwill),[62] and *euergesia*.[63] Titus was also honored with a festival called the Titeia at Argos and his own

---

[58] Richardson 1994, 584–89; Bringmann 2007, 161–62, 186–87.

[59] Thériault 2001, 85–7, 89–90, 91.

[60] Thériault (2001, 88; 2012, 377), following Ferrary (1997, 217 n. 47 and App. 2.1), attributes the festival of the Marcelleia in Syracuse to Gaius Claudius Marcellus, governor of Sicily in 79 B.C.E., rather than Marcus Claudius Marcellus, conqueror of Syracuse in 212 B.C.E. See also *SEG* 51.2351.

[61] Plut., *Flam*. 10-12 for the freedom of the Greeks and the honors Titus received as a result.

[62] *Aretē* and *eunoia* belong to the communitarian values and norms of the *polis* (Ma 2013, 55, 62–3).

[63] *IG* XII 9.931 (Chalkis on Euboia); *SEG* 22.214 (Corinth); *SIG*^{3} 592 (Gytheion); *SIG*^{3} 616 (Delphi); *SEG* 23.412 (Scotussa in Thessaly). Translations in Sherk 1984, no. 6.

festival day within a larger festival for the imperial family (ca. 15 C.E.) at Gytheion.[64] The Chalkidians were especially fond of Titus, and there remained into the second century C.E., according to Plutarch (*Flam*. 16.4), a priest of Titus at Chalkis who offered sacrifices followed by the singing of a hymn to him.[65] Other examples from the second century include:

- Lucius Mummius, *consul*, victor of the Archaian War and conqueror of Korinth (146): *agōn* at Eretria (*SEG* 51.1102bis; Ferrary 1997, App. 2.2; Thériault 2001, 87 and n. 15);[66] equestrian statues at Argos (*SEG* 30.365 and 41.286) and Olympia (*SIG*^{3} 676);
- Manius Aquilius, the *proconsul* of *provincia Asia* (129 to 126), first to organize the *provincia* and build roads: priest at Pergamon (*IGRR* IV 292 [lines 38-40]; Cerfaux and Tondriau 1957, 279; Sherk 1984, nos. 42, 43, 45; Thériault 2001, 89 and n. 29);
- Marcus Annius, *quaestor*, repulsed an invasion of the Scordisci (a Gallic tribe) in 120/19: annual equestrian contest in the Macedonian city of Lētē (*SIG*^{3} 700; Cerfaux and Tondriau 1957, 279; Sherk 1984, no. 48; Ferrary 1997, App. 2.3; Thériault 2001, 89 and n. 30).

The heyday of cults for Roman magistrate-benefactors came in the following century on the basis of a greater abundance of available evidence. The first half of the first century was a watershed moment for Rome's presence in the east, Asia Minor especially, on account of the three major campaigns (88-85, 83-82, 75-66) against the seemingly indestructible Mithradatēs (VI) Eupatōr Dionysos of Pontos. In his multiple attempts to wrest Asia from Rome, Mithradatēs was a significant threat and caused considerable disruption and instability in the region, and his final defeat allowed Rome to solidify its hold on *provincia Asia* and the surrounding areas. The second half of the first century was largely dominated by the repercussions of the fierce competition for

---

[64] Argos: *SEG* 22.266 (line 14); G. Daux, "Concours des *Titeia* dans un décret d'Argos," *BCH* 88 (1964), 569-76; Sherk 1984, no. 6G (translation of lines 13-14) P. Charneux, "En relisant les décrets argiens," *BCH* 114 (1990), 395-415, esp. 411-13; Thériault 2001, 87 and n. 11. Gytheion: *SEG* 11.923 (line 11); Thériault 2001, 87 and n. 12; E. Calandra and M. E. Gorrini, "Cult practice of a pompé in the imperial age: S.E.G. XI.923," *ΣPARTA* 2 (2008), 3-22.

[65] Plutarch (*Flam*. 16.3) also says that Titus's name could also still be seen inscribed on a gymnasium, a joint dedication with Herakles, and the Delphinion, a joint dedication with Apollo. Plutarch refers to the two buildings as *anathēmata* (votive offerings) dedicated to the named deities and Titus.

[66] It is possible that Mummius rewarded Eretria for its support against the Achaian League with a gift of the coveted territory of Oropos (D. Knoepfler, "Lucius Mummius, a benefactor of Eretria?" *Swiss School of Archaeology in Greece*. https://www.unil.ch/esag/en/home/menuinst/eretria/history/2nd-century/lucius-mummius.html [accessed 26 November 2016]).

power among the political élite in the city of Rome that eventually led to the change from republic to principate. Areas of the eastern *provinciae* became theaters of war during the internecine conflicts between Pompeius Magnus and Gaius Julius Caesar, between the Caesarians (Antonius and Octavianus) and Caesar's assassins (Marcus Iunius Brutus and Gaius Cassius Longinus), and between Antonius and Octavianus. As in the preceding century, the men with the power to liberate and protect cities, address corruption, provide financial and material aid, and alleviate taxes as well as the levies imposed for the payment of armies during these uncertain times were prime targets for *isotheoi timai*. Magistrate-benefactors honored in the first three decades of the century include:

- Quintus Mucius Scaevola, *proconsul* and exemplary governor of Asia in 98/7 or 94/3, honored for his efforts to restore the financial and judicial welfare of the *provincia*: multiple eponymous penteteric *agōnes* called the Moukieia (Cic., *Verr*. 2.21; Diod. Sic., 37.5-6; *OGIS* 437-439; Sherk 1984, no. 57 (translation of *OGIS* 437 [lines 25-55]); Ferrary 1997, App. 2.5; Thériault 2001, 89 and n. 31; Thériault 2012, 377–80);[67]
- Lucius Cornelius Sulla, victorious general of the First Mithradatic War and negotiator of the Peace of Dardanos in 86: the Sylleia festival and a statue erected on account of his *aretē* and *eunoia* in Athens (*IG* II^2 1039 [Sylleia], 4103 [statue base]); Raubitschek 1951; Ferrary 1997, App. 2.7; Habicht 1997, 311 and n. 49; Thériault 2001, 89 and n. 32; see also *SEG* 13.279;[68]
- Lucius Licinius Lucullus, victorious commander of the Roman forces during the first phase of the Third Mithradatic War and liberator of Kyzikos in the early 70s: festivals and *agōnes* called the Leukoulleia in Asia (Plut., *Luc*. 23.2; Ferrary 1997, App. 2.10; Thériault 2001, 89 and n. 33; Thériault 2012, 381–81) and specifically in Kyzikos (App., *Mithr*. 76).

The 60s and early 40s stand out as the decades in which the enormously powerful and popular rivals Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus and Gaius Julius Caesar were active in the east. In 67 Pompeius Magnus secured for himself a grant of extraordinary *imperium*, the executive power of the *populus Romanus* invested in certain high magistrates and promagistrates, to address the pirate problem. He quickly rid the Mediterranean basin of

[67] It seems that the Moukieia were celebrated in the major cities of *provincia Asia*.

[68] Although Sulla had besieged and sacked Athens and Piraeus in 87/6 because the city supported Mithradatēs, his return to Athens in 84/3 was much more affable; the Sylleia may or may not have taken place at that time (Raubitschek 1951, 49–50). The honors for Sulla may have marked the restoration of several Aegean islands, including Delos, to Athens.

rampant piracy, securing the safety of shipping and of coastal cities vulnerable to pirate attacks in the process.[69] On the heels of his victory over the pirates, Pompeius secured the command against Mithradatēs in the second phase of the third war. Between 66 and 64 Pompeius drove Mithradatēs out of Asia Minor for the final time and pushed south to conquer Syria. As part of his subsequent settlements and reorganization of the east, Pompeius established the provinciae Bithynia and Pontus, Cilicia, and Syria, and formed client-states loyal to him as patron.[70] His achievements on land and sea earned Pompeius widespread recognition. He was hailed as *sōtēr* and *euergetēs* in places like Milētos and Milētopolis and honored as an isotheos at Side.[71] Mytilēnē, which had supported Mithradatēs in the First Mithradatic War, honored Pompeius as *sōtēr* and *ktistēs* because he restored the city's freedom.[72] When the Hellenistic East lost its great benefactor as a result of Pompeius's defeat at Pharsalos in 48, focus shifted to his rival Julius Caesar, who was now in a position to punish or pardon the cities that had supported Pompeius in the civil war. Offerings of divine honors, especially of the pre-emptive sort, were one way for cities to demonstrate repentance and urge Rome's new master towards amnesty. No fewer than 18 honorific statue bases belonging to the two years following Pharsalos attest to divine honors for Caesar throughout Greece, the Aegean Islands, and Asia Minor.[73] A number of *poleis* like Ephesos, Pergamon, Karthaia on Keos, and Athens erected statues to Caesar as *sōtēr* and *euergetēs*.[74] One inscription from Athens (*SEG* 14.121) may be

---

[69] Bringmann 2007, 214-18.

[70] Bringmann 2007, 218-20.

[71] Wiegand (ed.), *Milet, Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen seit dem Jahre 1899* (Berlin 1906), I: 7.253 (Milētos); *ILS* 9459 (Milētopolis); G. E. Bean, *Inscriptions of Side* (Ankara 1965), no. 101; Sherk 1984, no. 75 A, C (Milētos and Milētopolis); Thériault 2001, 89 and n. 34; Hoff 2005, 331 and n. 18. See also Plut. *Pomp*. 27.3, 42.4-5; Cerfaux and Tondriau 1957, 284–85; Sherk 1984, no. 75; Thériault 2001, 89 and n. 34; Hoff 2005.

[72] Plut. *Pomp*. 42.4; *SIG*[3] 751; Sherk 1984, no. 75 A; Thériault 2001, 89 and n. 34; Hoff 2005, 331 and n. 21. There was also a month named after Pompeius (*IG* XII 2.59 [line 18]).

[73] Raubitschek 1954 remains the standard work on the subject. See also the list provided in Taylor (1931) 1981, 267-69.

[74] *SIG*[3] 760 (Ephesos); *IGRR* 4.303, 307 (Pergamon); *IG* XII 5. 556, 557 (Karthaia); *SEG* 14.121, Raubitschek 1954, 65–6, F (Athens); Sherk 1984, no. 79.

related to the pardon the Athenians received from Caesar directly after Pharsalos.[75]

2.5. A Sign of Things to Come: The Gold *stater* of Titus Quinctius Flamininus

The incorporation of Roman magistrates into the honorific system that underpinned the Hellenistic rulership model created the environment in which there occurred an early Roman intervention in the coinages of the East that anticipated what became normal practice from Antonius onward. Around the time that Flamininus declared the freedom of the Greeks, a familiar philhellenic rhetorical tactic of Hellenistic rulers in their dealings with Greek cities, the Roman general appears also to have made use of the royal prerogative of promulgating one's public image through coinage. The coins in questions are an exceptional issue of Attic-weight gold staters (*RRC* 548/1a-b) thought to have been struck after 197 at a mint in Greece, possibly Chalkis on Euboia or Corinth (Figure 4).[76] If not for the substitution of the Latin name T QVINCTI (Titus Quinctius) for the Greek name and title(s) of a king on the reverse, one would be hard pressed to classify these issues as something other than a royal gold coinage at first glance. The portrait style of the bearded male figure on the obverse is very much in line with representations of Hellenistic kings, particularly the style of the hair. The mass of serpentine locks that falls long on the nape, forms a starfish-shaped cowlick at the crown, and lifts off the forehead was an essential ideological component of the male royal portrait because the hairstyle was meant to visually invoke and emulate Alexander. A major part of the youthful appearance characteristic of representations of Alexander is his hair, a long leonine mane of serpentine locks with a distinctive *anastolē* (cowlick) that imparts vertical lift to the hair above the forehead and a starfish cowlick centered at the crown of the head (Figure 5).[77] In fact, the *stater* portraits have some similitude with

[75] App., *B Civ*. 2.88.368; Cass. Dio, 42.14.1-3; Raubitschek 1954, 66.

[76] Mørkholm 1991, 137; de Callataÿ 2011, 59.

[77] Smith 1988, 46–53; Stewart 1993, 52–6, 63–70, 170.

the likeness of Flamininus's defeated foe Philip V (Figure 6), but lack the telltale sign of Hellenistic royalty, the *diadēma* (headband), which was worn wrapped around the head and tied in a knot beneath the occipital ridge with the ends left long.[78] Also of royal origin is the reverse image of a standing winged Nikē holding a palm frond and crowning the name T QVINCTI with the laurel wreath of victory. This reverse type copies a well-known type of Alexander still in use.[79]

The use of Latin script on what is by nature a Greek coin has resulted in a hybrid issue indicative of the complex responses to the spread of Roman hegemony over the East as manifested in the many currency systems. Estimates place the output of the staters at about 100,000 coins, which is not an insignificant number and suggests an actual monetary purpose rather than commemorative gift-giving.[80] As such, the appearance of Flamininus's name and what must be his portrait suggest that the staters fall within his authority and likely should not be considered among the honors offered to Flamininus, but rather a consequence of the honorific treatment he received and the transfer of the role of the Hellenistic ruler to Rome's representatives. The Flamininus staters did not spark an immediate trend of eastern coinages exhibiting explicit signs of Roman intervention, and the portrait of no other Roman magistrate appeared on a non-Roman coin struck in the East until the silver *cistophori* issued for Antonius in *provincia Asia* in the early 30s (see Chapter 4). Unlike the ambiguity and overriding royal character of the staters, the Antonian *cistophori* overtly bear a recognizable portrait of Antonius, albeit in a style influenced by Hellenistic models, and his name and official titles in Latin script. Thus, although preempted by Flamininus, Antonius represents the first true instance of a Roman magistrate's likeness appearing on an eastern coinage, which was one of several major contributions Antonius made to the development of Rome's empire.

---

[78] Smith 1988, 34–8; Stewart 1993, 91–2 and n. 74, 352–57 (T 32–48).

[79] Mørkholm 1991, 42, 137.

[80] de Callataÿ 2011, 59–61; P. Thonemann, *The Hellenistic World: Using Coins as Sources* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 169; cf. Mørkholm 1991, 136.

When Antonius took up the mantle of his triumviral authority over the East in 42, he became the most important Roman magistrate-benefactor in the region and a rather likely recipient of divine honors from cities. And yet, for the most part, evaluations of Antonius as a prominent historical figure have separated him from this honorific system in which ruler cult routinely functioned as the currency of euergetic exchange between poleis and benefactors worthy of isotheoi timai. The remaining chapters will set aside the personal judgments and assumptions that have accumulated around Antonius over time and reconsider the issue of his deification in the Hellenistic East in light of the contextual background provided here. The process begins with the epigraphical evidence from Athens in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3

Athens Offers Divine Honors to Antonius

Two inscriptions from the city of Athens**,** *IG* II^2 1043 and *Agora* XVIII H273 (Agora Inv. I 3071), stand as concrete proof that Antonius received divine honors in the city on one or more occasions during his tenure as *triumvir*. These honors consist of the eponymous Antonieia festival dedicated to Antonius as Theos Neos Dionysos (*IG* II^2 1043, lines 22-23) and the title Theoi Euergetai for Antonius and his wife Octavia together as a couple (*Agora* XVIII H273). Whether or not the two inscriptions should be regarded as a pair or as separate but related documents is unclear. On the one hand, the honors referenced in *IG* II^2 1043 are unquestionably *isotheoi timai* of the type offered by a *polis* to a ruler/magistrate-benefactor since the reference occurs within the context of an official monument recording four decrees of the *boulē*. Although the inscription carries an archontal year in accordance with the Athenian civil dating system, the chronology is not entirely certain; attribution is to either 38/7 or 37/6 B.C.E. with the Antonieia occurring in the year previous, either 39/8 or 38/7. On the other hand, *Agora* XVIII H273 is a small and disembodied fragment, catalogued as belonging to an altar (original location unknown), that evinces neither dedicant nor date, which must fall within the period between 39 and 32 because Octavia would not otherwise be mentioned. Regardless of whether the dedicant responsible for *Agora* XVIII H273 was the Athenian *dēmos*, a sub-group within the population, or an individual, the appellation of Antonius and Octavia as Theoi Euergetai, a title familiar from Hellenistic royal titulature, likely also stems from a civic initiative to honor the couple.

Unfortunately, the nuances of the situation in Athens have been generally ignored as a result of the chronic marginalization of the epigraphic evidence. The evidential value of the inscriptions has not derived from their existence as rare, independent

documents contemporary with Antonius's lifetime, but from their perceived ability to support the largely non-contemporary literary image of Antonius and his alleged self-imposed deification as Dionysos. The purpose of this chapter is to bring *IG* II^2 1043 and *Agora* XVIII H273 out of the shadows and recontextualize the evidence by means of an inversion of the typical approach to the material, which is to make the literary testimony secondary to the epigraphic. The long-standing interpretation of these two Athenian monuments without individual analysis as standalone documents has led to an oversimplification and, to some extent, a misrepresentation of how the evidence fits together. Each informs the other, but not necessarily in a one-to-one relationship.

3.1. *IG* II^2 1043, Ephebic Monument of 37/6 B.C.E.

IG II^2 1043, by far the better known of the two Athenian inscriptions, records four decrees of the Athenian *boulē* pertaining to the previous year's members of the *ephēbeia*.[1] The *ephēbeia* was the two-year institutionalized program meant to provide intellectual, civic, military, and athletic training to young male citizens ages 18-19 (the ephebes), whose activities included participation in religious ceremonies and processions and in sacred games.[2] The second decree (lines 16-40) documents a request on behalf of the ephebes to recognize their *kosmētēs*, an instructor and central administrator within the *ephēbeia*, for exemplary service. It is within the list of laudable deeds enacted by the

[1] *IG* II^2 1043 (= *IG* II 482). Discovered 9 March 1861 at Άγιος Δημήτριος Κατηφόρης and now in the National Museum. 37 fragments of Hymettian marble arranged and edited by Κουμανουδης; dimensions of assembled fragments: h. 1.95 m, w. 0.85 m, d. 0.26 m; height of letters 0.007 m, non-stoichedon, versus prorsus inaequales. Σ. Α. Κουμανουδης, "Τριών εφηβικών στηλών ενεκδότων η πρώτη," Χρυσαλλις 4.87 (1866): 356-61 (online access: http://xantho.lis.upatras.gr/kosmopolis/index.php/xrysallis/issue/view/250); Taylor (1931) 1981, 122; Deubner (1932) 1969, 236; Tarn (1934) 1952, 52; Raubitschek 1946, 148–49 and nn. 9-10; J. Kirchner, *Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum*, vol 2, Berlin, 1948, no. 116, pl. 43; Taeger 1960, 92 and n. 23; Pélékidis 1962, 255; Habicht 1997, 362; De Lozier 2002, 184–201 (provides a full text translation).

[2] In general, see Casey 2013; Chaniotis 2013, 28–30; Pélékidis 1962. Lykourgos was responsible for the formalization of the *ephēbeia* in the 330s BCE, perhaps with the intention of renewing and restoring civic pride.

kosmētēs that we learn of *agōnes* that were part of an eponymous festival celebrated in honor of Antonius, who has received the honorific appellation θεός νεός Διόνυσος/Theos Neos Dionysos (lines 22-23). The text as reconstructed in *IG* II^2 reads as follows:

> [καὶ διηγωνίσθαι? ἐν τοῖς] ἀγῶσιν ἔν τε τοῖς Θησιήο[ις καὶ Ἐπιταφίοις, ὁμοί]ως δὲ κ[α]ὶ ἐν
> τοῖς Ἀντωνιήοις τοῖς Πανα-
> [θηναϊκοῖς Ἀντω]νίου θεοῦ νέου Διονύσο[υ - - - -]ου Ἀνθεστηριῶνος τῇ ἑπτακαιδεκάτῃ
>
> and he (the *kosmētēs*) presided(?) in the contests at both the Theseia and the Epitaphia and
> likewise also at the Pana[thēnaika] Antōnieia
> of Antōnius theos neos Dionysos [- - - -] on the seventeenth of Anthestēriōn

No further details are provided, and these honors are otherwise unattested in Athens and elsewhere. The interpretation of *IG* II^2 1043 with respect to Antonius, therefore, must rely upon circumstantial evidence for his career and the Hellenistic honorific habits applied to someone in his position. The primary issues to be addressed are the dating of *IG* II^2 1043 and, thus, of the honors for Antonius; the reconstruction of the lacuna at the beginning of line 23 to complete the phrase ἐν τοῖς Ἀντωνιήοις τοῖς Πανα- (end of line 22), which identifies the festival; and the implications of the attachment of Theos Neos Dionysos, an epithet related to Hellenistic royal titulature and ruler cults, to Antonius's name.

We know from the inscription that the stele upon which the decrees appear dates to the archonship of one Kallikratides and that the Antonieia took place during the preceding archonship of one Menandros. As will be explained below, the Athenian archontal chronology of the 40s and 30s is not entirely fixed. At the time of the publication of *IG* II^2, Kallikratides was assigned to 38/7 and Menandros to 39/8. These dates have been generally maintained in Antonian scholarship without notice of the fact that developments in Athenian archontal chronology of several decades past have resulted in the amendment of the dates to 37/6 for Kallikratides and 38/7 for Menandros.[3] A factor in the early arguments for assigning Menandros and the Antonieia to 39/8 was the

[3] E.g., Raubitschek 1946, 148 and n. 9; Taeger 1960, 92; Pélékidis 1962, 255; Huzar 1978, 156; Pelling 1988, 209; Fontani 1999, 198 and nn. 18, 20; De Lozier 2002, 194; Voutiras 2011, 461-62. Exceptions include Tarn (1934) 1952, 52; Habicht 1997, 362 and n. 105.

testimony of Cassius Dio (48.39.2), who says that, when Antonius returned to the East and resided at Athens with his new bride Octavia through the winter of 39/8, he called himself *neos* Dionysos and insisted that others refer to him as such.[4] The assumption that the appearance of Theos Neos Dionysos in *IG* II^2 1043 is directly related to the Dio reference, with Antonius himself as the prime mover in the whole scenario, continues to be accepted without further qualification.

The list of eponymous Athenian archons of the Hellenistic age depends upon a relative chronology largely constructed from the epigraphic record (in conjunction with the calculation of adjustments made necessary by the lunar year). Instances where the correspondence between the eponymous archon and the Julian year are certain act as the fixed points around which to arrange the archons with uncertain dates. Unfortunately, the corpus of evidence for the first century B.C.E. is not as large as for other periods, a situation which has posed challenges in the determination of the chronological sequence of archons. The uncertainties and gaps in the list of this period has, therefore, led to multiple proposed schemes for the incorporation of the unfixed archons in more than a century of published scholarly discussion and debate. The discovery of new evidence, the integration of previously neglected evidence, and the reassessment of old arguments have driven the process of revising and rearranging the unfixed points, and sometimes even those previously considered fixed with certainty. Menandros and Kallikratides fall into the category of unfixed points in the chronology at Athens; thus, their dates have met with differing opinions. As will be explained below, the current reckoning places the archonship of Menandros in 38/7 and that of Kallikratides in 37/6.

The assignment of the archonships of Menandros and Kallikratides depends upon a series of arguments, summarized in Table 1, focused on several key pieces of information. First, an honorific decree from Athens detailing the career of one Diodōros

[4] Cass. Dio, 48.39.2: καὶ ἄλλα τε ἐν τούτῳ πολλὰ ἔξω τῶν πατρίων ἐξεδιητήθη, καὶ Διόνυσον ἑαυτὸν νέον αὐτός τε ἐκάλει καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ὀνομάζεσθαι ἠξίου. The adjective *neos* can mean new, young, or fresh (see discussion below).

Year (B.C.E.)	Pythian & Greater Panathenaic Years	Kirchner 1898	Kolbe 1908 & IG II2 (1913-1940)	Dinsmoor 1931
50/49	♦			Dēmētrios
49/8				Dēmocharēs
48/7				Philokratēs
47/6				Dioklēs
46/5	♦			Euklēs?
45/4				Polycharmos?
44/3				Dioklēs?
43/2				
42/1	♦		Euthydomos	Euthydomos
41/0			Nikandros	Nikandros
40/39			Dioklēs of Melitē	Philostratos
39/8			**Menandros**	Dioklēs of Melitē
38/7	♦	Euthydomos	**Kallikratides**	**Menandros**
37/6		Nikandros	Theopithes	**Kallikratides**
36/5		Dioklēs of Melitē		Theopithes
35/4		**Menandros**		
34/3	♦	**Kallikratides**		
33/2		Theopithes		
32/1				
31/0				
30/29	♦			

Table 1. The proposed schemes of Athenian archon chronology affecting *IG* II^2 1043.

of deme Aphidna (*IG* II^2 1343 = *IG* II 630b) provides a list of six eponymous archons that includes Menandros and Kallikratides. The named archons are Euthydomos, Nikandros, Dioklēs of Melitē, Kallikratides, Menandros, and Theopithes.[5] Second, an inscription from the Athenian Treasury at Delphi (*FD* III 2, 57) attests that Euthydomos, the first archon in the list from *IG* II^2 1343, was archon in a Pythian year, a fact that provides an anchoring point for our two archons.[6] Third, scholars have presupposed that the Athenians likely celebrated the festival mentioned in *IG* II^2 1043 in the period between 39/8 and 32/1 B.C.E., a period that corresponds to Antonius's arrival in Athens with his wife Octavia and the latest point at which one can reasonably assume that such a celebration could have occurred given the looming confrontation with Octavianus.

In attempting to assign the archons of *IG* II^2 1343 to their corresponding Julian years, J. Kirchner initially believed that Euthydomos ought to be assigned to 38/7 and, thus, set the rest of the sequence as Nikandros (37/6), Dioklēs of Melitē (36/5), Menandros (35/4), Kallikratides (34/3), and Theopithes (33/2).[7] W. Kolbe disagreed with Kirchner, arguing that Euthydomos was archon in 42/1 on the following bases.[8] *FD* III 2, 57 establishes the archonship of Euthydomos in a Pythian year. *IG* II^2 1343, in conjunction with *IG* II^2 1043, establishes that the archonship of Euthydomos occurred at least three years before that of Menandros. If the festival honoring Antonius and the archonship of Menandros had to take place between 39 and 32, then the only possibilities for Euthydomos are the Pythian years of 42/1, 38/7, and 34/3. Kolbe rejected 34/3 as the year of Euthydomos's archonship because that date would have placed Menandros and the festival in 31/0, a most unlikely time for celebrations in honor of Antonius. Of the remaining two possibilities, Kolbe preferred to assign Euthydomos to 42/1 in order

---

[5] Menandros was the predecessor of Kallikratides despite the fact that *IG* II^2 1343 lists the former after the latter. The inscription provides the sequence of Diodoros's career, which may have required a slight chronological deviation (Kloppenborg and Ascough 2011, 224–29).

[6] The Pythian Games at Delphi were penteteric.

[7] Kirchner 1898, 391 and n. 1.

[8] Kolbe 1908, 141–42.

to place Menandros in 39/8. As justification, Kolbe cited the testimony of Cassius Dio (48.39.2).[9] Kolbe's dates are as follows: Euthydomos (42/1), Nikandros (41/0), Dioklēs of Melitē (40/39), Menandros (39/8), Kallikratides (38/7), and Theopithes (37/6). Kirchner subsequently accepted Kolbe's chronology in *IG* II^2 (first published in 1913).

Not long after the publication of *IG* II^2, W. B. Dinsmoor amended Kolbe's chronology in light of new information.[10] A list of archons inscribed on a wall of the Stoa of Philip V at Delos (*ID* 2632) provides the following names: Dēmētrios, Dēmocharēs, Philokratēs, Dioklēs, Euklēs, Dioklēs, Nikandros, Philostratos, Menandros, and Kallikratides. The archons Nikandros, Menandros, and Kallikratides are the same as those found in *IG* II^2 1343 and *IG* II^2 1043. The Delian inscription also confirms that Menandros did in fact precede Kallikratides as in *IG* II^2 1043. Dinsmoor was able to fix the first four archons of the Delian list to the years 50/49-47/6 by means of *IG* II^2 1713 (= *IG* III 1014 = *SIG*^{3} 733), a fragmentary archon list from Athens spanning the period between 145 B.C.E. and 44 C.E. Since Euthydomos must come before Nikandros, his place in the Delian sequence must be in a Pythian year after the second Diokles and before Nikandros. That is, in 46/5, 42/1, 38/7, or 34/3. Dinsmoor, like Kolbe, rejected 38/7 and 34/3 and considered 42/1 as the likely year of Euthydomos's archonship. Dinsmoor also followed Kolbe (and Kirchner in *IG* II^2) in thinking that the celebration of the festival honoring Antonius in the archonship of Menandros took place in the early 30s. Kolbe's date of 39/8, however, had to be lowered by one year to 38/7 in order to account for *ID* 2632 and the addition of Philostratos. Dinsmoor's chronology beginning from Euthydomos is as follows: Euthydomos (42/1), Nikandros (41/0), Dioklēs of Melitē (40/39), Philostratos (39/8), Menandros (38/7), Kallikratides (37/6), and Theopithes (36/5). Dinsmoor's dates for the archonships of Menandros (38/7) and Kallikratides

[9] See also Plut., *Ant*. 33.4, 60.3.

[10] Dinsmoor 1931, 280, 284–86.

(37/6) have, to the best of my knowledge, gone unchanged since at least 2005.[11] As these dates stand, the Antonieia must have occurred in 38/7.

Of a more uncertain and controversial nature is the reconstruction of *IG* II^2 1043 at the point where the text refers to the Antonieia: ἐν τοῖς Ἀντωνιήοις τοῖς Πανα- (end of line 22, continued on line 23). Two possibilities present themselves in the completion of the Πανα- fragment, either the noun Παναθηναίοις (the Panathenaia) or the adjective Παναθηναϊκοῖς (Panathenaic).[12] The distinction between these two options produces two different readings of the phrase, the Antonian Panathenaia or the Panathenaic Antonieia. If the noun Παναθηναίοις is correct, then the Athenians attached Antonius's festival to the Panathenaia held in the year of the archonship of Menandros (ca. 38/7).[13] The Panathenaia, the most important religious and civic festival in Athens, were dedicated to the city's poliadic deity Athena Polias.[14] Every four years the Athenians mounted a larger-scale, more splendid version of the Panathenaia, the so-called Greater Panathenaia, which culminated in the grand procession to the Akropolis to present the olivewood statue of Athena Polias with her newly woven *peplos* (a female garment).[15] If the adjective Παναθηναϊκοῖς is correct, then the Antonieia were organized according to the panathenaic format specifically for Antonius, and not an augmentation of the Panathenaia. The restoration of Πανα- as the adjective Παναθηναϊκοῖς has received a slightly wider acceptance than the alternative. I also prefer this reconstruction and accept the festival as the Panathenaic Antonieia for reasons that will become clear.

The place of the Panathenaia in the annual festival cycle has some bearing

---

[11] Follet 2005, 13; also Follet 1998, 258–60. The work of John. D. Morgan on the calendar and archon chronology of Athens (e.g., *AJA* 100 [1996]: 395), which has yet to appear in full to the best of my knowledge, may or may not affect these dates.

[12] Παναθηναίοις: Taylor (1931) 1981, 122; Tarn (1934) 1952, 52; Raubitschek 1946, 148-49 and nn. 9-10; Habicht 1997, 362. Παναθηναϊκοῖς: Deubner (1932) 1969, 236; Cerfaux and Tondriau 1957, 301; Taeger 1960, 92 and n. 23; Pélékidis 1962, 255; Huzar 1978, 156; De Lozier 2002, 193.

[13] Kolbe 1908, 141-42.

[14] Parker 2005, 253-69 (with bibliography); Sourvinou-Inwood 2011, 263-311 (with bibliography).

[15] Parker 2005, 256, 264–66, 268–69; Buraselis 2008, 215–16; Sourvinou-Inwood 2011, 266–70, 284–311. The Lesser Panathenaia, the annual version of the festival, may or may not have included the offering of a *peplos*.

upon the reconstruction question. As may be observed in Table 1, 38/7 was a Greater Panathenaic (and Pythian) quadrennium. The coincidence of the honors for Antonius and the Greater Panathenaia may seem to favor the combination of the two so that the festival of *IG* II^2 1043 was the Antonian Panathenaia. A complication in that line of reasoning presents itself at the terminus of line 23, where the date Ἀνθεστηριῶνος τῇ ἑπτακαιδεκάτῃ, 17 Anthestērion (the eighth month of the Athenian calendar, roughly February/March) appears. This date does not correspond to the Panathenaia, the procession of which took place on 28 Hekatombaion (the first month of the Athenian calendar, roughly July/August). Any argument for our festival as the Antonian Panathenaia must, perforce, reject 17 Anthestērion as pertaining to the honors for Antonius.[16] Acceptance of our festival as the Panathenaic Antonieia neither precludes nor confirms 17 Anthestērion as the date attached to the honors for Antonius, and no arguments rooted in epigraphical methods have appeared as far as I am aware. That said, some who have accepted the adjectival reconstruction of Πανα- as Παναθηναϊκοῖς have clearly accepted the date of 17 Anthestērion as well.[17] Part of the reason for doing so is the identification of Antonius with Dionysos.

The month of Anthestērion takes its name from the Anthestēria, the three-day Dionysiac festival (11-13 Anthestērion) primarily concerned with the new wine produced from the previous year's harvest. The *pithoi* of new wine were opened and offerings made to Dionysos on day one, called *Pithoigia* (Jar-Opening), followed by the famous all-day drinking competition on day two, called *Choes* (Beakers); the third day, *Chytroi* (Pots), involved offerings to the dead for reasons that are not entirely clear since the reconstruction of the Anthestēria is problematic. The epiphany of Dionysos from the sea

[16] As did Raubitschek (1946, 149 n. 10). Caution is warranted regarding Raubitschek's conclusion because his article is so often referenced. He was of the opinion that the Panathenaia of 39/8 B.C.E. were renamed in honor of Antonius, but the *triumvir* did not arrive in Athens before the autumn of that year (Pelling 1996, 21). Presumably the Antonieia took place while Antonius was present in the city, which means that one cannot combine the dating of the archonship of Menandros as 39/8 and the acceptance of Antonius's festival as the Antonian Panathenaia.

[17] Cerfaux and Tondriau 1957, 301; Taeger 1960, 92 and n. 23; De Lozier 2002, 72–3, 193–94.

in his wheeled ship-cart and the meeting and marriage between the god and the mortal *basilinna*, the wife of the *archōn basileus* (magistrate responsible for religious matters), known from works of art and literature are thought to be connected with the Anthestēria.[18] The possibility of a temporal proximity of the Antonieia to the Anthestēria is an attractive one given the appellation of Antonius as Theos Neos Dionysos in *IG* II^2 1043, not to mention the historical emphasis upon his Dionysiac affinities. I shall return to this festal connection and the appellation of Antonius as Theos Neos Dionysos later in the chapter.

3.2. *Agora* XVIII H273/Agora Inv. I 3071, Inscribed Altar Fragment of ca. 39-32 B.C.E.

The second inscription from Athens, *Agora* XVIII H273, is a small fragment of an altar dedicated to Antonius and his wife Octavia, who travelled east with her husband late in 39 (Figure 1).[19] The fragment was first published in 1946 by A. E. Raubitschek (*TAPA* 77: 146-50) and often appears with *IG* II^2 1043 as evidence for the identification of Antonius with Dionysos in Athens. The preserved text reads as follows:

[Ἀ]ντωνίυ και Ὀ
[κτ]αίασ δυῖν θε
[ῶν ε]ὐεργετῶν
vacat 2 vss.

[A]ntōnius and O[kt]avia
the two benefactor gods
vacat 2 vss.

Before discussing the inscribed text, a few comments regarding the physical characteristics of the fragment are warranted. The catalogue entry in *Agora* XVIII (cat. H273, p. 157) describes the preserved features of the fragment as "portions of the smoothly dressed face, the roughly picked top, the smoothly dressed right side, and the

[18] Parker 2005, 290–326; also Petridou 2015, 239–42, 277–78.

[19] *Agora* XVIII H273 = Agora Inv. I 3071. Discovered 6 November 1935 west of the north end of the Stoa of Attalos in a modern house wall. Hymettian marble; h. 0.21 m, w. 0.252 m, th. 0.102-0.115 m; height of letters 0.017-0.018 m. Raubitschek 1946 (with photograph of squeeze); Robert and Robert 1948, 149–50 no. 55 (reconstruct δυεῖν in line 2); Kajava 1990, 71–2, cat. 22 (erroneously refers to the fragment as a statue base).

roughly picked back; broken away below and to the left. The first line of text begins immediately beneath the traces of a lost molding across the upper edge of the face." One can observe in Figure 1, however, that the entire face of the fragment is not uniform. Only the upper third containing the first two lines of text can be described as smoothly dressed. The remaining area into which the third line of text is inscribed exhibits the kind of texture created by treatment with a toothed chisel. This roughened area possibly represents a cutting back of the stone so that the surface level is lower than that of the smoothened area. The photograph also shows that the smoothly dressed side appears to be the left rather than the right, which is where the fragment has broken away. The accuracy of the remaining description is difficult to determine without additional photographs and, above all, an autopic examination. Details of the rear surface may be particularly revealing. If, in fact, the "roughly picked back" is the preserved surface rather than a possible break, then *Agora* XVIII H273 may not be from an altar. The small scale of the fragment (h. 0.21 m, w. 0.252 m, th. 0.102-0.115 m), its width in particular, and its lettering (h. 0.017-0.018 m) may indicate that the original object was a stele.[20] Such a suggestion must remain conjectural until such a time that the fragment can be subjected to further study.

Returning to the text of *Agora* XVIII H273, it is clear that the Athenians offered divine honors to Antonius to recognize him as their benefactor and extended the same to Octavia; hence, the title θεοί εὐεργέται (Theoi Euergetai). In his short article on the altar fragment, Raubitschek was ultimately interested in the implications for Octavia and the position she occupied while in Athens. He concluded that, as a consequence of Antonius's status as Dionysos, the Athenians identified Octavia with Athena Polias, the goddess to whom the Athenian Akropolis belonged; thus, she played Athena to Antonius's

[20] I thank Dr. Bonna D. Wescoat for this suggestion.

Dionysos.[21] To reach this conclusion, Raubitschek looked to the identification of Antonius as Dionysos in Athens. The evidence he deployed consisted of a passage from the *Suasoriae* of Seneca the Elder (1.6-7) and *IG* II^2 1043. The key to the entire argument is the Seneca passage, which relates the episode in which the Athenians betrothed Athena to Antonius, much to their pecuniary disadvantage.

> Aiebat itaque apud Alexandrum esse <sic> dicendam sententiam ut multa adulatione animus eius permulceretur, servandum tamen aliquem modum, ne non veneratio <videretur sed adulatio>, et accideret tale aliquid quale accidit Atheniensibus cum publicae eorum blanditiae non tantum deprehensae sed castigatae sunt. Nam cum Antonius vellet se Liberum patrem dici et hoc nomen statuis <suis> subscribi iuberet, habitu quoque et comitatu Liberum imitaretur, occurrerunt venienti ei Athenienses cum coniugibus et liberis et Διόνυσον salutaverunt. Belle illis cesserat si nasus Atticus ibi substitisset. Dixerunt despondere ipsos in matrimonium illi Minervam suam et rogaverunt ut duceret; Antonius ait ducturum, sed dotis nomine imperare se illis mille talenta. Tum ex Graeculis quidam ait: κύριε, ὁ Ζεὺς τὴν μητέρα σου Σεμέλην ἄπροικον εἶχεν. Huic quidem impune fuit, sed Atheniensium sponsalia mille talentis aestimata sunt. Quae cum exigerentur, conplures contumeliosi libelli proponebantur, quidam etiam ipsi Antonio tradebantur: sicut ille qui subscriptus statuae eius fuit cum eodem tempore et Octaviam uxorem haberet et Cleopatram: Ὀκταουία καὶ Ἀθηνᾶ Ἀντωνίῳ·res tuas tibi habe.
>
> Thus he [Cestius] used to say that in the presence of Alexander an opinion had to be stated so that his pride would be appeased with much flattery, although it ought to preserve some moderation, lest the opinion seem to be not the highest respect but flattery, and lest such a thing occur as befell the Athenians when their public blandishments were not only detected but punished. For when Antonius wanted to call himself father Liber[22] and ordered this name to be inscribed on his statues, and he also imitated Liber in habit and dress, the Athenians with their wives and children ran to meet him as he arrived and greeted him as Dionysos. It would have turned out well for them if their Attic wit had stopped then and there. They said they promised him their Minerva in matrimony and asked that he marry her; Antonius said that he would marry her, but that he ordered them to supply a dowry of 1,000 talents. Then one of the Greeklings said, "Lord, Zeus took your mother Semelē without a dowry." For this Greekling indeed there was no punishment, but the Athenians' betrothal was valued at 1,000 talents. Because the dowry was demanded, not a few abusive lampoons were put about, some were even passed on to Antonius himself. As, for instance, the one which was inscribed on his statue when he had Octavia and Cleopatra as his wife at the same time: "Oktaouia [Octavia] and Athēna to Antōnios, take your property [a statement of divorce]."

[21] Raubitschek took as the premise of his article that Antonius's interest in representing himself as Dionysos ought to be linked with his marriage to Octavia (as opposed to his relationship with Kleopatra), which was at the time a recent argument put forth by W. W. Tarn in relation to Vergil's controversial fourth *Eclogue* (Tarn, "Alexander Helios and the Golden Age," *JRS* 22.2 [1932]: 135-60, esp. 157).

[22] A native Italian fertility god with characteristics in common with the Hellenic Dionysos.

Whereas some had viewed this passage with doubt,[23] Raubitschek insisted upon the reliability of Seneca's account because (i) the episode was likely the eyewitness testimony of Quintus Dellius, who was close to Antonius and authored a lost history primarily of the campaign in Media Atropatēnē in 36,[24] and (ii) support from the epigraphic record now existed (*IG* II^2 1043 and the newly presented *Agora* XVIII H273).[25] Raubitschek deliberately assumed that the references to Antonius taking Athena to wife, including the betrothal and the witty rejoinder, meant that the Athenians identified Octavia with Athena Polias. Raubitschek then used *IG* II^2 1043 to bolster the connection between Antonius and Athena by way of his preference for the reconstruction of the festival in line 22 as the Antonian Panathenaia (i.e., ἐν τοῖς Ἀντωνιήοις τοῖς Παναθηναίοις).[26] On the basis of his interpretations of Seneca and *IG* II^2 1043, Raubitschek came to the conclusion that Octavia's acclamation as Thea Euergetis in *Agora* XVIII H273 equated to her deification as Athena Polias in direct support of *Suasoriae* 1.6-7.[27] Although not explicitly stated, Raubitschek attributed *Agora* XVIII H273 to the year 39/8 as a result of presenting Seneca as the basis for "the literary tradition pertaining to Antony as *Νεός Διόνυσος* in Athens, in 39/8 B.C."[28] and specifying the renamed Panathenaia as those of the same year.[29]

Despite the age of the article, scholars continue to cite Raubitschek as the definitive publication of *Agora* XVIII H273 and, by default, have lent his arguments an air of unassailability through persistent repetition. The failure to question the validity

---

[23] Raubitschek 1946, 147 and n. 4, with reference to the skepticism initially raised by Nock ([1930] 1972, 204) and thereafter Tarn ([1934] 1952, 53) and others.

[24] *Suas*. 1.7 relates an epigram of Dellius, and so it may be that he was Seneca's source for the entire episode.

[25] Raubitschek 1946, 147–48, 149. Cassius Dio (48.39.2), likely following Seneca, provides a shorter version of the episode, but with the amount of the dowry as four million sesterces, which is 1/6 of the amount provided by Seneca.

[26] Raubitschek 1946, 148-49 and nn. 9–10.

[27] Raubitschek 1946, 149.

[28] Raubitschek 1946, 146.

[29] Raubitschek 1946, 148.

of the assumptions that undergird Raubitschek's interpretation of *Agora* XVIII H273 has given the impression that a one-to-one relationship with Seneca's account is the conclusive answer to the inscription's significance when in fact the opposite is true. The impulse to qualify the deification of Antonius and Octavia as Theoi Euergetai in terms of deification as traditional gods (Dionysos and Athena) represents an outdated mode of thinking that does not include the concept of ruler cult as euergetic exchange. This mode of thinking is also one that toes the line of traditional Antonian scholarship and grafts the literary tradition onto *Agora* XVIII H273 without sufficient cause in order to legitimize the former at the expense of the latter.

While it is not my intent here to debate the extent to which the episode of Athena's betrothal to Antonius reflects reality, a few comments regarding its context are warranted. First and foremost, Lucius Annaeus Seneca (ca. 50 B.C.E.-ca. 40 C.E.), otherwise known as Seneca the Elder or Seneca Rhetor, is one of the three earliest surviving literary sources for Antonius's identification with Dionysos.[30] Seneca's surviving works constitute a portion of his books on declamation (Lat. *declamatio*, Gk. *meletē*), a form of rhetorical training the Romans inherited from Greek education, written at the behest of his sons who wanted the best sayings of the declaimers of their father's time. The developed forms of declamation were referred to in Latin as "the *controversia*, a speech in character on one side of a fictional law case, and the *suasoria*, a deliberative speech advising a course of action in a historical, pseudo-historical, or mythological situation; the first trained for the courts, the second for the political assembly or committee room."[31] By the time declamation came to Rome the *suasoria* often had very little connection with reality. Seneca's *Suasoriae*, of which we have one of at least two books and no introduction, are each arranged so as to first state the theme and then provide cherry-picked Latin epigrams derived from the declamations of multiple

[30] The other two authors are Sokratēs of Rhodes (apud. Athen., *Deipn*. 147f-148c), a Greek historian of the first century B.C.E., and Velleius Paterculus (2.82.3-4), a younger contemporary of Seneca the Elder.

[31] M. Winterbottom, "declamation," *OCD*, 4th ed. (Oxford Reference Online 2012).

speakers. After the epigrams come the division, the main lines of argument a teacher would set in place for his students to follow in their own speeches, related anecdotes, and finally the Greek epigrams.[32]

The *suasoria* in question (*Suas.* 1) takes as its deliberative theme whether Alexander III. conqueror of all, should sail the Ocean, the great river thought to encircle the earth beyond the limits of the known world. The reference to Antonius in Athens comes from the division (*Suas*. 1.5-7), in which Seneca relates the approach of the declaimer Cestius, who said that this type of *suasoria* required advice suited to individual circumstances (*Suas*. 1.5). The declaimer who found himself in a free country should advise differently from one who found himself before a king, in which case the declamation ought to be tailored to the personality of the particular king in need of advice. So, according to Cestius, the heights of Alexander's arrogance called for the declaimer to stroke the king's ego, but in such as a way as to disguise *adulatio* (flattery) as *veneratio* (highest respect); moderation was the name of the game (*Suas*. 1.6). Cestius invoked the Athenians and their dealings with Antonius as a cautionary tale. In playing to Antonius thinking himself Dionysos and suggesting he marry Athena, the Athenians were overly obvious in their *adulatio* and were forced to pay a costly dowry in consequence of their error in judgement.

The scene of Athena's betrothal to Antonius falls within the modernized category of a *hieros gamos* (sacred or ritual marriage), which is a union that involves at least one divine partner with or without the performance of a sexual act. Our evidence for this type of proceeding is scant and murky, but such festal activities seem a rare occurrence within Hellenic cultural practices.[33] What is certain, however, is that Athens was a location where cult activity included a marriage between a god and a mortal, Dionysos and the *basilinna*, currently thought to be a component of the annual Anthestēria. Details of how the Athenians enacted the nuptial proceedings are unknown, and the inclusion of an

[32] See the introduction to the Loeb Classical Library edition (1974), esp. pp. xx, xvii, xxi.

[33] Burkert 1985, 108; E. Kearns, "marriage, sacred," *OCD*, 4th ed. (Oxford Reference Online, 2012).

actual consummation is far from certain.[34] As to the potential significance and aitology of the marriage, Robert Parker has suggested that "the giving of the *archon basileus*' wife to Dionysus is a supreme gesture of hospitality, the god's acceptance of her a supreme token of presence."[35] What Parker has proposed is a link between Dionysos's arrival in Attica, originally in the time of King Amphiktyon, and his marriage to the *basilinna*, which quite possibly took place during a festival partially devoted to the celebration of the epiphany of Dionysos (i.e., the Anthestēria). Thus, Parker characterized the marriage of Dionysos as "the most vividly realized advent of a god attested in all Greek cult."[36] Perhaps this potential link between the marriage of Dionysos and the hospitality extended in response to a divine epiphany applies also to the exchange between the Athenians and Antonius related in *Suasoriae* 1.6. Unfortunately, Seneca does not explain why the Athenians should have offered Athena in marriage, for the choice of a virgin goddess as a participant in a marital union seems inappropriate and rather unlikely.

Given the focus upon epigram in the *Suasoriae*, the whole business of the Athenian display of folly provides Seneca with the opportunity to present his readers with the witty divorce comment supposedly inscribed on statues of Antonius in Athens. While we can appreciate the mocking humor levelled at Antonius for philandering with Kleopatra, we are not entirely in on the joke because we are not privy to the whole story. Just as someone lacking a certain level of knowledge of historical and current events and the requisite cultural familiarity cannot fully appreciate modern American political satire, so too are we unable to see beyond the surface of the divorce remark. Apart from marking his arrival in the city, why and in what year the Athenians may have offered Athena, a virgin goddess and thus an unlikely and inappropriate choice as bride, in marriage to Antonius is completely unclear. Equally obscure is how Octavia and Athena were meant

[34] Parker 2005, 303–12, 314–15.

[35] Parker 2005, 315. Alternatively, the cultic rite may have reflected the union between Dionysos and Ariadne. Additional discussion with bibliography may be found in Petridou 2015, 239–42, 277–78.

[36] Parker 2005, 315.

to relate to each other as Antonius's marital partners. Maybe Octavia was identified with Athena and maybe she was not. Regardless, Raubitschek's assumption that *Suasoriae* 1.6-7 indicates a deification of Octavia as Athena Polias and that *Agora* XVIII H273 is proof of the same is a false one.[37] The inscription is a standalone document that does indeed prove that Octavia was deified at Athens, but as Thea Euergetis in her own right. As a recipient of divine honors, she was *de facto* deified irrespective of any connections she may or may not have had with Athena.

Agora XVIII H273 establishes that Antonius and Octavia received as a couple the acclamation Theoi Euergetai, which clearly indicates the presence of the traditions of Hellenistic ruler cult. As discussed in the previous chapter, powerful benefactors able to serve *poleis* with extraordinary acts of euergetism received *isotheoi timai* in a show of gratitude on behalf of the recipients of their beneficence. The title Theoi Euergetai, which is much the same as the honoring of Antiochos III and Laodikē III as *sōtēres* at Tēos (*SEG* 41.1003, I),[38] is a manifestation of the reciprocal euergetic dialogue that was the driving mechanism of ruler cult.

3.3. Recontextualizing *IG* II² 1043 and *Agora* XVIII H273

Now that *IG* II² 1043 and *Agora* XVIII H273 have been adequately detached from the more troublesome of the misleading information found in publication, I shall present my suggestions for recontextualization of the inscriptions. The point that I most want to emphasize is this. That these two inscriptions stand as witnesses to divine honors for Antonius in Athens and that one of the two names Antonius as (Theos Neos) Dionysos is not, perforce, sufficient grounds for failing to look past the Dionysos role-play so keenly emphasized in the literary record as the height of his improprieties. No evidence

[37] Pelling (1996, 23 n. 99) is in agreement and is, to the best of my knowledge at this time, the only one to question Raubitschek's argument.

[38] See Chapter 2.

external to *IG* II^2 1043 and *Agora* XVIII H273 speaks directly to their content, nor is there cause to presuppose that both inscriptions emerged from precisely the same set of circumstances at the same point in time. In other words, what may be gleaned from the Athenian inscriptions on their own and in combination with circumstantial evidence has the potential to provide a narrative that is separate, yet related, to that of the literary sources.

I noted earlier the comments of Cassius Dio at 48.39.2 in which the historian set Antonius's insistence upon his Dionysos persona alongside his arrival in Athens late in 39: καὶ **Διόνυσον** ἑαυτὸν **νέον** αὐτός τε ἐκάλει καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ὀνομάζεσθαι ἠξίου, "and he [Antonius] called himself **Dionysos neos** and required that he be called so by others." (Incidentally, Dio's reference to the marriage of Athena and Antonius belongs to this same description of the goings-on in Athens.) The similarity between Διόνυσος νεός in Dio and θεός νεός Διόνυσος of *IG* II^2 1043 has functioned as justification for arguing that the inscription ought to belong to the winter of 39/8, the first of two consecutive winters Antonius spent in Athens with Octavia. In turn, winter 39/8 has become a point of fixation within Antonian scholarship and related studies, past which not many have seen fit to extend their view in any detail. One gets the impression that the evidence relevant to Antonius and Athens at that point in time presents a uniform situation in which *IG* II^2 1043, *Agora* XVIII H273, and the literary testimony of Seneca, Cassius Dio, and other authors do not differ in their chronological and/or connotational aspects. All the pertinent pieces are collapsed into a single layer. As an example, consider the following extract from C. B. R. Pelling's commentary of Plutarch's *Life of Antony*:

> It was now [late 39 B.C.E.] that A. [Antonius] began to encourage his identification with Dionysus … He made his wishes clear to the cities of Greece (Dio 48.39.2): in Athens he was duly celebrated as Θεός Νεός Διόνυσος in 39/8 (*IG* II^2 1043 ll. 2203), and he and Octavia were both hailed as Θεοί Εὐεργέται (A. E. Raubitschek, *TAPA* 77 (1946), 146-50). There may even have been talk of a divine marriage between Antony-Dionysus and the city's goddess Athena: that seems to emerge from Dio 48.39.2 and Sen. *Suas.* 1.6-7, even if one allows for

rhetorical improvement of the story.[39]

Pelling, who does acknowledge elsewhere in his commentary that traditions of Hellenistic ruler cult are at play in regards to Antonius's reception in the East, here toes the line of Antonian scholarship at large. He points to a single cause, Antonius takes actions to encourage his identification as Dionysos, and to a particular moment in time, the winter of 39/8. Given the limited scope, purpose, and length of a literary commentary, providing a cursory, state-of-the-issue type entry falls within the bounds of reasonable expectations. These limitations, however, tend to be outweighed by Pelling's authority, as his is the only commentary of the *Life of Antony* in English and one of very few in a modern language. As such, the passage quoted above frequently appears as a citation in publications with little to no scrutiny of the content. The pattern of reiterating the same set of arguments over and over again, therefore, persists and the need to parse the constituent parts of a multi-faceted situation goes unrecognized or, at the very least, unaddressed on a large scale.

In the historical reconstruction of Antonius's triumviral career from the ancient literary record (primarily Plutarch, Appian, and Cassius Dio), there are three nodes in the chronology where interactions with the Athenians could have prompted the polis to offer divine honors to the *triumvir*, which is a necessary condition for the existence of the evidence provided by *IG* II^2 1043 (lines 22-23) and *Agora* XVIII H273. Whether the events about to be discussed and the epigraphic evidence are directly related is impossible to determine due to the unavailability of necessary information; one can only postulate in service of recontextualizing the inscriptions. The three chronological nodes are: (i) late 42/early 41, the point at which Antonius initially assumed jurisdiction over the eastern *provinciae* and circuited Greece, Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine; (ii) late 39/early 38, the time when Antonius returned to the East with Octavia and spent the first of two winters in residence at Athens living like an Athenian; and (iii) late 38/early 37, when

[39] Pelling 1988, 209 (in reference to *Ant*. 33.6-34.1).

Antonius again returned to Athens (where Octavia had remained in the interim) to spend the winter after putting an end to the recent Parthian invasions of Asia Minor and Syria. The line of connection between these three nodes is euergetism of the highest level, the sort that Hellenistic poleis acknowledged with *isotheoi timai*.

The first instance occurred in the aftermath of the final victory at Philippi and the redistribution of territory, as well as power, among the *triumviri*. Charged with levying funds from the East to pay the legions and reorganizing the eastern *provinciae*, Antonius spent the winter of 42/1 making a circuit of Greece and, chiefly, Asia.[40] Both Plutarch (*Ant*. 23.2) and Appian (*B Civ*. 5.7) note that Athens received gifts from Antonius during this period; however, the two authors differ in the details they have chosen to provide. According to Plutarch, Antonius crossed first to mainland Greece and then to Asia Minor upon his departure from Philippi. While in Greece the *triumvir* was well disposed towards the Greeks and found himself greeted not just as a philhellene, but even more so as a philathenian (φιλαθήναιος); indeed, he τῇ πόλει πλείστας δωρεὰς ἔδωκε, "gave to the city [Athens] very great gifts." What those gifts were Plutarch does not say. Nor is it clear whether Antonius visited Athens, although the city, still a cultural and intellectual giant, was a likely stop.[41] The emphasis Plutarch places on Greece at *Ant*. 23.2 is unique to the *Life* and may be the result of oral traditions, to which Plutarch, being from Boiōtia, would have been privy.[42] At the same time, Appian, who makes no mention of time spent in Greece, has an Athenian envoy visiting Antonius to ask the *triumvir* to return the island of Tēnos to their control. The Athenians did not receive Tēnos, but Antonius did give them the islands of Aigina and Kēos in the Cyclades and Ikos, Skiathos, and Peparēthos in the Sporades. These islands, which Athens had controlled at various points in the past, were

---

[40] Plut., *Ant*. 23-24; Appian, *B Civ*. 5.3-7; Cass. Dio, 48.2.1-4, 24.1-2. He moved on to Syria and Palestine in the spring.

[41] Athens had long been an expected stop for Roman officials, provincial governors in particular, travelling to and from the East (Hoff 2005, 329; Parigi 2013, 447). Antonius had previously spent time in Greece, presumably in Athens, to study oratory in 58 B.C.E. prior to his first military command under Aulus Gabinius in Syria (Plut., *Ant*. 2.4-5).

[42] Pelling 1988, 175, 209.

either the great gifts to which Plutarch alluded or were in addition to those unspecified gifts. Nevertheless, Antonius established himself as benefactor of Athens early on and continued to purposely foster the relationship for the rest of his career.[43]

It was during this initial tour of the East that the famous meeting between Antonius and Kleopatra took place in Cilicia. Their liaison having begun, Antonius spent the winter of 41/0 with the queen in Alexandria, the other major eastern city where Antonius spent much of his time when not in Athens or on campaign. In the meantime, back in Italy, Antonius's wife Fulvia and his brother Lucius Antonius had been in open military conflict with Octavianus; this was the so-called Perusine War. The successful siege of Perugia ended the war in Octavianus's favor; Fulvia soon fled to Greece where she then fell ill and died. The conflict, for which Fulvia has traditionally borne the full brunt of the blame, brought Antonius back to Italy in the summer of 40 to smooth over relations with Octavianus. They met at Brundisium and, once an agreement had been reached, returned to Rome where Antonius married Octavianus's elder sister Octavia (November 40 B.C.E.) to solidify the renewed *concordia* between the two *triumviri*. Antonius spent the next year attending to affairs in Italy, the most immediate concern being Sextus Pompeius and his chokehold on the grain supply. At the same time across the Mediterranean, a Parthian army with the anti-Caesarian Quintus Labienus and the Parthian prince Pakoros at its head invaded Syria and then moved to simultaneously attack Palestine and Asia Minor. Late in 40 Antonius dispatched Publius Ventidius to deal with the Parthian threat. Once Antonius and Octavianus reached an agreement with Sextus at Misenum in the summer of 39, Antonius turned his attention back to affairs in the East and soon departed for Greece accompanied by Octavia and their infant daughter Antonia. Headquartered at Athens, Antonius resided in the city for the winter as he prepared for war against the Parthians come the spring.[44]

---

[43] Antonius seems to have held Athens in special regard, going so far as to make a post-Actium appeal to Octavianus that he be allowed to live out his days as a private person in Athens (Plut., *Ant*. 72.1).

[44] Plut., *Ant*. 25-33; App., *B Civ*. 5.8-76; Cass. Dio, 48.27-39.

Here is where I wish to separate *IG* II^2 1043 and *Agora* XVIII H273 into two distinct pieces of evidence required neither to represent the same set of circumstances nor to coincide chronologically. This is not an assertion that the inscriptions are in no way linked to one another in time and circumstance, but an opening up of avenues for discussion of other possible interpretations. In the absence of supporting evidence to elucidate and solidify the contextual details of the inscriptions, one must be inclusive rather than restrictive, think in terms of nuance rather than broad strokes.

As discussed above, the Antonieia of *IG* II^2 1043 took place in 38/7 B.C.E. according to the year currently attributed to the archonship of Menandros. The first step, therefore, is to detach the one known occurrence of the Antonieia, that of *IG* II^2 1043, from 39/8, which is a move away from the prevailing stance of Antonian scholarship. The question then becomes whether *Agora* XVIII H273, which provides no internal evidence of its date, may be assigned to this year. Given that the inscription names Antonius and Octavia as Theoi Euergetai together as a couple, the inscription must belong to the period during which they were married and very likely not before they arrived in Athens the year after their nuptials took place.[45] The *terminus post quem* is autumn 39. The *terminus ante quem* is 32, the year in which Antonius finally divorced Octavia (probably in May or June) after many years of a simultaneous connubial relationship with Kleopatra.[46] *Agora* XVIII H273, therefore, could roughly fall anywhere between autumn 39 and spring 32 B.C.E.[47] Octavia returned to Rome in the spring of 37 and remained there throughout the remainder

[45] Octavia's presence in the East is noteworthy for its deviation from Roman Republican tradition, which held that female family members of provincial magistrates did not accompany the latter to their *provinciae* during the term of office. Prior to Octavia, there are only two known examples: Caecilia Metella, in Athens with her husband Lucius Cornelius Sulla in 86 B.C.E.; and Cornelia, in Mytilene with her husband Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus in 49/8 B.C.E. This trend did change significantly until the reign of Tiberius (14-27 C.E.). See Kajava 1990, 59–60, 63, 107.

[46] I purposely do not refer to the relationship between Antonius and Kleopatra as a marriage or anything involving any sort of formal or informal commitment ceremony. Despite the obvious existence of a private relationship involving cohabitation and children, there is no evidence to prove or disprove the occurrence of a ceremony to create a marriage, as is so often assumed in modern scholarship and literature. For a critical review of the issue with bibliography, see Ager 2013.

[47] Plut., *Ant*. 57.3; Pelling 1996, 51.

of the conflict between her husband and brother with one important exception. Octavia, not of little significance to the affairs between her husband and brother, sailed to Greece with troops, money, and supplies for Antonius around the middle of 35. Antonius, at the time en route to Media Atropatēnē to enact another campaign after the arduous expedition of 36, accepted the assistance; however, he ordered Octavia to either remain in Athens or return to Rome.[48] Octavia had not seen her husband for two years and would never see him again. Although the legal divorce did not occur until three years later and Antonius had in the meantime made no secret of his relationship with Kleopatra and of his children by her, the repudiation of Octavia in 35 was a turning point. Thus, one could argue that *Agora* XVIII H273 should not be dated later than 35, but not with absolute certainty.

The winter of 39/8 presents one reasonable candidate for the chronological attribution of *Agora* XVIII H273, as this was a time when the dual presence of Antonius and Octavia in Athens and happenings known from the literary record created the kind of atmosphere in which a *polis* offering *isotheoi timai* was not unusual. One opportunity was the arrival of the triumviral couple in Athens. As part of the wide-ranging proliferation of festivals (defined as *pompē kai thysia kai agōn* / procession, sacrifice, and contest), and indeed of spectacle in general, in the Hellenistic age, there emerged a new festal form—the "ritualized reception of kings [and queens], Roman magistrates, and foreign envoys in cities."[49] Antonius, as will be discussed in the next chapter, may have already encountered this sort of activity at Ephesos during his eastern tour of 42/1.[50] Athens and other *poleis* appear to have had a two-part protocol for the formal reception of prominent figures into the city that applied as equally to Hellenistic rulers as to Roman magistrates and foreign ambassadors on the condition of benefactions received or services rendered.[51] The first part was the *apantēsis* (arrival), the conducting of the honoree(s) into the city. The Athenian

[48] Plut., *Ant*. 53.2 (Athens); Cassio Dio, 49.33.4 (Rome).

[49] Chaniotis 2013, 28, also 25, 27–8, 39–43. See also Buraselis 2012.

[50] Plut., *Ant*. 24.1-4.

[51] Perrin-Saminadayar 2004-2005, 362, 375; Le Guen 2006, esp. 345-48; Perrin-Saminadayar 2009.

apantēsis seems to have regularly begun at Peiraias, the port of Athens, where the ephebes met the disembarking beneficiary and escorted the honorand to the city in a procession.[52] The second part was the *apodochē* (reception), which included an invitation to sacrifice, at times on the Akropolis where foreigners were usually prohibited, and to speak before the *dēmos*, the very body responsible for the honors granted.[53] Other honors, including *isotheoi timai*, could augment this protocol when warranted.[54] Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus may have received divine honors when he "went up [to the city], sacrificed to the gods, and addressed the *dēmos*"[55] in 67; before him Lucius Cornelius Sulla may have been honored with, among other things, the Sylleia when he returned to Athens as a liberator and tyrant-slayer in 84.[56] It is, therefore, not difficult to imagine that the Athenians initiated their arrival protocol when Antonius and Octavia sailed into Peiraias near the close of 39. Honoring the couple as Theoi Euergetai was an act that could have been associated with their *apantēsis* owing to past euergetic relations between Antonius and the Athenians. The extension of these honors to include Octavia would not have been unlike what used to occur with Hellenistic royal couples, where a title bestowed upon the king was also adopted for his wife (thereby stressing the closeness of their relationship as well as the queen's role in rulership).[57] Thus, *Agora* XVIII H273 may in some way reflect the honoring of Antonius and Octavia as a

---

[52] Perrin-Saminadayar (2004-2005, 360-64) argues that the Athenian protocol for the reception of prominent figures was an adaptation of the ancestral ceremony in which the ephebes were entrusted with the duty of processing the sacred objects from Eleusis to Athens during the celebration of the Mysteries. His reconstruction of the protocol stems from descriptions of the reception of Attalos (I) Sōtēr and two envoys from Rome and Rhodes into Athens in 200 B.C.E. to discuss a declaration of war against Philip V (Polyb., 16.25-26; Livy, 31.14.11-15.7). For reconstruction based on the Athenian reception of Athēniōn, ambassador of Mithradatēs Eupatōr Dionysos, in 88 B.C.E., see Le Guen 2006. Several surviving texts demonstrate that a decree was necessary to authorize the *apantēsis* and regulate the principal stages of the festival-like event (Perrin-Saminadayar 2009, 67–71).

[53] Perrin-Saminadayar 2004-2005, 364-72.

[54] E.g., the Athenians named a tribe after Attalos Sōtēr on the occasion of his *apantēsis* in 200 B.C.E. (Polyb., 16.25.9; Livy, 31.15.6).

[55] Plut., *Pomp*. 27.3: ἀναβὰς δὲ καὶ θύσας τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ προσαγορεύσας τὸν δῆμον. Plutarch records an epigram inscribed on the city gate that suggests an *isotheos* status for Pompeius, but the situation is uncertain; see Hoff 2005, 328, 331.

[56] Habicht 1997, 311; Bell 2004, 111.

[57] This shared titulature was most prominent in the Ptolemaic dynasty: e.g., Ptolemy (I) Sōtēr and his wife Berenikē I were officially the Theoi Sōtēres (Savior Gods), Ptolemy (III) Euergetēs and his wife Berenikē II the Theoi Euergetai (Benefactor Gods), etc.

result of the Athenian *apantēsis-apodochē* protocol for appropriately ranked persons.

Part of the Athenian response to the *apantēsis* of Antonius and Octavia in 39 may have been the episode of Antonius's betrothal and marriage to Athena, provided that the event actually occurred and at this early date.[58] Seneca (*Suas*. 1.6), who has lifted the episode out of its historical context, associates the marriage incident with one of Antonius's arrivals in Athens and a multi-front imitation of Dionysos; no mention is made of Octavia. As Dio (38.49.2) relates the same information and situates the betrothal anecdote in the winter of 39/8 (also with no mention of Octavia), this date is usually attached to the incident. There is a possibility, however, that the marriage to Athena did not occur until Antonius and Kleopatra arrived in Athens in the summer of 32, as was the opinion of Margaret Thompson and, more recently, É. Perrin-Saminadayar.[59] If true, then Dio has associated the event with the wrong visit. The difference in dates also influences the innuendo attached to the jest that Octavia and Athena should both divorce Antonius (Sen., *Suas*. 1.6-7): either Octavia was present and the relationship between Antonius and Kleopatra was already an open secret or Kleopatra was present and she and Antonius together bore the brunt of the joke.[60] Although Dio cannot be dismissed out-of-hand, the latter date is, in my opinion, the more attractive option since the divorce lampoon would have been better timed and had much more bite than in the earlier period, before the situation had really had a chance to develop.

Descriptions of Antonius's, and to a much more limited extent Octavia's, activities in Athens during the winter of 39/8 paint a picture in which the Athenians could very well have found further cause to offer divine honors.[61] Plutarch and Appian, perhaps owing to a shared source, relate similar stories of Antonius the philathenian immersing himself in the cultural and civic life of Athens. As A. Lessie has aptly observed, ancient literary portrayals

---

[58] Sen., *Suas*. 1.6-7; Cass. Dio, 48.39.2.

[59] Thompson 1941, 227 n. 89; Perrin-Saminadayar 2004-2005, 363; contra Raubitschek 1946, 147 n. 5.

[60] By the time Octavia arrived in Athens in 39, Kleopatra had already given birth to the first of her children by Antonius, the twins Alexander Helios and Kleopatra Selene (born in 40 B.C.E.).

[61] Plut., *Ant*. 33.3-4; App., *B Civ*. 5.76; Cass. Dio, 48.39.2.

of Antonius present him as a play-actor on a stage, a man characterized as one "who shifts easily between different identities."[62] During this period of residence in Athens, Antonius quite literally changes costume, divesting himself of all insignia of his office as *triumvir* and *imperator* (military general) and donning distinctly Attic attire. He shifts from Roman to non-Roman, from ruling official to private individual.[63] What is more, Antonius, if we can take Plutarch (*Ant*. 57.2) at face value, was granted the honor of Athenian *politeia* (citizenship) at some unknown moment during his relationship with Athens.[64]

In his new guise Antonius pursued leisure and took up the Hellenic lifestyle as an Athenian. This demonstration of further goodwill towards Athens could have been enough to elicit an honorific response whereby Antonius and Octavia became Theoi Euergetai. At the same time, however, a detail found in Plutarch suggests a less ambiguous cause for divine honors at this time. According to Plutarch, Antonius received news of victory from the Parthian front while wintering at Athens. Ventidius, dispatched a year earlier to deal with Labienus and the Parthians, had by the autumn of 39 won two major battles, one at the Cilician Gates and the other at the Syrian Gates at Mount Amanos, and pushed the Parthians back from Cilicia and Syria. Although Antonius was not directly involved in the fighting, Ventidius operated under his aegis; thus, Ventidius's successes were also Antonius's. In celebration Antonius "feasted the Hellenes [Greeks] and was gymnasiarch for the Athenians."[65] The gymnasiarchy was one of the liturgical obligations of wealthy Athenian citizens, and the gymnasiarch was typically responsible for equipping and

---

[62] Lessie 2015, 15.

[63] Plutarch (*Ant*. 33.4) describes Antonius as dressed ἐν ἱματίῳ καὶ φαικασίοις προῄει, "in himation and white shoes," while Appian (*B Civ*. 5.76) describes Antonius as σχῆμα τετράγωνον ἔχων καὶ ὑπόδημα Ἀττικὸν, "wearing the square-cut garment [the himation or *pallium*] and Attic footwear." Cassius Dio (48.39.2) simply says that Antonius lived contrary to his native Roman customs.

[64] *Politeia* was an honor Greek *poleis* conferred upon foreigners as part of the institution of euergetism since at least the end of the sixth century B.C.E. See Gygax 2016, 40, 49, 61, 194–96, 227, 236.

[65] Plut., *Ant*. 33.4: ἐπὶ τούτοις εἱστία τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ἐγυμνασιάρχει δὲ Ἀθηναίοις. I presume that Plutarch uses the broader term οἱ Ἕλληνες (the Hellenes or Greeks) to mean that the feasting was not limited to Athenian citizens alone, but rather open to whoever was in the city at the time. The Roman defector Labienus was killed at the first battle and the Parthian general Pharnapatēs at the second (Plut., *Ant*. 33; App., *B Civ* 5.65; Cass. Dio, 48.39.3-41.6).

training the *lampadēphoroi* (torch runners) for the *lampadēdromia* (torch race) of certain festivals, the Greater Panathenaia among them.[66] Such liturgical euergetism had been an integral part of the civic fabric of *poleis* for centuries, and Antonius's participation was yet another way in which he cultivated goodwill with the Athenians and they with him. This atmosphere of military victory, benefaction, and "philathenianness" may well have provided the conditions under which Antonius was acclaimed Theos Euergetēs. And lest Octavia be relegated to a mere bystander in the extension of honors to her as Thea Euergetis, it must be noted that she gained a great deal of popularity during her residence in Athens. To this point, Plutarch notes further on in the *Life* (*Ant*. 57.1) that Octavia had received τιμᾶι (*timai*, honors) in Athens on account of the fact that the Athenians were extremely fond of her. Whether these honors mentioned by Plutarch were linked to those represented by *Agora* XVIII H273 is impossible to ascertain, as is any coincidence with the winter of 39/8. The possibility does, however, exist. Also, although many Roman senatorial women had received honorific treatment alongside husbands and fathers in the previous decades of the first century B.C.E., Octavia is the first known case of deification prior to the imperial period.[67]

The link between the Athenian gymnasiarch and the Greater Panathenaia is another argument that sometimes appears in discussions where the eponymous festival for Antonius and *IG* II^2 1043 are at play.[68] The two are usually connected through the coincidence of their occurrence in 39/8; however, as established above, the celebration of the Antonieia

---

[66] Fontani 1999, 197 and nn. 14-15; Austin 2006, no. 117 n. 1; Gygax 2016, 173 n. 177. A liturgy may be seen as an obligatory service that bore the perception of benefaction (Gygax 2016, 36) or as a kind of honorific tax (Austin 2006, no. 48 n. 6) through which wealthy citizens made contributions to the *polis* over and above the moral obligations shared by all citizens. Antonius's liturgical activities in Athens (and elsewhere) were easily placed in contrast to his duties as a Roman magistrate for propagandistic purposes at the instigation of Octavianus and his supporters; see Fontani 1999, 196.

[67] Kajava 1990, esp. 71-2 (cat. 22). Unfortunately, Kajava did not take advantage of the opportunity to examine *Agora* XVIII H273 beyond the conclusions of Raubitschek (1946).

[68] Thus Raubitschek (1946, 148-49), referring to the debate over the reconstruction of line 23 of *IG* II^2 1043, comments that "one cannot be sure, therefore, whether the Panathenaic Games of 39/8 B.C. were called after Antony (as many have assumed), because he functioned as gymnasiarch, or whether special games were established in his honor, which received the name Panathenaic Antoniea [*sic*]."

attested in *IG* II^2 1043 took place the following year and was probably not connected with the Panathenaia. That Antonius performed the office of gymnasiarch in Athens more than once is a possibility, but one that must remain unsubstantiated. Of greater import is the question of what conditions in Athens could have induced the Athenians to offer Antonius an eponymous festival and the appellation Theos Neos Dionysos in the year 38/7. The answer may very well lie once again with the Parthian threat across the Aegean.

Come the new campaigning season in 38, Ventidius was once again engaged with the Parthian army, under the command of the crown-prince Pakoros, in the north of Syria. Entrenched to the northeast of Antioch at Gindaros, Ventidius completely routed the Parthians in battle and took the head of Pakoros. Antonius, having made a brief sojourn to Italy, joined Ventidius along the upper Euphrates midsummer to besiege the Parthian-allied king of Kommagēnē, Antiochos Theos Dikaios Epiphanēs Philorhōmaios Philhellēn, in his capital of Samosata. The siege was far from a resounding success for the Romans and eventually ended in a coming to terms (in Rome's favor). With the Parthian threat to Syria definitively quelled, Antonius rejoined Octavia in Athens for the winter of 38/7. Should *Agora* XVIII H273 not belong to 39/8, this second winter in the city is another possibility for the date of the inscription; however, whether the honors of *Agora* XVIII H273 are related to those of *IG* II^2 1043 is difficult to say without more information.[69]

Antonius's triumphant return to Athens could hardly have failed to generate a jubilant atmosphere as did the previous year's successes against the Parthians. Could it be that the divine honors offered to Antonius, the eponymous festival and the title θεός νεός Διόνυσος / Theos Neos Dionysos, were meant to celebrate the successes of the Antonian forces and their general? Downdating the archonship of Menandros, the eponymous archon attached to the occurrence of the Antonieia in *IG* II^2 1043, to the year 38/7 allows for the

[69] Plut., *Ant*. 34; Cass. Dio, 49.19-22; Pelling 1996, 23. Ventidius returned to Rome and, according to the list of *triumphatores* from the *Fasti Triumphales*, otherwise known as the *Fasti Capitolini* (Beard 2007, 61–6, 72–80), celebrated a triumph EX·TAVRO … MONTE·ET·PARTHEIS (*CIL* I^2, p. 50), for the victory "at Mount Taurus and over the Parthians." The triumph seems to have taken place on 27 November 38 B.C.E. (Buttrey 1953, 10–16; Buttrey 1960, 106-08; Pelling 1996, 24).

possibility of a connection between the Parthian campaigns in Syria and the divine honors for Antonius in Athens. A potential relationship between military victory and the Athenian honors is an explanation that reflects the rationale of *isotheoi timai* at the *polis* level, for recognition of conquest/victory was part of the euergetic reciprocity that had developed in the Hellenistic period as a means of communication between subjects and rulers (and eventually other categories of extraordinary benefactors). Most especially, the military connection provides an alternative route of interpretation for Antonius's acclamation as Theos Neos Dionysos that takes into consideration the title's roots in the honorific practices of ruler cult and Hellenistic royal titulature.

The common disinclination to see past reports of Antonius's real-life imitation of the god Dionysos and his insistence upon being publicly addressed as Dionysos or *neos* Dionysos has resulted in the absence of sufficient explanation for Antonius's titulature in *IG* II^2 1043 (line 23). In reality, the inscription may or may not have anything to do with how ancient authors chose to represent the *triumvir*. That is to say that, although Antonius may very well have fancied himself Dionysos incarnate before the entire Hellenic world as early as 39 or at some later date, his acclamation as Theos Neos Dionysos at Athens may be a completely separate issue linked to cultural norms of the eastern Mediterranean rather than historical reception. Attempting to understand how the title or epithet Theos Neos Dionysos and Antonius could relate to one another involves consideration of two aspects of Hellenistic rulership: the basic conventions of royal titulature and the status of Dionysos as the royal god par excellence thanks to the god's affiliation with the kingship of Alexander III of Macedon, the ultimate source of authority and legitimation of rule in the Hellenistic kingdoms.

The titulature of male and female rulers is one of the most recognizable characteristics of the Hellenistic period, as even a fleeting encounter with the history of the period is enough to gain familiarity with such names as Ptolemy (I) Sōtēr, Seleukos (I) Nikatōr, Arsinoë (II) Philadelphos, Ptolemy (III) Euergetēs, Mithridatēs (VI) Eupatōr

Dionysos, and Kleopatra (VII) Thea Philopatōr.[70] There is no question that Hellenistic royal titulature followed a consistent and systematic, yet flexible, formulation that combined personal names with one or more epithets attuned to the qualities, deeds, achievements, and dynastic lineages vital to the (self-) presentation of rulers. The epithet examples provided in the above list represent a canon of approximately 33 epithets employed in official titulature sanctioned, though not always initiated, at the level of the royal administration, as is evident from their appearance in the epigraphic, papyrological, numismatic, and literary records.[71] Equally familiar are the "unofficial epithets," more properly labeled nicknames, which originated in public opinion and were unofficially promoted outside the purview of royal authority.[72] Unlike epithets proper, nicknames appear solely in the literary record.[73]

The prevailing trend in modern studies of Hellenistic royal titulature is the division of the epithetic canon into three spheres: the politico-military (e.g., Euergetēs/Euergetis, Sōtēr/Sōteira, Nikatōr, Nikēphoros), the religio-cultic (e.g., Theos/Thea, Epiphanēs), and the dynastic (e.g., Philadelphos, Philopatōr, Philomētōr).[74] Owing to the inflexibility of this classification system, the categories are highly artificial when it comes to epithets that do not fall squarely in one sphere or another.[75] For example, Sōtēr/Sōteira and Euergetēs/

---

[70] These epithets translate as: Savior (Sōtēr); Victor (Nikatōr); Brother-loving (Philadelphos); Benefactor (Euergētēs); of noble descent (Eupatōr); and goddess who loves her father (Thea Philopatōr).

[71] As listed in Muccioli 2013, 11–2. Muccioli's list is not exhaustive given that the purpose of his monograph is a synthesized analysis of royal titulature and not a repertoire of single instances of all attested royal epithets. An alternative list comprised of royal epithets found on Hellenistic coinages, and thus of an expanded range of possibilities, is found in de Callataÿ and Lorber 2011, 450–52.

[72] Nicknames typically described physiognomic and/or personality traits of individuals and could be complementary or derogatory depending upon an individual's popularity. Well known examples include Poliorkētēs (Besieger of cities) for Dēmētrios, Physkōn (Fat-belly) for Ptolemy VIII, Grypos (Hook-nose) for Antiochos VIII, and Aulētēs (Flute-player) for Ptolemy XII. Epithets and nicknames also served the practical purpose of specifying historical persons, particularly those with the same name (e.g., the Ptolemies). The use of Roman numerals is a modern convention not found in ancient sources.

[73] Muccioli 2013, 19–25 provides an extensive discussion that includes issues of terminology in ancient and modern literature. See also de Callataÿ and Lorber 2011, 417–19. In some instances, nicknames proved much more popular than official epithets so that certain rulers are more commonly known by a nickname rather than an official title (e.g., Antiochos VIII often called Grypos rather than Epiphanēs Philomētōr Kallinikos).

[74] While the epithets tied most closely to the politico-military and/or religio-cultic spheres could originate with the honors offered rulers from *poleis* or the royal administration, dynastic epithets went hand-in-hand with dynastic cults and, thus, originated with the royal administration.

[75] Muccioli 2013, 14–8 with discussion and bibliography.

Euergetis are often assigned to the politico-military sphere owing to the fact that, as with Antiochos III at Tēos, hailing rulers as saviors and benefactors had much to do with the euergetic basis of *polis*-ruler relations. At the same time, Sōter/Sōteira and Euergetēs/Euergetis also belong to the religio-cultic sphere since several divinities, Zeus, the Dioskouroi, and Athena for instance, possessed these and other popular epithets long before the Hellenistic period. While a small number of epithets were neologisms specifically created for royal titulature, the majority either originated in or were associated with the Hellenic religious sphere at large. The rapid rise in the use of divinely-derived epithets in appellations of rulers speaks to the transference of divine qualities to mortals as part of *isotheoi timai* and the ruler cult phenomenon.[76]

Titles composed of Theos or a compound of Theos and one or more suitable companion epithets were not all that common for living kings.[77] As we have already seen, the term *theos* is ambivalent and inherently flexible in meaning; the borderline between traditional deities and mortal recipients of ruler cult is one not easily defined. The same holds true in the realm of royal titulature, where the epithetic use of *theos* is no less ambiguous in its assertions about the nature of the deified ruler.[78] At a basic level, Theos seems to have served to underscore the divinity of the king in general terms.[79] The more common form Theos Epiphanēs (God Manifest), first introduced as an official title ca. 198 B.C.E. for the young Ptolemy V, may have been intended to further emphasize the king's *isotheos* status through the assertion that he too was capable of the divine *epiphaneia* (divine manifestation, something hidden made visible, the perception of divinity by one or

[76] Versnel 2011, 460–65; Muccioli 2013, 26–8, 159–93, 281–332.

[77] In contradistinction to the well-known Ptolemaic practice of incorporating deceased royal couples, deified post mortem, into the dynastic cult as the Theoi Sōtēres (Ptolemy I and Berenikē I), the Theoi Adelphoi (Ptolemy II and Arsinoë II), the Theoi Euergetai (Ptolemy III and Berenikē II), and so forth.

[78] For a full discussion of Theos and the closely related Theos Epiphanēs and Epiphanēs, see Muccioli 2013, 281–309. Contrary to what one might expect, the appearance of Theos (or Thea) in the titulature of a living monarch was not all that common and did not come into use until Ptolemy V became Theos Epiphanēs (God Manifest) ca. 198 B.C.E.

[79] Muccioli 2013, 284.

more of the senses) of a traditional deity.[80] The preferred option, however, was to clearly intimate a king's identification with a specific god, Dionysos almost exclusively, through the direct use of the god's name preceded or not by Theos and/or the adjective *neos* (young, new, fresh).[81] Apart from reinforcing the god-like condition of the recipient of *isotheoi timai*, an appellation like Theos Neos Dionysos may have also made some manner of claim that the mortal individual was an incarnation of Dionysos.[82] This concept of incarnation need not be in the literal sense of a divinity inhabiting a human body, but rather in a more vague sense in which the man in question reproduces the qualities and achievements of a particular god, in this case Dionysos.[83] I suggest that it is within this likening of a mortal with a specific deity because the former replicates the qualities and/or achievements characteristic of the latter that the honoring of Antonius as Theos Neos Dionysos may be better understood on a level attuned to evidence contemporary with Antonius's lifetime.

The focus on Dionysos in the construction of the public identities of Hellenistic kings traces back to the alignment of this god's divine exploits with Alexander III's conquest of the Achaemenid Persian Empire in the second half of the 4th century B.C.E. One of the many facets of Dionysos, whose multiplicity defies reduction to a single definition with distinct boundaries, is his affiliations with eastern lands, particularly the region of Baktria near the Hindu Kush. Beyond accounts of his birth and rearing at Nysa, Dionysos was said to have come to Greece from the East at the head of his entourage in true Dionysiac fashion. In the wake of Alexander's unimaginable achievements, Dionysos's peregrination from Baktria took on a triumphal character due to the evolution

---

[80] Muccioli 2013, 282–87, 295; Seaford 2006, 39; Petridou 2015, 2–3, 5–11.

[81] Muccioli 2013, 287–90. The Seleukids preferred Apollo, from whom the dynasty claimed descent. Aphrodite was the primary choice for queens.

[82] Nock (1930) 1972, 147-52; Muccioli 2013, 287. Nock, who cites Ptolemy XII as the only example, presents a limited interpretation based upon the narrow, often disparaging, view of the then-current scholarship concerning the Ptolemies. We have since made great strides in the study of Hellenistic rulership thanks to an ever-increasing corpus of evidence and major shifts in approaches to the Hellenistic age in recent decades.

[83] Nock (1930) 1972, 149, 152.

of his story to include a conquest of India à la Alexander.[84] "Entangled with the rising legend of the Macedonian king, the royal figure of Dionysus was developed into a divine prototype of the mighty and epiphanic kingship of the Hellenistic period, a consequence of which can be seen in the strengthened military connotation of his [Dionysos's] mythic *thiasos* [group of a god's worshippers] in the Hellenistic stories about the god."[85] In other words, Dionysos became an integral component of the ideology of Hellenistic kingship, in which the concept of rule by right of *dōriktētos chōra* (spear-won land) and the invocation of Alexander were used to establish legitimacy and authority.[86] It is entirely unclear whether Alexander was identified with Dionysos during his lifetime, for the Alexander known to history is the one posthumously constructed through a process begun by the first of his successors. What is certain, however, is that the Alexander-Dionysos-India connection was in place at least from the time of the famous *pompē* of Ptolemy (II) Philadelphos in Alexandria in the third or fourth decade of the third century.[87] Thus, by the first century B.C.E., the mirroring of Dionysos and Alexander as eastern conquerors had long before taken hold and become a familiar motif associated with Hellenistic kingship and the reciprocal euergetic dialogue of ruler cult.

What the Persian Empire was to Alexander in the fourth century, the Parthian Empire was to Rome in the first century and well into the imperial period. Conquest of the Parthian Empire was the brass ring, a chance for powerful and ambitious military leaders to cast themselves as new Alexanders and, after the Roman disaster at Carrhae in 53, to avenge Rome. Antonius's return to Athens following the success of his legions

---

[84] Diod. Sic., 4.3; Arr., *Ind*. 5.

[85] Caneva 2016, 82.

[86] Other central ideological principles include the demonstration of euergetism towards populations within and outside of one's kingdom, membership in one of the royal dynasties, associations with the divine sphere, and observance of ideal ethical qualities, such as justice and piety towards the gods. Together, all six principles were the universal building blocks that could be selected and in combined in ways suitable to the public image a particular ruler wished to project.

[87] The only account of the Grand Procession, as the event is often called, is found in Athenaeus (*Deipn*. 5.197C-203B), who has taken excerpts from the much earlier work of Kallixeinos of Rhodes. Caneva 2016 (87-121, 173-76) provides an up-to-date assessment of the procession with bibliography and discussion of earlier work.

against the Parthians in Syria in 38 was a moment that lent itself naturally to comparison with Dionysos in his manifestation as the divine prototype for earthly rulers. As such, if the force of the title Theos Neos Dionysos was to identify Antonius as an incarnation of Dionysos, then Antonius's victory over the Parthians and his subsequent arrival in Athens could be framed in divine terms as the epiphany of the triumphant Dionysos in Greece following his conquest of India. That is to say that Antonius replicated the achievements and qualities of Dionysos in ways other than bibulousness and overindulgence. In turn, the Antonieia were possibly connected with victory celebrations in Athens as had occurred the previous year. If the Antonieia were in any way proximate to the Anthestēria, itself a festival in part dedicated to the epiphany of Dionysos, the parallel would have been present and tangible, with attendees of the festivals able to engage with the mingling of the deified Antonius and his counterpart Dionysos through sensorial experience.

Whether the Antonieia of 38/7 was the first and/or only occurrence of the festival in Athens and whether the Athenians were the first to celebrate an Antonieia and/or the first to name him Dionysos in an official context cannot be ascertained. The evidence simply does not exist at this time. The paucity of evidence also means that the assumption, drawn from the ancient literary record, that Antonius himself was responsible for his identification with Dionysos cannot be adequately supported as fact. The divine honors indicated in *IG* II^2 1043 and *Agora* XVIII H273 were of the kind initiated at the level of the *polis*. If it is correct to pinpoint 39 and 38 as the beginning of the intensification of Antonius's persona as Dionysos in the public arena, then the triumvir may not have been solely responsible, if at all, for his affiliation with the god, at least at this early stage. Instead, the Athenian honors could have sparked the synonymity with Dionysos that has defined Antonius since antiquity. The alternative scenario would have the Athenians following precedent established elsewhere either concurrently or at an earlier time, perhaps the late 40s. If the latter were the case and the trend had already begun during Antonius's first tour of his triumviral domain, he may have planned to

emphasize the connection to Dionysos upon his return to the East in 39.

Before leaving Athens, one additional account of Antonius's activities in the city warrants mention. The literary passage in question is a fragment of Sokratēs of Rhodes, author of a first century B.C.E. account of the Roman civil wars, preserved in Athenaeus's *Deipnosophistēs* (*Learned Banqueters*), a Platonic-style dialogue of the late second/early third century C.E. in the setting of an extravagant *deipnon* and *symposium* (dinner and drinking party). The excerpt appears in Book IV (147f-148c) where conversation has turned to royal *tryphē* and geo-cultural variations in banqueting practices. The excerpt from Sokratēs begins with the lavish displays of Kleopatra VII during her legendary first encounter with Antonius on the river Kydnos in Cilicia. The scene then shifts to Antonius in Athens, providing the earliest known literary reference to the identification of Antonius with Dionysos.

> ἱστορεῖ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Ἀντώνιον ἐν Ἀθήναις μετὰ ταῦτα διατρίψαντα περίοπτον ὑπὲρ τὸ θέατρον κατασκευάσαντα σχεδίαν χλωρᾷ πεπυκασμένην ὕλῃ, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν Βακχικῶν ἄντρων γίνεται, ταύτης τύμπανα καὶ νεβρίδας καὶ παντοδαπὰ ἄλλ᾽ ἀθύρματα Διονυσιακὰ ἐξαρτήσαντα μετὰ τῶν φίλων ἐξ ἑωθινοῦ κατακλινόμενον μεθύσκεσθαι, λειτουργούντων αὐτῷ τῶν ἐξ Ἰταλίας μεταπεμφθέντων ἀκροαμάτων συνηθροισμένων ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν τῶν Πανελλήνων. μετέβαινε δ᾽ ἐνίοτε, φησίν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἀπὸ τῶν τεγῶν λαμπάσι δᾳδουχουμένης πάσης τῆς Ἀθηναίων πόλεως. καὶ ἔκτοτε ἐκέλευσεν ἑαυτὸν Διόνυσον ἀνακηρύττεσθαι κατὰ τὰς πόλεις ἁπάσας.
>
> He [Sokratēs] also reports that when Antonius himself spent some time in Athens after this [the meeting in Cilicia], he had a roughly framed hut built in a conspicuous spot above the Theater and covered with green brushwood, as they do with Bacchic "caves"; and he hung drums, fawnskins, and other Dionysiac paraphernalia of all sorts in it. He lay inside with his friends, beginning at dawn, and got drunk; musicians summoned from Italy entertained him, and the whole Greek world gathered to watch. Sometimes, he says, Antonius moved up onto the Acropolis, and the entire city of Athens was illuminated by the lamps that hung from the ceilings. He also gave orders that from then on he was to be proclaimed as Dionysus throughout all the cities.[88]

It is not entirely clear when this Dionysiac revelry was supposed to have taken place, although the *terminus post quem* must be Antonius's return to the East in 39.[89] The vital piece of missing information is the timing of Antonius's demand that he be

[88] Translation is that of S. D. Olson (Loeb Classical Library edition).

[89] The meeting in Cilicia occurred around the end of summer in 41, after which Antonius spent the winter with the queen in Alexandria.

recognized as Dionysos everywhere, for both the merrymaking in Athens described above and the marriage to Athena episode (Cass. Dio, 48.39.2) are dependent events. Seneca the Elder's (*Suas*. 1.6) description of the affair of Athena's dowry has the Athenians greeting Antonius as Dionysos, seemingly as a response to his divine role-play and the order to (re)name his statues with some form of the designation Dionysos (in Athens alone?). This to me does not have the same force as the reports, found in Sokratēs and Dio, of a command from Antonius that all cities should recognize him as Dionysos. In my mind, the three literary accounts suggest three possible scenarios. First, Dio's chronology is correct and the betrothal to Athena and Antonius's city-wide demand belong to the winter of 39/8. On this condition, Sokratēs and Seneca must also have related events of the same winter. This scenario suggests that the identification of Antonius with Dionysos began prior to 39. Second, Dio has in some way conflated events and is chronologically incorrect. Instead, one should look first to the winter of 38/7 when the Parthian victory of 38 and the subsequent honoring of Antonius with the Antonieia and the title Theos Neos Dionysos could have provided the conditions for the entertainments atop the theater and the Akropolis.[90] The spectacle of Antonius in his Dionysiac grotto could then be of his own making or part of the festal activities of the Antonieia. Looking ahead to the work of securing Armenia and Media Atropatēnē against Parthia,[91] the treatment of Antonius in Athens could have incited the triumvir to strongly encourage his deification as Dionysos in other cities in or around the winter of 38/7 to promote himself in that tradition of eastern conquest. In this case, the affair of Athena's dowry could be pushed forward to 32, as was preferred above. Third, all three authors describe events that occurred in 32

[90] The report of Sokratēs that Antonius used the sacred ground of the Akropolis for pursuing his entertainments is interesting to note. Dēmētrios Poliorkētēs, whose biography parallels that of Antonius in Plutarch's *Lives*, was said to have lived in the Parthenon with his courtesans during one of his earlier stays in the city (Plut., *Demtr*. 23.3).

[91] Antonius's campaign of 36/5 B.C.E has customarily been viewed as a total disaster and a failed attempt to mount a full-scale war against Parthia. A new assessment by K. R. Jones suggests that the campaign was a success because Antonius's intent was not to conquer Parthia, but to stabilize Roman-Parthian relations and extend Roman influence to Media Atropatēnē in order to "contain Parthia and to establish a *modus vivendi*" (Jones 2017, 59).

(and Dio would again be considered incorrect), a time when Antonius and Kleopatra were traveling and acting as benefactors to the Dionysian *technitai* (artists' associations) in scenes of banqueting and gift-giving.[92] It is more reasonable to think that, at this late date, Antonius had progressed to the point of fully embodying his honors as Dionysos, for his fate most certainly depended upon his authority in the Hellenistic East. Perhaps any command or other form of insistence regarding widespread recognition as Dionysos was Antonius rousing support for the coming war against Octavianus.

3.4. The Missing Monuments

Fortunate as we are to have the unique epigraphic evidence that has survived from Athens, the corpus falls woefully short of allowing one to reconstruct how the honors for Antonius translated to honorific monuments and other physical expressions of his euergetic relations with the *polis*. Even without the reference to statues of Antonius in the Elder Seneca (*Suas*. 1.6), there could be no doubt that honorific portrait-monuments (an honorific statue plus its inscribed base) of the *triumvir* did exist and likely in a relatively large number in Athens and other locations, including Rome.[93] With the exception of a lone statue base from Alexandria[94] and a possible loricate statue from

[92] Plut., *Ant*. 56.3-57.1.

[93] Plut., *Ant*. 60.2-3 (Alba and Athens), 86.5 (Alexandria); Plut., *Cic*. 49.6 (Rome); Cass. Dio, 48.31.5 (Rome), 49.18.6 (Rome), 50.5.2-3 (dual images of Antonius and Kleopatra), 50.8.6 (Alban Mount), 50.15.2 (Athens).

[94] Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum inv. 10: basalt; h. 28 cm, w. 75 cm; damage to edges and top right corner, inscription worn in places; found in Alexandria, specific findspot and date of discovery unknown; first published 1866 (C. Wescher, *Bull. Int. Arch. Rom*. 38: 199-201, no. 1); according to the inscription the base dates to 28 December 34 B.C.E.; inscription: Ἀντώνιον μέγαν | ἀμίμητον ἀφροδισίοις | Παράσιτος τον ἑαυτοῦ θεὸν [ε] | καὶ εὐεργτην L ιθ τοῦ καὶ δ | Χοιὰχ κθ, "Antonius Megas [the Great], lover without peer, Parasitos (set this up) to his own god and benefactor, 29th day of Choiack, year 19 and year 4 (= 28 December, 34 B.C.E.). See Walker and Higgs 2001, cat. 213 for translation and photograph; also Fraser 1957. Note that the catalogue entry in Walker and Higgs looks to have taken the Greek text of the inscription from Fraser's article, which contains an error in the regnal dates in line 4.

Naxos,[95] no material traces of such monuments remain. Also, as is generally the case with divine honors for Roman recipients in the second and first centuries, the honorific decrees that potentially contained some clue as to what honors were voted and why, the display locations of inscriptions and statues, and any statue specifications no longer exist. That said, Plutarch and Cassius Dio, perhaps drawing from a shared source, point to the statuescape of the Athenian Akropolis playing host to the *triumvir*.[96] Much like the reconstruction of a statue from fragments, however, so too the picture of what transpired on the Akropolis as sketchily described by the two authors is a puzzle with missing pieces.

Both Plutarch (*Ant*. 60.2-3) and Cassius Dio (50.15.2) refer to statuary on the Athenian Akropolis within the context of portents of the coming defeat of Antonius and Kleopatra at Actium. The details differ, but the underlying event is the same: a furious storm topples by force of winds or thunderbolt at least two statues located on the Akropolis.[97] Plutarch says that three statues were toppled, the Dionysos belonging to the Gigantomachy (battle of gods and giants) was thrown down into the theater and two colossal statues of Eumenēs and Attalos of Pergamon (re)inscribed (ἐπιγράφειν) with

---

[95] Naxos Archaeological Museum: fragmentary torso wearing a decorated cuirass, *cingulum* (sash), and *paludamentum* (military cloak); marble; approximate h. 1 m; found in 1986 within the Temple of Dionysos (Sanctuary of Iria); see Lambrinoudakis and Gruben 1987, 608–14 (with photographs); Lambrinoudakis 1989 (with detailed photographs); Lambrinoudakis 1991, 173–75; also B. Sismondo Ridgway, *Hellenistic Sculpture II: The Styles of ca. 200-100 B.C.* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2000), 275-77. The tentative attribution to Antonius depends upon a stylistic dating to the first century B.C.E. and the mythical subject matter of the figural reliefs: the punishment of Dirkē, who was a follower of Dionysos (upper zone of cuirass); Hēraklēs and the Nemean Lion (lower zone of cuirass); and a standing Dionysos holding a thyrsos and kantharos and accompanied by a panther (central *pteryx*). Also found was the statue's left hand, which once supported a partially surviving Nikē-like statuette currently interpreted as a maenad. An inscribed fragment of the statue's base has been found as well. The excavators have reported that both the torso and the inscription exhibit signs of reuse.

[96] Plut., *Ant*. 60.2-3; Cass. Dio, 50.15.2.

[97] Andrew Stewart has previously expressed to me in conversation the possibility that memories of portents in the form of the toppling of statues of Antonius may be anti-Roman sentiment in disguise; cf. Sen., *Suas*. 1.6. The honors offered to Antonius in Athens were a function of the appropriate and expected treatment of a man in his position that could and did exist alongside political dissatisfaction. For anti-Roman sentiment in Athens, see Hoff 1989, esp. 269-74.

Antonius's name.[98] Dio says that two *eikones* of Antonius and Kleopatra in the form of gods were thrown down into the theater.[99] In both cases the theater is taken to mean the Theater of Dionysos on the south slope of the Athenian Akropolis.

The Dionysos of the Gigantomachy, an appropriate portent because of the identification of Antonius with the god, is generally thought to be one of the several bronze figures belonging to the so-called Small Attalid Dedication, an under-lifesize victory monument dedicated by Attalos (I) Sōtēr (241-197 B.C.E.) or Attalos (II) Philadelphos (159/8-139/8 B.C.E.), that once stood in front of the south wall of the Akropolis alongside the Parthenon.[100] The two Attalid colossi of Eumenēs (II) Sōtēr (197-159/8 B.C.E.) and either his brother Attalos Philadelphos or their father Attalos Sōtēr seem to have stood at the east end of the Small Dedication.[101] Without knowing precisely Plutarch's meaning, at the very least the Attalid colossi were reused as dedications to Antonius through the appearance of his name, and the original inscription(s) retained or erased. Modification of the statues themselves was not a necessary condition, but could have occurred. Reuse of honorific dedications in Athens was not unusual at this time, particularly given difficult economic conditions.[102] Already by the first century B.C.E. the Akropolis had experienced a reorientation in its dedications from various forms of votive dedications offered to Athens to portrait statues erected as public and private honorific dedications to the subjects represented.[103] The Athenians drew upon this population of honorific dedications when they "responded to the political turmoil of the end of the Roman Republic and the ensuing Augustan settlement with a spate of honorific portrait

---

[98] καὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησι γιγαντομαχίας ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ὁ Διόνυσος ἐκσεισθεὶς εἰς τὸ θέατρον κατηνέχθη προσῳκείου δὲ ἑαυτὸν Ἀντώνιος Ἡρακλεῖ κατὰ γένος καὶ Διονύσῳ κατὰ τὸν τοῦ βίου ζῆλον, ὥσπερ εἴρηται, Διόνυσος νέος προσαγορευόμενος. ἡ δὲ αὐτὴ θύελλα καὶ τοὺς Εὐμενοῦς καὶ Ἀττάλου κολοσσοὺς ἐπιγεγραμμένους Ἀντωνείους Ἀθήνησιν ἐμπεσοῦσα μόνους ἐκ πολλῶν ἀνέτρεψε. See Pelling 1988, 266.

[99] τάς τε εἰκόνας αὐτῶν, ἃς οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει τὸ τῶν θεῶν σχῆμα ἐχούσας ἔστησαν, κεραυνοὶ ἐς τὸ θέατρον κατήραξαν.

[100] Stewart 2004, esp. 181-236, 242-86.

[101] Stewart 2004, 198–99.

[102] Keesling 2010, 307.

[103] Keesling 2007, 142.

statues that primarily represented Roman subjects."[104] Thus, the rededication of the Attalid statues in and of itself is not all that problematic; it is rather the existence and location of the originals and the reality behind Plutarch's statement, for nothing of these statues has yet been identified in the archaeological record.

Dio's is the more perplexing version of the portents, and three possibilities present themselves. First, the portents of Dio and Plutarch are one in the same, but Dio has conflated the portent of the statues of Antonius and Kleopatra and that of the Gigantomachy Dionysos. Second, Dio refers to the same two statues as Plutarch, but one of the male Attalids somehow became a Kleopatra. Third, Dio refers to two statues that are completely different from Plutarch's colossi. Of the three, the second option seems unlikely and the first is perhaps the more likely explanation.[105] Dio may have intended the reader to recall an earlier allegation at 50.5.3 where he asserts that Antonius and Kleopatra were visually represented together in painting and sculpture in the guise of Dionysos/Osiris and Selēnē/Isis. The historian provides no further explanation, and no other author makes the same comment. The what and where of Dio's reference and the validity of his information is, therefore, completely unknown; the archaeological record is, of course, no help.[106]

A possible third Attalid monument on the Akropolis may have had an Antonian phase. There was, just outside the Propylaia where the imposing marble base is still visible today, a bronze quadriga (four-horse chariot) group dedicated to Eumenēs Sōtēr dated to ca. 178. An epigraphic erasure and cuttings for the sculpture group in the blocks

---

[104] Keesling 2007, 141.

[105] Pelling 1988, 266; Habicht 1997, 364 n. 108.

[106] The temptation to take license with this passage and draw unfounded and overstated conclusions about Antonius, his images on display around the Hellenistic East, and the status of Osiris as an Egyptian god intimately connected with pharaonic kingship must be avoided. It would have been completely inappropriate for Antonius to be depicted as Osiris, for that was the prerogative of kings of Egypt. The Greek Dionysos and the Egyptian Osiris shared common qualities, primarily as gods of liquids, that led the Greek tradition to draw a comparison between the two. Isis was the primary deity of Egyptian queenship and had some ties to the moon, which may be the reason for the crossover with the Greek moon goddess Selēnē in this instance. The association with Kleopatra is odd since her usual divine identification is Aphrodite/Isis.

of the base demonstrate that the monument was modified and reused. The surviving inscription (*IG* II^2 4122), which represents the final iteration of the monument, names Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa as the honored recipient. Analysis of the cuttings in the blocks, primarily for the horses' hooves, has shown that the quadriga group was changed twice, which means that the monument had three phases.[107] The intervening phase has been connected with Antonius on the basis of the portents of the toppled statues despite the fact that the trajectory in relation to the theater is not possible. Unfortunately, the erasure of the previous inscriptions has eradicated any identifying information. Reuse of this monument to honor Antonius, and possibly Kleopatra if she were included as the secondary figure, would have been very noticeable. One can only imagine the impact of graffiti such as that described by the Elder Seneca (*Suas*. 1.6).

The preceding discussion has attempted to bring the only epigraphic attestations of divine honors offered to Antonius to the fore and recontextualize the evidence in terms of his relationship with Athens and the underlying currents of Hellenistic ruler cult. Previously used primarily to support literary reports of Antonius's activities in the East, *IG* II^2 1043 and *Agora* XVIII H273 are standalone documents capable of presenting a picture of his Dionysos persona apart from moralizing judgements. While the vast majority of ancient literature relevant to Antonius is far removed from his lifetime, the inscriptions from Athens are rare instances of contemporary evidence best deployed when firmly connected to their proper contexts. According to *Agora* XVIII H273, which may be the earlier of the two inscriptions, Antonius and his wife Octavia were hailed Theoi Euergetai in a way that need not have anything to do with the identification of Antonius as Dionysos nor with the assumed identification of Octavia as Athena Polias. The honorific title more readily reflects the Athenians relating to the couple as benefactors worthy of divine honors, perhaps in reaction to their favorable presence in the city during the winter of 39/8. Another condition could have been the efforts of the Antonian forces

[107] Korres 2000, 314–19; also Keesling 2010, 307-08.

to repel the Parthian invasions of Asia Minor and Syria, which may also lie behind the acclamation of Antonius as Theos Neos Dionysos and the creation of the Antonieia in Athens attested in *IG* II^2 1043 (lines 22-23). The definitive victory over the Parthians in 38 may provide the reason for honoring Antonius in a way that designated him an incarnation of Dionysos who had replicated the god's eastern conquests. Whereas *IG* II^2 1043 is the only surviving textual evidence for the identification of Antonius with Dionysos in a public, official context, a different kind of evidence represents the only surviving graphic attestation of this same identification. This evidence, the *cistophori* minted in Asia, will be the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 4

Antonius and the Ivy

Moving now across the Aegean to *provincia Asia*, this chapter considers the third part of the archaeological evidence connected with Antonius's association with Dionysos, the issue of *cistophori* bearing Antonius's portrait minted ca. 38 B.C.E.[1] These coins have figured so prominently in discussions of Antonius's career because, in addition to the Dionysiac theme historically characteristic of the cistophoric coinages, the portrait of the *triumvir* depicts Antonius wearing an ivy wreath, one of Dionysos's primary attributes. These numismatic images are the only known instances of securely identifiable representations of Antonius that incorporate Dionysiac iconography;[2] thus, much has been made of the *cistophori* as unequivocal proof that Antonius considered himself the embodiment of Dionysos in the ways laid out in ancient literature. The situation on the ground, however, is not so one-dimensional.

The *cistophori*, as with the epigraphically attested honors for Antonius in Athens (*IG* II^2 1043 and *Agora* XVIII H273), present challenges of chronology and interpretation. Especially vexing is the fact that the date of the *cistophori* cannot be pinpointed due to the absence of a date on the coins themselves and difficulties involved in dating elements of Antonius's official Roman titulature. A further complication comes from Plutarch (*Ant*. 24.2-4), who first references Antonius's identification with Dionysos in conjunction with the visit to Ephesos in the spring of 41. He is the only author to situate the mortal-god pairing at this early date, perhaps to better serve his character

---

[1] *BMCRR* II, 133-37; Sutherland 1970, 1–11, 33, 86–88, 105-06, 112–13; *RPC* I, p. 377, nos. 2201-02.

[2] As the situation currently stands. One must of course allow for the fact that additional evidence in other media may exist, but has gone unrecognized as relating to Antonius.

portrait of Antonius in light of the fact that the famed scene of the meeting with Kleopatra in Cilicia immediately follows (*Ant*. 25-27).[3]

In keeping with the overall intent of the current project, the primary purpose of this chapter is to recontextualize the *cistophori* of Antonius according to their nature as currency using numismatic methodology, a perspective that is generally lacking within Antonian scholarship at large. A detail largely overlooked in this regard is that *cistophori* were struck on a reduced weight standard and, therefore, had a limited range of circulation, which affects any potential relationship between the Dionysiac imagery on the coins and the epigraphic evidence from Athens. Interpretation of the significance of the Antonian *cistophori* from a visual perspective has never truly extended beyond a superficial reading. Rarely, if ever, does mention of these coins not dismiss the iconographic scheme as Antonius's insistence upon his identification as Dionysos (as says Dio at 48.39.2) and the pre-existing condition of the cistophorus as primarily Dionysiac in design.[4] In probing further and seeking alternative explanations within the larger context of Antonius's administration of the East, I suggest below that the euergetic basis of ruler cult and Antonius playing benefactor to the *technitai* (artists) of Dionysos may have contributed to the Dionysiac presentation of Antonius on the *cistophori*.

[3] Pelling 1988, 179–80.

[4] E.g., Pelling 1988, 209.

4.1. Introduction to the *cistophori* of Antonius (*RPC* 2201-2202)

The *cistophori* issued under Antonius's authority were struck in two types as described below.

RPC 2201 (Figure 2)
Obv. M·ANTONIVS·IMP·COS·DESIG·ITER·ET·TERT·, around; head of Antonius wearing ivy wreath, r.; below, lituus; ivy wreath border.[5]
Rev. III·VIR·, l., R·P·C·, r; draped bust of Octavia, r., on a cista mystica, flanked by twisting serpents.[6]

RPC 2202 (Figure 3)
Obv. M·ANTONIVS·IMP·COS·DESIG·ITER·ET·TERT·, around; head of Antonius, wearing ivy wreath, and draped bust of Octavia, jugate, r.; border of dots.
Rev. III·VIR·, l., R·P·C·, r; Dionysos standing, l., on a cista mystica, holding a kantharos and a thyrsos, flanked by twisting serpents.[7]

Neither the precise strike date of the Antonian *cistophori* nor the mint(s) from which they originated are certain, as the coins themselves do not bear dates, mint marks, or ethnics.[8] We must, therefore, rely upon chronological markers within Antonius's career and what we know about cistophoric production during the first century B.C.E. The titles identifying Antonius in the obverse and reverse legends name him as *Imperator* (IMP), *Consul Designatus Iter Et Tertio* (COS DESIG ITER ET TERT), *Triumvir Reipublicae Constituendae* (III VIR RPC), which is Imperator (Commander), Consul Designate for the Second and Third Time, Triumvir for the Establishment of the State. First, the *cistophori* must have been minted after Antonius as *triumvir* took up the administration of the

[5] Ivy and the ivy wreath are standard attributes of Dionysos, ivy being the plant sacred to the god (Otto 1965, 152–59). The evergreen leaves and berry clusters of ivy vines recall the grapevines of Dionysos' primary domain, viniculture and wine. Furthermore, the female participants in Bacchic worship, women known as Maenads or Bakchae, may have used ivy leaves as an entheogen to reach the altered state of mind needed to achieve *ekstasis* (being out of oneself) and *enthusiasmos* (having the god inside oneself); see Plut., *Quaest. Rom. 112 (291A-B), Quaest. conv. 3. (648B-649F);* Porres Caballero 2013, 170.

[6] Serpents relate to the cults of Dionysos as chthonic symbols of renewal and the life after death sought through the god's mystery rites and as the accoutrements of Maenads/Bacchae in artistic representations and literature (e.g., Eur., *Bacch*. 102-104, 697-698, 767-768; Nonnus, *Dion*. 14.363, 15.80, 33.368, 35.209, 45.311); see Macías Otero 2013, 335–36. The *cista mystica*, the "mystic basket," held secret objects sacred to the mysteries of Dionysos (Burkert 1993, 265 and n. 33).

[7] The *thyrsos*, a staff wrapped with ivy or vine leaves and sometimes topped with a pinecone, and a *kantharos, a two-handled drinking vessel for wine, are attributes of Dionysos.*

[8] Sutherland 1970, 86.

eastern provinces in 42 after the final victory at Philippi.[9] Second, a predetermination of future consulships must have occurred in order for Antonius to be *consul designatus* for the second and third time. The establishment of the triumvirate under the *lex Titia* (43 B.C.E.) invested Antonius, Octavianus, and their colleague Marcus Aemilius Lepidus with consular power for a term of five years as well as the right to appoint magistrates, which the *triumviri* exercised for the benefit of themselves and their allies.[10] The Perusine War (41-40 B.C.E.) and the food shortages caused by Sextus Pompeius's naval blockade of Italy brought about two important re-negotiations of the terms of the triumvirate within a short period of time. On both occasions, consulships were assigned several years in advance. The settlement at Brundisium in the fall of 40 renewed the mutual cooperation between Antonius and Octavianus and addressed administrative matters like the allocation of future consulships. As a sign of renewed friendship, Octavianus married his sister Octavia, then recently widowed, to Antonius, also recently widowed. The *triumviri* knew that they also had to come to terms with Sextus so that the growing crisis in the western Mediterranean might find some relief. After negotiations through the spring and summer of 39, a settlement was reached at Misenum (or perhaps at Puteoli) in the Bay of Naples. The agreement afforded Sextus a share of the territories divided among the *triumviri* and included him in the consulships, which were allotted down to the year 32.[11] Antonius received the consulships of 38 and 35 as a result of these two settlements. He did not, however, become consul for the second time until 34 because he appointed

[9] Pelling 1996, 9–10.

[10] A. Berger, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law* (Philadelphia: The American Philological Society, 1991 reprint), 560; Millar 1973, 51–2; Pelling 1996, 4.

[11] Cic., *Phil*. 2.113, 5.11, 5.22, 5.64, 13.18; Vell. Pat., 2.76.3, 2.77.1-2, 2.78.1; Plut., *Ant*. 30-32; Suet., *Aug*. 13-14; App., *B Civ*. 5.4-73; Cass. Dio, 48.1-20, 48.27-32.1, 48.35-36, 50.10.1; Millar 1973, 52; Huzar 1978, 131–41; Pelling 1996, 14–21.

suffect consuls to serve in his stead in the years previous.[12] Antonius was, therefore, *consul designatus* for the second and third time from the second half of 39 until the end of 35. This chronological window can be narrowed further, although not without some ambiguity.

Reference to Antonius as IMP without an iteration locates the production of the *cistophori* before his third acclamation as *imperator*, at which point the title changed to IMP TER(T).[13] That is, the *cistophori* must belong to the years in which Antonius was *imperator* for the first or second time. An *imperator* was, at least in the Republican period, a magistrate who possessed the *imperium militiae*, the absolute authority with which the magistrate was invested in the field; hence, the use of *imperator* to refer to a general or commander-in-chief. The commander of an army did not, however, have the right to use *imperator* as a title until such a time that his soldiers, prompted by a worthy victory over a foreign enemy, had hailed him *imperator*. This act of the army was usually a step towards obtaining the right to triumph from the Senate, in which case the honoree was also called *imperator*.[14] Regrettably, the occasions of Antonius's second and third imperatorial acclamations cannot be securely attributed chronologically because the iterations of the title are not attested for Antonius outside of the numismatic record, which alone cannot provide a definitive answer.[15] Mentions of Antonius receiving the

---

[12] Cass. Dio, 48.35.1-3, 49.38.2; *BMCRR* II, pp. 449, 502 n. 1, 505 n. 1; Syme (1939) 2002, 269;Broughton 1951, 410, 531; Buttrey 1953, 21; Millar 1973, 52; Huzar 1978, 140–41. The appointment of suffect consuls became a regular occurrence under the triumvirate and was not limited to Antonius (Broughton 1951, 336–428). Antonius was to be consul for the third time in 31 B.C.E. He did not actually take up office that year on account of the war with Octavianus, but we do have coins (*RRC* 546) affording him the titles COS III (CONSUL FOR THE THIRD TIME) AND IMP IIII (*IMPERATOR* FOR THE FOURTH TIME). HE HAD THUS RECEIVED HIS FOURTH APPELLATION AS *IMPERATOR* BY OR IN 31 B.C.E. (BUTTREY 1953, 26–33).

[13] Buttrey 1953, 6; *RRC, p. 101 and n. 3.*

[14] McFayden 1920, 1–6; Beard 2007, 188. Legally, a magistrate forfeited his *imperium militiae* upon entering the city of Rome and, as a result, surrendered the imperatorial title. The breaking with convention that occurred throughout the civil wars meant that the "rules" were bent and ignored so that, given the circumstances, Antonius never ceased to use *imperator* as part of his titles once he had initially achieved the distinction.

[15] Select bibliography: *BMCRR* II, pp. 448-49, 502 n. 1, 505 n. 1 (with earlier scholarship); Buttrey 1953, 1–33 (with earlier scholarship); Buttrey 1960, 100-08; *RRC, p. 101 no. 533;* Amandry 1990, 80–83; *RPC* I, p. 284.

acclamation *imperator* in literature provide no clarification,[16] nor is there any help from the papyrological and epigraphic records.

The occasion of Antonius's first imperatorial acclamation is generally accepted to be the siege of Mutina in 44/3. The second and third acclamations are much more controversial as tends to happen as a result of ambiguous evidence. Arguments for the timing of the second and third acclamations have assigned various dates falling within a range of seven years, from 42 to 36, in connection with Philippi (42), the settlement at Brundisium (40), the victories of Publius Ventidius over the Parthians in Cilicia (39) and Gindaros (38), and Antonius's campaign in Media Atropatēnē (36).[17] Current opinion follows Michel Amandry (1990, pp. 80-3 and *RPC* I, p. 284), who has argued that Antonius was *imperator* for the third time in 38,[18] with the second acclamation falling within the period between the Treaty of Brundisium and the Parthian defeat at Gindaros. A protracted discussion of the intricacies of the debate over the dating is not of great concern here; rather, a few key points will suffice to outline some of the chronological considerations.

First, the coincidence of IMP or IMP·TER(T) and COS·DESIG·ITER·ET·TERT on coins (e.g., *RRC* 533, 539; *RPC* I, 1453-61, 1462-70, 2201-02, 4088-93) indicates that the second and third imperatorial acclamations were valid in the period in which Antonius was *consul designatus iter et tertio*, namely, 39-35 B.C.E.[19] Second, Philippi and the

---

[16] Select passages: Vell. Pat., 2.82.3; Val. Max., 6.9.9; Plut., *Ant*. 31.3, 33.4, 34.2-4, 43.1; App., *B Civ. 5.65; Cass. Dio, 48.31.3, 48.41.4-5, 49.21.2-3; App., B Civ. 5.65; Cass. Dio, 48.39.3-41.6.*

[17] Buttrey 1953, 4–26 provides an extended review and discussion of the key players and the associated numismatic and ancient literary evidence.

[18] This is also the date followed by Grueber (*BMCRR* II, pp. 448-49, 502 n. 1, 505 n. 1) and Crawford (*RRC*, p. 101 no. 533 and n. 3); cf. Buttrey 1953 (10-28), who places the third acclamation in 36 B.C.E. (and the second in 38 B.C.E.). Note that Crawford's reference to Buttrey (1960, 106-08) points to the evidence for an acclamation of Antonius as *imperator* for the victory at Gindaros in 38 B.C.E., and not towards an argument by Buttrey for that date as Antonius's third acclamation.

[19] We have no certain examples of a coin naming Antonius as IMP·ITER(um). There was a unique *aureus* (*BMCRR* II, p. 505; *RRC* 533/1) in the Bibliothèque Nationale that may have been the only example with this designation. Unfortunately, this coin was lost in the robbery of 1831 whilst there was still debate regarding whether the obverse legend read IMP·ITER or IMP·TER (see *BMCRR* II, p. 506 and Buttrey 1953, 4-5). In the absence of this single coin, it is accepted that "the titulature IMP SERVED THROUGHOUT THE PERIOD DURING WHICH ANTONIUS WAS ENTITLED TO THE TITULATURE IMP·ITER" (*RRC*, p. 101 n. 3).

Parthian campaigns of 39 are unlikely because, on the one hand, the victory was not at the expense of a foreign enemy and, on the other, Ventidius received a triumph for his Parthian victories of 39 so that officially Antonius could not have been *imperator* at the same time.[20] Lastly, hoard evidence indicates that Antonius received his third imperatorial acclamation no later than 38.[21] There appears in the Avetrana hoard (*RRCH* 440) a *denarius*[22] of Antonius on which he is named IMP TERT (*RRC* 533/2) and a *denarius* of Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa, Octavianus's second-in-command, on which Agrippa is named COS·DESIG (*RRC* 534/3).[23] Setting aside the *denarius* of Antonius, the most recent coin in the hoard is the *denarius* of Agrippa. We know that Agrippa was *consul designatus* in the latter part of 38, he having received the consulship of 37 from Octavianus following the victory over the Aquitanii in Gaul.[24] The closing date of the Avetrana hoard, therefore, is the second half of 38, and Antonius must have achieved his third imperatorial acclamation by the time of the deposition of the hoard. It is generally thought that the defeat and death of Pakoros, heir-apparent to the Parthian Empire, at Gindaros is the event for which Antonius achieved his third acclamation as *imperator* (despite his absence from the campaign). The question of the second acclamation remains

---

[20] 42 B.C.E.: Buttrey 1953, 4–9; contra M. Bahrfeldt, "Über die Chronologie der Münzen des Marcus Antonius 710-724 U.C. (44-30 v. Chr.)," *Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Storiche* (1904, 187-200, esp. 195). 39 B.C.E.: Buttrey 1953, 10–16; Buttrey 1960, 106-08. Buttrey utilized the list of *triumphatores* from the *Fasti Triumphales* (Beard 2007, 61–6, 72–80) to refute the statement of Cassius Dio (48.41.5) that Ventidius did not receive credit for the two victories of 39 B.C.E. The *Fasti* clearly indicate that Ventidius celebrated a triumph (27 November 38): P. VENTIDIVS P. F. PRO CO(N)S(ULE) EX·TAVRO AN DCCX[V] MONTE·ET·PARTHEIS V K. DECEM (*CIL* I$^{2, p. 50}$).

[21] A coin hoard is a store of wealth that was buried or otherwise concealed and then never recovered by its owner(s) for reasons we often cannot know. The history of a hoard before its deposit and non-recovery is also nearly impossible to reconstruct. Hoards are not only important for issues of chronology, but also currency circulation patterns.

[22] The *denarius* was a silver denomination which served as the basic unit of the Roman monetary system from the time of its introduction ca. 211 B.C.E.

[23] *RRCH* 440: Avetrana, Italy, date of discovery unknown, 38 B.C.E.; *Coin Hoards of the Roman Republic Online*, http://numismatics.org/chrr/id/AVE (accessed 28 August 2017), hoard identifier AVE. *RRC* 533/2 is also found in hoards *RRCH* 439 (Dobrogea, Romania, 1946, ca. 38 B.C.E. [most recent coin is *RRC* 533/2]; *Coins Hoards of the Roman Republic Online*, http://numismatics.org/chrr/id/DOB [accessed 28 August 2017], hoard identifier DOB) and *RRCH* 443 (Carbonara, Italy, 1882, 36 B.C.E.; *Coins Hoards of the Roman Republic Online*, http://numismatics.org/chrr/id/CR2 [accessed 28 August 2017], hoard identifier CR2).

[24] Cass. Dio, 48.49.

an open one; however, the only option that remains within the limits set forth above is the occasion of the double *ovatio*, traditionally a victory celebration less prestigious than a full triumph, voted to Antonius and Octavianus in honor of the concordia established at Brundisium.[25] It is unclear whether the *ovatio* would have, contrary to convention, resulted in the acclamation of the *triumviri* as *imperatores*.[26]

Returning to the *cistophori*, assigning a precise date to Antonius's second acclamation as *imperator* does not affect the outer limits of the period in which the coins could have been struck. The presence of both Antonius and Octavia on issues struck at an eastern mint(s) indicates a *terminus post quem* of the last few months of 39 (when the couple arrived in Athens), while the evidence of the Avetrana hoard (*RRCH* 440) indicates a *terminus ante quem* of the latter part of 38 (when Agrippa was *consul designatus*).[27] As such, the *cistophori* were likely issued in the first half of 38 (in Roman dating) or the latter half of 39/8 (in Greek dating), prior to the final defeat of the Parthians in Syria.

Opinion regarding the mint attribution of the Antonian *cistophori* is divided between two possibilities: either they are separate issues from Pergamon and Ephesos or a single issue from Ephesos alone. These two mints were major producers of *cistophori* from the establishment of the currency by the Attalids of Pergamon in the second century through the emissions of the so-called late (133-68/7 B.C.E.) and proconsular (58-49

---

[25] The purpose of the *ovatio* may have shifted when, in January 44 B.C.E., Julius Caesar celebrated an *ovatio* in conjunction with the celebration of the *Feriae Latinae* possibly in a show of concord, peace, and reconciliation; see G. S. Sumi, *Ceremony and Power: Performing Politics in Rome between Republic and Empire* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005), 65-9.

[26] A possibility that I have yet to encounter is Samosata as the occasion of Antonius's third imperatorial acclamation following the second acclamation for Gindaros. Although the standoff ended in negotiation after a failed siege, the action against Antiochos of Kommagēnē was still a success and could have been represented as a victory. One would have to look more closely at the acceptable circumstances for the imperatorial acclamation in the late first century to further argue the point.

[27] *RPC* I provides a date of ca. 39 B.C.E.

B.C.E.) *cistophori* in the Roman Republican period.[28] H. A. Grueber was of the opinion that the Antonian *cistophori* ought to be divided between Pergamon and Ephesos. To Pergamon he assigned the single portrait obverse type (his Type I = *RPC* 2201) and to Ephesos the jugate portrait obverse type (his Type II = *RPC* 2202), citing stylistic similarities with the *cistophori* of the provincial governors Quintus Caecilius Metellus Scipio (Pergamon) and Caius Fannius (Ephesos).[29] D. R. Walker saw no justification for a dispersion of the coinage among multiple mints due to the fact that the coins analyzed in his study, an admittedly low sample size of 19, did not exhibit any variation in silver content.[30] C. H. V. Sutherland, on the other hand, was prepared to accept Grueber's argument on the following basis:

> "It does not seem at all likely that the two series of Antonian cistophori, both struck approximately within the limits of the year 39 B.C., could have come from the same mint: their points of [stylistic and epigraphic] difference must be regarded as being greater than would normally have been evolved within so short a time in a single mint … No certainty can be claimed for these attributions [of Grueber]; but, if we accept that these *are* two issues and not one (and we must surely accept this), and also that these two classes are not subdivisible into the product of more than two mints (and no such subdivision can easily be carried out), then Grueber's views may command support."[31]

While Sutherland insisted upon separate emissions from two mints, the editors of *RPC* have chosen a single attribution to Ephesos as the more probable, yet still uncertain, scenario since both types "display a similar range of larger and smaller heads." That is to say that variation in the size of the portraits from one die to the next has been dismissed

---

[28] *BMCRR* II, p. 502 n. 2; Sutherland 1970, 86, 87; Kleiner and Noe 1977, 121–22; Crawford 1985, 206-09; Mørkholm 1991, 171–73; *RPC* I, pp. 368, 376-77, 398, 431; de Callataÿ 2011, 61, 63–4, 65, 71–2, 75; Ashton 2012, 196, 204; Meadows 2013, 175–81, 182 Table 5.8a–b; Carbone 2014, 10–1, 12–3. The main cistophoric mints were four in number: Pergamon, Ephesos, Tralleis, and Apameia.

[29] *BMCRR* II, pp. 502-03, nos. 133-37. *Cistophori* of Q. Caecilius Metellus Scipio: *BMC Mysia*, 127-28; Stumpf 1991, no. 68. *Cistophori* of C. Fannius: *BMC Phrygia*, 31; Stumpf 1991, nos. 58-9.

[30] Walker 1976, 28, 34, 78 n. 12.

[31] Sutherland 1970, 86, 87.

as an indicator of multiple mints.[32] The absence of an extended argument within the *RPC* commentary is symptomatic of the fact that the *cistophori* of Antonius had not yet been extensively studied at the time of the publication of the volumes; this is still true. The mint attribution of the Antonian *cistophori* must, therefore, remain an open question until such a time that more information becomes available. A single attribution to the mint at Ephesos is currently the preferred option and may be correct given that Antonius used the city as a headquarters, effectively making Ephesos the capital of *provincia Asia* (as it would eventually become).

Predictably, the depiction of Antonius wearing the ivy wreath of Dionysos on the *cistophori* struck in his name has served as unequivocal proof that Antonius identified himself as *neos* Dionysos and fully committed to this role upon returning to the east in 39.[33] Support for this interpretation of the coins typically stems from a combination of Plutarch's testimony at *Ant*. 24.3-4, which implies that Antonius was first hailed Dionysos at Ephesos (in 41); a general acceptance of the same city as the origin of the *cistophori*; and the Theos Neos Dionysos titulature found in the Athenian ephebic monument *IG* II^2 1043 (line 23). Indiscriminate use of the *cistophori*, whether on their own or in conjunction with texts, inscriptions, and works of art, to argue the view that Antonius thought of and actively promoted himself as Dionysos throughout the eastern Mediterranean has not necessarily led us to grasp the subtleties of the situation. Missing from the conversation is the nature of the *cistophorus* as a unit of currency, specifically the quantity of the coinage produced and where the coinage circulated.

---

[32] The editors also draw a comparison between the bust of Octavia on *RPC* 2201 and "some rare bronzes of Ephesus" (*RPC* 2574, also 2574 in *RPC Suppl*. I) as further support of Ephesos as the origin of the Antonian *cistophori* (see RPC I, p. 377). Without a survey of these small bronzes of Ephesos, I am hesitant to accept the identification of the bust as Octavia and the comparison with her portrait on the *cistophori* and certain *aurei* (*RRC, nos. 527, 533/3a-b) of Antonius.*

[33] *BMCRR* II, p. 502 n. 2; Tarn 1932, 149–50; Raubitschek 1946, 146; Huzar 1978, 195; Pelling 1988, 209 (33.6-34.1); Pelling 1996, 22–3.

4.2. Quantification and Circulation

Modern statistical methods developed to quantify ancient coin production typically rely upon an estimation of the number of obverse dies used to produce a particular coinage.[34] The path to this information is through the observation of how many dies, ideally determined by means of a full die study, are represented in a group of surviving specimens of the coinage in question.[35] A given sample of coins does not necessarily represent every die used to strike the coinage in antiquity; thus, the number of dies observed very likely represents only a proportion of the total number of original dies. The specimen group, therefore, should be as large as possible in order to increase the reliability of the estimated number of original dies.[36] Once the die calculation has been completed, one could use the number of dies to gauge the output of a mint or to take the quantification one step further. Multiplying the determined number of dies by an average number of coins produced per die can provide an approximate amount of coinage able to be produced from those dies. Estimates place this average at 20,000-30,000 coins per obverse die.[37] There is debate within ancient numismatics and economic history concerning what the average number of coins per die should be and whether or not we can realistically arrive at such a number. One major challenge is die life. It is not realistic to assume that each die used to strike a coinage produced the same amount of

---

[34] The "simplified" method found in Carter 1983 has proved popular in numismatic publications since its introduction. For an updated discussion with a method for calculating the coverage of a sample, see Esty 2006.

[35] The specimens should be collected from multiple sources in order to attain some degree of randomness in the group. Coins from only museum collections or only from coin hoards, for example, may skew the results. In cases where either a die study is not available or an issue of coinage is too large to accommodate a die study, it may be possible to use coin hoard analysis if sufficient data is available, e.g., F. de Callataÿ, "Calculating Ancient Coin Production: Seeking a Balance," *NC* 155 (1995), 289-311.

[36] The probability that the next coin added to the sample group was struck by a die already represented in that group (i.e. the coverage of the sample) increases as the sample group increases and approaches completeness. See Esty 2006, 360–61.

[37] Average based upon P. Kinns, "The Amphictionic Coinage Reconsidered," *NC* 143 (1983), 1-22. Kinns derived the data for his calculations from a die study of the surviving Amphictionic coins combined with the balances and expenditures recorded by the fragmentary treasurers' accounts from Delphi, the only evidence of its kind to have survived for Greek coinage.

coins. Some dies would have broken with very few strikes and others with very many strikes. The condition of observing the existence of a die is to have a coin produced by that die. Generally speaking, the fewer the coins produced by a die in antiquity, the lesser the chance of having those coins preserved in the archaeological record. We cannot truly know how many dies had short lives within a sample, and statisticians are continuing to grapple with this problem.[38] Also a consideration in die life is the point at which a die was discarded because it had become too worn to produce coins of the desired quality. This sort of decision, namely what constituted a worn obverse or reverse die (which would not wear at the same rate), could have varied from mint to mint and perhaps even within the same mint.

Unfortunately, no die study of the Antonian *cistophori* has ever been published. The only data currently available are those presented in *RPC*, which provides tentative obverse die counts for *RPC* 2201 and 2202 where the sample groups consist of coins contained within the core collections covered by the catalogue.[39] For *RPC* 2201, 68 obverse dies were observed among 98 specimens. For *RPC* 2202, 103 obverse dies were observed among 139 specimens. In total that is 171 obverse dies among 237 coins. These numbers are not absolute, but do suggest that the quantity of *cistophori* produced for Antonius was quite substantial, as Sutherland had surmised some twenty years earlier.[40]

More important than quantity is to know something about where the Antonian *cistophori* circulated. Were these coins confined to a certain area or did they circulate widely throughout all of the eastern territory under Antonius's hegemony? In order to attempt an answer to this question, we must consider the nature of the *cistophorus* as a currency and the evidence of coin hoards containing Antonian *cistophori*.

The *cistophorus*, introduced by Eumenēs (II) Sōtēr (197-158 B.C.E.) perhaps in

---

[38] See Esty 2006, 362–63 for further discussion.

[39] The apparatus for each type seems to indicate that only the coins in the British Museum were observed, but the editors may have chosen not to provide full lists of specimens and their collections because the list would have been too lengthy.

[40] Sutherland 1970, 86; *RPC* I, pp. 6-7.

the 160s, was the epichoric royal silver coinage of the Attalid kingdom and remained in place after Attalos (III) Philomētōr Euergetēs (138-133 B.C.E.) bequeathed his kingdom to the Roman people in 133.[41] Unlike the royal coinages typical of the Attalids and the other Hellenistic royal dynasties, the *cistophorus* bore no inscription naming the king and no royal portrait (Figure 7). The immovable types consisted of a serpent emerging from a *cista mystica* surrounded by an ivy wreath on the obverse and two twisting serpents flanking a bow case accompanied by a mint mark in the form of a city ethnic (e.g., ΕΦΕ for Ephesos) on the reverse.[42] The cistophoric system was set apart as its own denominational scheme by means of its weight standard. A weight standard essentially defined the target weights to which a basic unit of currency and its fractions and multiples ought to be produced. For instance, in the Hellenistic period the weight of an Attic drachm was 4.3-4.2 g and that of a tetradrachm, a quadruple drachm, was 17.3-16.8 g.[43] Weight was a critical component of ancient coinage owing to the fact that "the value of

[41] Kleiner and Noe 1977, 10–8; Mørkholm 1991, 173; *RPC* I, p. 376-77; Ashton 2012, 204; 2013, 245–49; de Callataÿ 2013, 218–31; Meadows 2013, 175–81, 197–99, 202; Thonemann 2013b, 30-5. The precise date of the introduction of the *cistophorus* is not known. Some have suggested a high date in the 180s and 170s B.C.E. (e.g., Ashton 2013; de Callataÿ 2013). Others have suggested a low date in the 160s (e.g., Meadows 2013), around the time of Eumenēs Sōtēr's victory over the Galatians, or the 150s. Detailed discussion of the issue with extensive bibliographies are provided by Kleiner and Noe 1977 and Meadows 2013.

[42] From the reign of Eumenēs Sōtēr down to 133 B.C.E., *cistophori* were regularly issued in the name of Pergamon, Ephesos, Sardeis, Tralleis, Laodikeia on the Lykos, and Apameia. Not every city produced *cistophori* for itself, as demonstrated by the die study of Kleiner and Noe (1977). The royal mint at Pergamon struck for itself, Sardeis and Apameia; Tralleis struck for itself and possibly Laodikeia. Ephesos struck for itself. The drachm and didrachm fractions of the *cistophorus* (nearly all struck at Tralleis) bore a lion skin draped over a club within an ivy wreath on the obverses and a bunch of grapes with leaves on the reverses. The obvious references are to Heraklēs and Dionysos. The bow case on the reverses of the *cistophori also refer to Herakl*ēs. The Attalids claimed descent from Heraklēs through his son Telephos and claimed Dionysos as a the patron of their dynasty.

[43] Mørkholm 1991, 8–9.

a coin was intrinsic, so its tariff bore a direct relationship to its weight and fineness."[44] Not every mint or system of mints controlled by a centralized authority utilized the same weight standard, which means that numerous standards developed at different times and in different locations. Weight standards already in place prior to the Hellenistic period did not cease to exist with the conquests of Alexander III of Macedon and the establishment of the Hellenistic kingdoms. Some pre-existing standards remained in use, well into the Roman period in some cases, and new standards, such as the cistophoric, were created.[45] At 12.6 g, the *cistophorus* was a reduced-weight tetradrachm corresponding to the weight of three Attic drachms (4.3-4.2 g) rather than four.[46]

Why should this matter? Because Alexander, building upon monetary reforms begun by his father Philip II, had moved the Macedonian silver coinage to the Attic weight standard. "In this way Alexander made his silver directly interchangeable with the most widely used trade coins of this time, the Athenian 'owl' tetradrachms, and increased its acceptability throughout the Mediterranean world. Within a few decades, thanks to the enormous metal resources at the disposal of Alexander and his successors, this silver currency superseded the Athenian coins as the leading trade coinage of Alexander's empire and far beyond its borders."[47] In other words, the so-called Alexander

---

[44] Metcalf 2012, 3. The truly intrinsic coins were those composed of precious metals, namely gold and silver. Except in situations where a precious metal coinage was purposely manipulated, the amount of gold or silver used to produce a coin gave that coin its face value. As such, gold and silver coins were strictly controlled with respect to weight and fineness or metal purity. A reduction in the weight but not the denominational value of a coin and/or a reduction in the fineness of the metal could occur in response to such situations as a shortage of gold or silver bullion or the desire to increase the profit to the state or other issuing authority from the striking of coinage. The weight and fineness of bronze coins (or coins of another copper alloy), being composed of non-precious metals, were less strictly controlled than gold and silver coins. Bronze coins were also more fiduciary in nature; the metallic value of the bronze in a bronze coin was typically worth less than the coin's face value. Owing to the fact that their value was guaranteed by the issuing authority rather than by the actual weight of the coin, bronze coinages were epichoric.

[45] Kraay 1976, 329–30; Mørkholm 1991, 7–11. The western tradition of coinage is very much a phenomenon of the Greek world with its beginnings in western Asia Minor in the 7th century B.C.E. The Romans acquired the practice of coined money from the Greek cities of southern Italy and Sicily and did not begin to strike coins until the late 4th century B.C.E. On the weight standards of the Roman system, see *RRC, pp. 590-97.*

[46] Kleiner and Noe 1977, 17–8; Mørkholm 1991, 9, 10.

[47] Mørkholm 1991, 43. For a recent account of Alexander and impact of his monetary reforms, see Meadows 2014.

tetradrachms (*obv*. head of Heraklēs; *rev*. seated Zeus) struck on the trusted Attic standard came to be recognized as "good money" over a vast geographical area from the Greek mainland to the easternmost parts of Asia. The great quantity and successful deployment of Alexander's silver coinage made its continuation, initially by the first generation of Successors and then by the succeeding ruling dynasties of the Hellenistic kingdoms, a pragmatic and effective economic approach to the needs of massive military expenditures and payments made beyond territorial borders.[48] An epichoric coinage like the *cistophorus* was not designed for international movement, but rather was designed for use within a proscribed territory, namely the Attalid kingdom.

Epichoric coinages were not out of the ordinary at the time of the introduction of the *cistophorus* in the second century.[49] One of the best-known examples for the Hellenistic period is Ptolemaic Egypt, where a weight standard below the Attic was adopted near the end of the fourth century under Ptolemy (I) Sōtēr (323-283 B.C.E.). The metrological reform was coupled with a ban on currency of Attic weight. Foreigners were forced to exchange their Attic-weight tetradrachms for Ptolemaic coin, likely at par, in order to purchase grain and other products in Egypt. These changes created a closed currency system in which only coins of Ptolemaic weight circulated within the kingdom. The major benefit of the closed system was the profit to the royal treasury as a result of the striking of lighter weight coins and the intake of heavier weight coins, which allowed for the respective retention and collection of silver bullion.[50] The Ptolemaic model has led to the now conventional characterization of the post-*cistophorus* Attalid kingdom as a closed currency system.[51] Meadows has recently demonstrated that this assessment may not be true for two reasons: (i) production of silver coinage struck on the Attic weight

---

[48] Meadows 2013, 202.

[49] Meadows 2013, 202-03.

[50] Mørkholm 1991, 64–6; Lorber 2012, 212–14 (with bibliography); de Callataÿ 2013, 218–19; Meadows 2013, 150–53, 196. A change in the character of coin hoards, from mixed hoards to hoards composed of only Ptolemaic coins, supports the argument for the Ptolemaic kingdom as a closed currency zone.

[51] Meadows 2013, 150-51 and nn. 5–7.

standard did not cease in Attalid Asia Minor with the advent of the *cistophorus*; and (ii) the hoard evidence is too meagre to definitively demonstrate that Attic-weight silver coinage did or did not circulate within the Attalid kingdom after the introduction of the *cistophorus*.[52] For Meadows, the new epichoric silver was not "a cuckoo in the nest that ejected all other coinage from the Attalid kingdom, but is rather to be seen as part of a varied assemblage of coinages struck by the Attalid kings for specific purposes in specific places."[53] Unlike the situation in Asia Minor, there is ample hoard evidence from other regions like Syria to demonstrate that the *cistophorus* itself did not circulate outside of Attalid territory.[54]

In appearance, the *cistophorus* looks like a civic coinage rather than a royal one owing to the absence of the royal portrait and the name of the king and the presence of city ethnics. The *cistophorus* was, however, most certainly under the purview of the king rather than the cities.[55] The changes in the Attalid state undertaken by Eumenēs Sōtēr in response to the acquisition of much of Seleukid Asia Minor via the Treaty of Apameia (188 B.C.E.) may be seen as a development of infrastructural power, the "capacity to actually penetrate society and to implement logistically political decisions."[56] Lacking the more absolutist authority witnessed in other Hellenistic kingdoms, "Eumenēs Sōtēr

---

[52] Meadows 2013.

[53] Meadows 2013, 204.

[54] Kleiner and Noe 1977, 110, 124; de Callataÿ 2013, 241–43; Meadows 2013, 192–96. Four of the 35 cistophoric hoards listed in de Callataÿ 2013, all mixed hoards, were deposited outside Asia Minor: *IGCH* 1383 = *CH* II 113 (Giresun, Pontos, 1933, ca. 77 B.C.E.); *CH* VIII 521 (east coast of Antikythera, 1976, ca. 75-50 B.C.E.); *IGCH* 352 = *CH* II 125 = *CH* X 185 = *RRCH* 374 (Hierapytna, Krete, 1933, 44-42 B.C.E.); *IGCH* 1746 = *CH* I 105 = *RPC* I, pp. 610-11 no. 2 (Sarnakonuk, Armenia, 1945, after 34 B.C.E.). Note that these hoards are dated after 133 B.C.E. and belong to periods of major military action, which may explain their compositions and location of deposition. Large amounts of the Attic-weight silver struck by the mints in western Asia Minor found its way to Seleukid Syria. Of the 45 hoards dated to 188-100 B.C.E. collected by Psoma (2013, Appendix I), none contained *cistophori.*

[55] Kleiner and Noe 1977, 125; de Callataÿ 2013, 227–28; Thonemann 2013b, 32. The valuable die study and control mark analysis of Kleiner and Noe brought to light die links between the *cistophori* of Pergamon, Sardeis, and Apameia (also Synnada), which indicated that the royal mint of Pergamon was the issuing mint rather than each individual city. Sharing of dies, whether it is a single mint striking on behalf of other mints or the transfer of dies between mints, is an indication of a centrally controlled coinage. That Tralleis bore the primary responsibility for the bulk of the cistophoric fractions also suggests centralized control.

[56] Mann 1986, 170.

and his successors instead systematically aimed to increase their independent capacity to penetrate and co-ordinate local society in Asia Minor" in order to effect cohesiveness within a kingdom newly formed by Roman *fiat* rather than by right of spear-won land.[57] Seen in this light, the *cistophorus* may have been given the guise of a civic coinage issued by a *koinon* in order to express the ideological conception of the newly expanded Attalid state as an alliance or federation of cities.[58] With its constrained area of circulation, the *cistophorus* may have served to "make payments within an economically defined and rapidly developing imperial space" as a means to fund the process of state-building at a time when bullion was in short supply due to the funneling of silver west to Rome.[59] It has also been suggested that the *cistophorus* could have been struck to fund military expenditures, as the wars fought by the Attalids after 188 were within their own territory.[60]

Roman involvement in the affairs of the Hellenistic kingdoms and the gradual annexation of those kingdoms to Rome over the course of the second and first centuries B.C.E. did not cause the Roman *denarius* system to extinguish the myriad silver and, most especially, bronze coinages already in use. The mosaic of coinages which existed simultaneously in the east continued to exist because the Romans rather pragmatically utilized the existing monetary systems rather than forcefully impose their own.[61] The *denarius* eventually gained a firm foothold in the eastern provinces in the last four decades of the first century, but not everywhere at the same time nor to the same extent. Through the end of the Julio-Claudian period (14-68 C.E.), production and circulation varied from the *denarius* alone (e.g., Thrace and Achaea) to a mixture of the *denarius* and local silver coinage (e.g., Asia) to local silver coinage only (e.g., Egypt). In the case of

---

[57] Thonemann 3013b, 46-7. The Treaty of Apameia came about as a result of the Roman defeat of the Seleukid king Antiochos III Megas (223-187 B.C.E.) at Magnesia in 190/89 B.C.E. Eumenēs Sōtēr was a major Roman ally in that conflict.

[58] Thonemann 2013b, 30-4.

[59] Meadows 2013, 205-06.

[60] de Callataÿ 2013, 229–31; Carbone 2016, 153–55.

[61] Burnett 2005, 176–77.

bronze coinages, civic or otherwise local issues were highly favored over Roman bronze and production continued well into the third century C.E. The prevalence and persistence of the Hellenistic coinages in the eastern Roman provinces presented a much different picture than the western provinces, where the *denarius* and its related bronze fractions were adopted much earlier and on a wider scale. In the west, the *denarius* system had already made significant inroads over non-Roman coinages at about the same time that increased circulation of the *denarius* in the east had only just begun in the first century.[62]

Although we are still attempting to reach a full understanding of the currencies in Asia Minor as a whole at the time of the Attalid bequest to Rome and beyond, it is quite clear that the *cistophorus* functioned as the primary silver currency for the newly established *provincia Asia*. In comparison to the period before 133, the number of coin hoards containing *cistophori* from Asia Minor in the Republican period is much more plentiful.[63] Whereas we have only two hoards certainly dated before 133,[64] there are roughly 40 known hoards belonging to the period between the late second and late first

[62] Crawford 1985, 55–60, 140, 177–81, 245–49, 252; Kinns 1987, 111–13; Price 1987, 98–9; *RPC* I, pp. 6-25; Burnett 2005, 176–78; de Callataÿ 2011, 56–8; Amandry 2012, 394–95.

[63] Coin hoards, as well as individual finds, are not frequently recovered from strictly controlled contexts, particularly since the advent of the metal detector. Due to the money and demand involved in the coin trade, finds from outside controlled excavations typically make their way to dealers, who have the opportunity to remove the coins most valued by collectors. The loss of context and possible dispersion are therefore inherent challenges in the use of hoards as evidence.

[64] *IGCH* 1452 (Asia Minor, unknown findspot, ca. 1876, 150-145 B.C.E.); *IGCH* 1453 (Asia Minor, unknown findspot, ca. 1962, 145-140 B.C.E.).

centuries.[65] The vast majority of these hoards were recovered from Asia Minor. Five hoards have an unknown provenience (*CH* IX 524; *CH* VIII 437; *CH* VIII 447; *CH* VIII 526; *CH* VIII 537) and four were discovered in areas outside of the Roman province (*IGCH* 1383; *CH* VIII 521; *IGCH* 352; *IGCH* 1746). The fact that *cistophori* did not typically move beyond their province of origin makes this currency a true "provincial coinage," locally struck on a local weight standard for local circulation. The *cistophorus* was also no longer a royal coinage, but rather a civic coinage produced by cities under Roman rule.

Cistophori struck in Asia prior to the civil wars of the 40s and 30s fall into two groups as designated by modern numismatists: the "late" *cistophori* of 134/3-68/7 B.C.E.

---

[65] *CH* IX 524 (unknown findspot, 1999 or earlier, mid to late 2nd century B.C.E.); *IGCH* 1340 (Smyrna, Ionia, 1865, mid-1st century B.C.E. [date corrected by Meadows 2013, 191 n. 97]); *IGCH* 1326 (Balikesir, Mysia, 1958, 135-130 B.C.E. [according to Meadows 2013, 192]); *IGCH* 1415 (Afyon Karahisar, Phyrgia, 1876, after 133 B.C.E. [date corrected by Meadows 2013, 191 n. 97]); *IGCH* 1327 (Yeşilhisar, Mysia, near Savaştepe, 1963, 130 B.C.E.); *CH* VIII 446 (Polath, Phyrgia, near Ankara, 1985, 130 B.C.E. [according to Meadows 2013, 192]); *CH* II 94 (Ionia, 1974, 130s B.C.E.? [according to Meadows 2013, 192]); *IGCH* 1328 (Sahnali, Karia, near Dalama, 1952, 128 B.C.E. [according to Meadows 2013, 192]); *CH* VIII 437 (unknown findspot, 1982, 128 B.C.E. [date corrected by Meadows 2013, 192 n. 98]); *IGCH* 1455 (Asia Minor, ca. 1928, 128 B.C.E. [according to Meadows 2013, 192]); *CH* IX 535 (Ahmetbeyli [ancient Kolophon], Ionia, 1973, 128 B.C.E. [according to Meadows 2013, 192]); *IGCH* 1336 (Marmara [ancient Prokonnesos], Mysia, 1863, ca. 110-100 B.C.E.); *IGCH* 1456 (Asia Minor, 1971, ca. 105-100 B.C.E.); *IGCH* 1458 (Asia Minor, 1955 or earlier, ca. 100 B.C.E.); *IGCH* 1466 (Asia Minor, before 1722, 1st century B.C.E.); *IGCH* 1467 (Asia Minor, 1968, 1st century B.C.E.); *IGCH* 1459 (Asia Minor, ca. 1935, ca. 95 B.C.E.); *IGCH* 1460 (Asia Minor, 1970, ca. 95-90 B.C.E.); Ashton and Kinns, *NC* 164 (2004), 106 n. 129 (Asia Minor, 2002, 90/89 B.C.E.); *CH* X 341 (Izmir [ancient Smyrna], Ionia, 1995, 89/8 B.C.E.); *IGCH* 1461 (Asia Minor, 1966, ca. 88 B.C.E.); *IGCH* 1462 (Asia Minor, 1961, ca. 85-80 B.C.E.); *IGCH* 1383 = *CH* II 113 (Giresun, Pontos, 1933, ca. 77 B.C.E.); *IGCH* 1358 = *CH* V 52 (Karacebey [ancient Miletopolis], Mysia, 1929, ca. 75 B.C.E.); *CH* IX 558 = *CH* VI 46 = *CH* VII 134 (Gridia, Chios, 1959, ca. 75 B.C.E.); *CH* VIII 521 (east coast of Antikythera, 1976, ca. 75-50 B.C.E.); *CH* IX 560 (unknown findspot in the area of Mysia, 1933 or before, ca. 70 B.C.E.); *IGCH* 1359 (Çesme [ancient Erythrai], Ionia, 1960, ca. 70-65 B.C.E.); *CH* VIII 447 (unknown findspot, date of discovery unknown, 68/7 B.C.E. [date corrected by Meadows 2013, 191 n. 97]); A. Çankaya and H. Köker, *Adalya 14 (2011), 63-71 (Dumancik, Pisidia, 2009, 67 B.C.E.); CH* VIII 525 (Asia Minor, 1991/1992, ca. 65 B.C.E.); *CH* VIII 526 (unknown findspot, 1990, ca. 65 B.C.E.); *CH* VIII 536 = *CH* IX 568 (Pergamon, Mysia, 1987, ca. 50 B.C.E.); *IGCH* 1464 (Asia Minor, 1971, ca. 50-40 B.C.E.); *CH* VIII 537 (unknown findspot, 1986, after 48 B.C.E.); *IGCH* 352 = *CH* II 125 = *CH* X 185 = *RRCH* 374 (Hierapytna, Krete, 1933, 44-42 B.C.E.); B. Overbeck, *SNR* 1978, 164 = *RPC* I, p. 368 no. 1 (Halikarnassos, Karia, 1975, 41 B.C.E.); *IGCH* 1746 = *CH* I 105 = *RPC* I, pp. 610-11 no. 2 (Sarnakonuk, Armenia, 1945, after 34 B.C.E.); C. H. V. Sutherland, *The Cistophori of Augustus*, 1-11 = *RPC* I, p. 368 no. 4 (Asia Minor, ca. 1918, 18 B.C.E.); *CH* II 130 = *RPC* I, p. 368 no. 3 (Turkey, date of discovery unknown, after 18 B.C.E.). This list has been culled from de Callataÿ 2013, Meadows 2013, and Carbone 2016, 158–59 and is not necessarily exhaustive.

and the "proconsular" *cistophori* of 58/7-49.[66] Production then ceased, not to resume again until the *cistophori* minted for Antonius.[67] The late *cistophori* saw no major design changes from their Attalid predecessors with one notable exception. The city of Ephesos, given the status of a free city at the time of Attalos's bequest to Rome, began to strike *cistophori* bearing the date of an Ephesian era in which Year 1 = 134/3 B.C.E. (Figure 8).[68] In contrast, the proconsular *cistophori* demonstrated a marked change from what had come before (Figure 9). In addition to the city ethnic, the reverse now carried the name of the proconsular Roman governor of the province in Latin. The governor's name was sometimes accompanied by the name of a local mint official, rendered in Greek script like the city ethnic. New iconographical elements, such as a Roman military standard, were also incorporated into the reverse design in some instances.[69] While these new components never supplanted the traditional pair of twisting serpents, they did at times replace the bow case. The modified reverse types of the proconsular *cistophori* leave no doubt as to the direct involvement of a Roman authority in their production. It is not necessarily the case, however, that Rome pursued a non-interventionist policy with respect to the circulation and production of *cistophori*, and other civic silver coinages in Asia Minor, prior to the proconsular issues as was previously thought.[70]

---

[66] Late *cistophori*: Kleiner 1972; Kleiner 1978; Kleiner 1979. Proconsular *cistophori*: Crawford 1985, 206-09; Kinns 1987, 111; Stumpf 1991; Amela Valverde 2004. See now W. E. Metcalf, *The Later Republican Cistophori* (*NNM* 170, New York: American Numismatic Society, 2017). The revolt led by Aristonikos, who claimed to be a son of Eumenēs Sōtēr, forestalled the organization of the Roman province of Asia until his death in 129 B.C.E. Styling himself Eumenēs III, Aristonikos struck *cistophori* which bore the legend ba(sileos) ey(menoy); see Kleiner and Noe 1977, 103-06.

[67] The next issues of *cistophori* came under Augustus, initially as Octavianus, in the period from 28 to 19/8 B.C.E. (Sutherland 1970). The Augustan *cistophori* were issued in great quantity and remained in circulation well into the 2nd century C.E. *Cistophori* of Antonius were also available for quite some time, as we have specimens countermarked by Vespasian (69-79 C.E.) and specimens overstruck by Hadrian (117-138 C.E.).

[68] Kleiner 1972; Crawford 1985, 159–60. The city of Tralleis also later struck dated *cistophori* using an era beginning in 85/4 B.C.E. with the reorganization of *provincia Asia* by Lucius Cornelius Sulla.

[69] Stumpf 1991.

[70] The two standard treatments of Rome's involvement with the currencies of Asia Minor, Crawford 1985, 152–60 and Kinns 1987, concluded that the Romans followed a conservative, non-interventionist policy. More recent studies, such as those by de Callataÿ (2011) and Carbone (2014; 2016), are now challenging that view in light of a greater body of evidence and the integration of information now available from critical die studies.

The survival of multiple Republican-era hoards from Roman Asia is truly fortunate, and it is worth highlighting a few characteristics of the evidence which point to important changes and developments in the province's currency patterns. Since hoards were often deposited in order to safeguard wealth during times of warfare, it is not surprising that two clusters of hoards occur at the time of the Aristonikos revolt (133-129 B.C.E.) and the Mithradatic Wars (88-63 B.C.E.). Eight hoards belong to the time of the earlier conflict and all are unmixed, consisting wholly of *cistophori*.[71] Nine hoards date to the period between the Aristonikos revolt and the Mithradatic Wars.[72] All of these hoards are also unmixed except for *IGCH* 1336, a hoard containing a *cistophorus* and silver coinages of other weight standards.[73] This hoard was found on the island of Prokonnesos, which was part of the territory of Kyzikos when the hoard was deposited in ca. 110 B.C.E. Kyzikos did not become part of *provincia Asia* until at least the early first century C.E.[74] Since we can lay aside mixed hoard *IGCH* 1336, it is possible to say that all of the hoards prior to the invasion of Mithradatēs (VI) Eupatōr Dionysos in 88 contain only *cistophori*. This aspect of the evidence suggests that the *cistophorus* circulated unmixed in Asia at this time, which would indicate a closed economy. If Meadows is correct in his argument that the Attalid kingdom did not become a closed economy with the introduction of the *cistophorus*, the switch to Roman control of the region seems to have created this economic condition.[75]

The 12 hoards belonging to the period of the Mithradatic Wars mark a change in hoarding behavior.[76] We see for the first time mixed hoards deposited within the

---

[71] *IGCH* 1415; *IGCH* 1327; *CH* VIII 446; *CH* II 94; *IGCH* 1328; *CH* VIII 437; *IGCH* 1455; *CH* IX 535.

[72] *IGCH* 1336; *IGCH* 1456; *IGCH* 1458; *IGCH* 1466; *IGCH* 1467; *IGCH* 1459; *IGCH* 1460; Ashton and Kinns, *NC* 164 (2004), 106 n. 129; *CH* X 341.

[73] 70 AR: Lysimachos (11 posthumous (?) tetradrachms); Athens (1 tetradrachm); Nikomedes II-III (8 tetradrachms); Kyzikos (5 tetradrachms); Pergamon (1 *cistophorus*).

[74] Jones 1971, 58–9, 63, 86–7.

[75] Carbone 2016, 158–66.

[76] *IGCH* 1461; *IGCH* 1462; *IGCH* 1383 = *CH* II 113; *IGCH* 1358 = *CH* V 52; *CH* IX 558; *CH* VIII; *CH* IX 560; *IGCH* 1359; *CH* VIII; A. Çankaya and H. Köker, *Adalya* 14 (2011), 63-71; *CH* VIII 525; *CH* VIII 526.

boundaries of the province (*CH* IX 558, *IGCH* 1359).[77] The occurrence of *cistophori* and silver coinages of non-cistophoric weight in these two hoards suggests that there may have been at least a partial integration within *provincia Asia* of the currencies circulating in Asia Minor at large; however, the majority of the hoards remain unmixed.[78] The economy of the province thus remained closed, but not completely. The reason for the closed or relatively closed system may have been intended to control the flow of silver in and out of Roman Asia, a circumstance that benefitted the *publicani* by means of allowing them opportunities to exchange the lighter weight *cistophori* for silver of standard weight.[79] The Gridia hoard of ca 75 B.C.E. (*CH* IX 558) is the earliest hoard to contain a Roman *denarius*. The *denarius*, however, seems not to have played a role in Asia Minor before 50 B.C.E. and probably not in any significant way until the 40s.[80] A third mixed hoard, *IGCH* 1383, was deposited at Giresun in Pontos, the kingdom of Mithradatēs.[81] This hoard presents a rare case of *cistophori* travelling outside of *provincia Asia* and likely belonged to a soldier in the army of Mithradatēs who carried the coins back to Pontos.[82]

---

[77] *CH* IX 558 = *CH* VI 46 = *CH* VII 134: Pergamon (2 *cistophori*); Chios (14 drachms); Athens (1 drachm); Rome (1 *denarius*). *IGCH* 1359: Pergamon (4 *cistophori*); Chios (15 drachms); Athens (14 *stephaneophoroi*); imitation Athens (2); Byzantion (1 late Lysimachos); Mithradatēs VI (1 tetradrachm); Nikomedes II (1 tetradrachm).

[78] Carbone 2014, 13; Carbone 2016, 160–62. For both hoards, see C. Lagos, "A study of the coinage of Chios in the Hellenistic and Roman periods" (Ph. D. diss., Durham University, 1998).

[79] Carbone 2016, 13, 150, 163.

[80] Crawford 1985, 252; Kinns 1987, 112; *RPC* I, p. 368-9; de Callataÿ 2011, 56–8; Carbone 2016, 162–63. None of the 549 hoards containing Republican *denarii* down to 27 B.C.E. listed in *RRCH* were found in modern Turkey. Individual coin finds are likewise lacking. The exchange rate of three *denarii* to one *cistophorus* likely did not exist before the Augustan period.

[81] Ephesos, Pergamon, Apameia (3 *cistophori*); Mithradatēs VI (22 tetradrachms); Athens (18 tetradrachms); Nikomedes II-IV (7 tetradrachms); kings of Kappadokia (3 drachms); Antiochos VII (2 tetradrachms).

[82] The hoard of ca. 75-50 B.C.E. from the famous shipwreck off the east coast of Antikythera (*CH* VIII 521) is another instance of cistophori outside the province. It is the only unmixed hoard of *cistophori*, 36 in total, to be found outside of Asia Minor. The explanation for this hoard could be commercial, the hoard serving as a store of Asian currency ready for a merchant's use.

The dated series of late *cistophori* struck at Ephesos came to an end in 68/7 B.C.E. = Year 67 of the Ephesian era.[83] It is presumed on the basis of the Ephesian evidence that the other cistophoric mints, primarily Pergamon, Apameia, and Tralleis, also ceased production of *cistophori*.[84] The reason for this hiatus in cistophoric production likely lies in the activities of Pompeius Magnus, who was afforded an extraordinary command with proconsular *imperium* over the financial and military resources of the provinces in 67 for the eradication of pirates in the Mediterranean. He then went on to finally drive Mithradatēs and his ally Tigranēs (II) Megas of Armenia out of Asia Minor and Syria. Pompeius Magnus's control over the provincial treasuries and the possible diversion of silver bullion to the royal mints of Kappadokia to fund the campaigns against Mithradatēs and Tigranēs may have interrupted the minting of *cistophori* in Asia. The cities of Asia, most especially Ephesos, were also experiencing financial difficulties as a result of the massive indemnities instituted by Lucius Cornelius Sulla in 85 as retribution for the allegiance of the cities to Mithradatēs.[85] The resumption of cistophoric production with the proconsular issues of 58/7-49 may be tied to a need to replenish the supply of silver currency in *provincia Asia* at a time when the *denarius* had not yet achieved widespread acceptability and, thus, circulation in the region.[86]

The nearly two decades of civil wars from 49 to 31 sparked another significant development in the monetary system of Asia. The military presence of Pompeius Magnus resulted in the first issue of *denarii* (*RRC* 445/3) in Asia in 49, but did not result in a corresponding increase in circulation of the Roman silver.[87] As such, the *denarii* seem to have been struck in support of Pompeius's armies while the *cistophorus* continued to act as the circulating silver currency of *provincia Asia*. 49 was also the same year in which

---

[83] Kleiner 1972, 28.

[84] Kleiner 1978, 78; Kleiner 1979, 121;Crawford 1985, 200; Kinns 1987, 111; *RPC* I, p. 377; Amela Valverde 2004, 14–6.

[85] Crawford 1985, 200; Kinns 1987, 110, 111; Amela Valverde 2004, 16–8.

[86] Amela Valverde 2004, 18–9.

[87] *RRC*, p. 604; Crawford 1985, 245; Kinns 1987, 112; *RPC* I, p. 368, 369; Carbone 2014, 13; Carbone 2016, 162–63.

Julius Caesar instituted tax regulations in Asia and prorogued the prerogatives of the *publicani* (App., *B. Civ* 4.5.1), which helped to move the economy of Asia away from the relatively closed system established at the establishment of the *provincia*.[88] Based upon the scanty hoard evidence available to us for the period, the *denarius* seems not to have reached the circulation pool in Asia for much of the 40s because the hoards continue to be unmixed.[89] By the close of the decade, however, the situation changed. The mixed hoard of 41 B.C.E. recovered from Halikarnassos is our earliest surviving instance of a sizable number of *denarii* (62 of 99 coins) in a hoard from the province of Asia. 36 late and proconsular *cistophori*, mainly of Pergamon, and a drachm of Kibyra in Phrygia make up the rest of the hoard's contents.[90] The variety of eastern and western mints represented by the *denarii* in the Halikarnassos hoard suggests some level of integration of the *denarius* within the currency pool of Asia, particularly since there is no obvious military reason for the deposition of this hoard. Thus, by the close of the 40s, Asia may have transitioned to a more open economic zone where the provincial cistophoric coinage and Roman silver circulated together.[91] Unfortunately, not much can be said concerning the importance of the *denarius* relative to the *cistophorus* in Asia during the period of the civil wars, or even the early empire, without more information about what was circulating, when, and in what quantity.[92] What is certain is that the *cistophorus* still did not leave the province except in rare instances. The Hierapytna hoard from Krete (*IGCH* 352 = *RRCH* 374), dated 44-42 B.C.E., is such a case. As with the Giresun hoard, the explanation likely lies within the realm of military conflict. During the war against Julius Caesar's assassins, Antonius wrested control of Krete from Brutus; the Hierapytna hoard may have been the

---

[88] Carbone 2016, 13, 163.

[89] *CH* VIII 536; *IGCH* 1464; *CH* VIII 537. The non-circulating status of the *denarius* could mean that the Asian issues were exceptional, intended for the payment of armies (Carbone 2016, 162–64).

[90] B. Overbeck, "Ein Schatzfund der späten Republik von Halikarnassos," *SNR* 57 (1978), 164-73; *Coin Hoards of the Roman Republic Online*, http://numismatics.org/chrr/id/BOD (accessed 02 September 2017), hoard identifier BOD.

[91] Carbone 2016, 164.

[92] Crawford 1985, 252; Kinns 1987, 112–13; *RPC* I, pp. 6-9, 368-69. See now Carbone 2016.

property of one of the Roman soldiers involved in the fighting on the island.[93]

There are three, fairly large hoards known to contain *cistophori* of Antonius:

1. *IGCH* 1746 = *CH* I 105 = *RRCH* 455[94] = *RPC* I, pp. 610-11 no. 2,[95] Sarnakounk (Armenia), 1945, ca. 32-25 B.C.E.; 373 AR coins: Antonius *cistophori* (7); Roman Republican *cistophori* (8, Pergamon & Ephesos); Kleopatra/Antonius *denarii*, *RRC* 543 (3); Roman Republican *denarii* (207); Kleopatra/Antonius tetradrachms, *RPC* I 4094-96 (8); Hellenistic silver coinages including royal issues of Armenia, Pontos, Kappadokia, and the Seleukids (120 total); Parthian drachms (22).[96]
2. C. H. V. Sutherland, *The Cistophori of Augustus*, 1-11 = *RPC* I, p. 368 no. 4, Asia Minor, ca. 1918, 18 B.C.E.; 293 *cistophori*: Antonius (12 of *RPC* 2201; 26 of *RPC* 2202); Augustus (255).
3. *CH* II 130 = *RPC* I, p. 368 no. 3, Turkey, date of discovery unknown, after 18 B.C.E.; 146 *cistophori*: Antonius (17 of *RPC* 2201; 21 of *RPC* 2202); Augustus (108).[97]

In this group of hoards is the third occurrence of *cistophori* outside the province of Asia—the Sarnakounk hoard from Armenia, which Antonius invaded in 34, capturing the Armenian king Artavasdēs I and the royal family and parading them in chains in Alexandria.[98] The latest coins contained within the hoard are *denarii* of Antonius

---

[93] E. J. P. Raven, "The Hierapytna Hoard of Greek and Roman Coins," *NC* 18 (1938), 133-58 (esp. 146-47); Crawford 1985, 252; *Coin Hoards of the Roman Republic Online*, http://numismatics.org/chrr/id/GIE (accessed 02 September 2017), hoard identifier GIE. The hoard contained 360+ AR: Athens (50-55 New Style tetradrachms, 1 New Style drachm); Knossos (11 tetradrachms); Hierapytna (7 tetradrachms, 13 didrachms, 2 drachms); Pergamon, Ephesos, Laodikeia, Apameia, Tralleis (60 *cistophori*); Roman Republic (200 *denarii*); etc. Raven based his dating of the hoard upon the conflict between Antonius and Brutus.

[94] Also *Coins Hoards of the Roman Republic Online*, http://numismatics.org/chrr/id/SRN (accessed 02 September 2017), hoard identifier SRN.

[95] *RPC* I (p. 611) cites an erroneous date for the Kleopatra/Antonius *denarii*. The date given by *RRC* (543) is 32 B.C.E., not 34.

[96] Mousheghian et al. 2000, 103–38. The Sarnakounk hoard was partially dispersed by the villagers who discovered it. Kh. Mouscheghian (*Monetnye Klady Armenii*, 1973) was the first to publish the hoard after attempting to recover as much information, and as many coins, as possible.

[97] S. de Roquefeuil, "Un trésor de cistophores trouvé en Turquie," *Bulletin de la Société française de numismatique* 30 (1975), 766-67.

[98] Vell. Pat. 2.82.3; Plut., *Ant*. 50.4, Cass. Dio, 49.39.3-40.1-4.

(*RRC* 543) struck in 32 by a moving mint.[99] The Armenian campaign and its aftermath, therefore, have usually been identified as the motivation behind the deposition of the hoard.[100] A recent re-assessment of the Sarnakounk hoard has expanded upon this explanation through analysis of the hoard's composition.[101] The coins in the hoard can be divided into three chronological groups: (i) Hellenistic coins and Roman *denarii* of the second century B.C.E.; (ii) Hellenistic coins, Parthian coins, and Roman *denarii* of the first century B.C.E. (primarily the 50s and 40s); and (iii) *denarii* of Antonius struck in the 30s.[102] The first group of coins were no longer circulating in the 1st century B.C.E., which suggests that these older coins were either collected and saved over a long period of time and always belonged to the hoard or were obtained elsewhere and combined with the later coins en masse. There was then a period of collecting in the mid-first century B.C.E. and again in the time of Antonius or slightly afterward. The Sarnakounk hoard, therefore, was likely not consolidated at one particular moment, but rather accumulated over time.[103] We can reasonably consider the presence of *cistophori* in the Sarnakounk hoard to be an atypical finding caused by the disruptions of warfare and the movements of armies. Armenia was a territory in turmoil throughout the first century as a result of the Mithradatic Wars and the campaigns of Marcus Licinius Crassus (53 B.C.E.) and of Antonius. Irrespective of how the contents of the Sarnakounk hoard came together, it is not difficult to imagine the movement of various currencies into the region and the instinct to hoard and protect wealth.

---

[99] *RRC* has attributed this issue of *denarii* to 32 B.C.E.; however, the coins themselves do not provide much information by way of dating (e.g., Antonius's titles are not included in the legends). What is absolutely certain is that the coin type directly references Antonius's Armenian victory since the obverse legend reads Antoni Armenia Devicta. The *denarii*, therefore, had to be minted after the campaign in 34 B.C.E. and definitely no later than 31 B.C.E.

[100] *RPC* I, p. 611; Mousheghian et al. 2000, 103; Carbone 2016, 164–65.

[101] Mousheghian et al. 2000, 103–38.

[102] Mousheghian et al. 2000, 115.

[103] Using the categories often encountered in publications, the Sarnakounk hoard is a "savings" hoard, as opposed to an "emergency/currency" hoard (A. Burnett, *Coins [Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991], 51).*

The remaining two hoards, the hoard catalogued by Sutherland 1971 and *CH* II 130, are entirely consistent with what we have already seen; both are unmixed hoards of *cistophori* (reportedly) found in Asia Minor. Although mixed hoards had begun to appear in the province of Asia from the time of the Mithradatic Wars through the 40s, the majority of the known cistophoric hoards from the province are unmixed. What this group of hoards demonstrates is that, with respect to circulation, the *cistophori* of Antonius did not behave differently than those of previous periods. Until such a time that further evidence from coin hoards and/or individual coin finds[104] comes to light, there is no reason to assume that, as a matter of normal circumstance, the *cistophori* of Antonius circulated outside *provincia Asia*.[105] Limited circulation means a limited audience, a circumstance that must be taken into account when considering the Antonian *cistophori* within the larger picture of the associations between Antonius and Dionysos.

4.3. Qualitative Commentary

RPC 2201 (Figure 2)
Obv. M·ANTONIVS·IMP·COS·DESIG·ITER·ET·TERT·, around; head of Antonius wearing ivy wreath, r.; below, lituus; ivy wreath border
Rev. III·VIR·, l., R·P·C·, r; draped bust of Octavia, r., on a cista mystica, flanked by twisting serpents.

RPC 2202 (Figure 3)
Obv. M·ANTONIVS·IMP·COS·DESIG·ITER·ET·TERT·, around; head of Antonius, wearing ivy wreath, and draped bust of Octavia, jugate, r.; border of dots
Rev. III·VIR·, l., R·P·C·, r; Dionysos standing, l., on a cista mystica, holding a kantharos and a thyrsos, flanked by twisting serpents.

[104] None are known to me at this time.

[105] Svornos (*Numismatique de la Crète ancienne* [Paris, 1890], 334/1) catalogued an enigmatic issue of *cistophori* from Krete, perhaps struck at Gortyn. The coins bear the name Kydas, who may have been connected to Antonius (Crawford 1985, 252). The obverse and reverse types, however, do not conform to those of Antonius's Asian *cistophori and look much more like the proconsular cistophori*. Either the coins from Krete belong to an earlier period or a decision was made not to employ Antonius's portrait and titles.

The involvement of Antonius with the Hellenistic East was unmistakably a moment of significant change in the cistophoric coinages of Asia, as well as in other areas of economic reform. Prior to the early 50s, Roman involvement in the production of *cistophori* was not readily observable from the coins themselves. This state of affairs came to an end with the proconsular issues, which bore the Latin names and titles of governors of Asia in combination with an ethnic and sometimes the name of a mint authority, both in Greek. While some proconsular *cistophori* retained the traditional serpents and bow case reverse type with slight modifications, other issues, such as those of Titus Ampius Balbus and Caius Fannius, wholly replaced the bow case with another motif (Figure 10).

The moneyer(s) of Antonius continued this trend of visually asserting Roman authority on the *cistophorus*, but much more emphatically and in a manner that set the precedent for *cistophori* struck for Roman emperors. The most drastic change is the radical redesign of the obverse, which has become completely dedicated to Antonius and his authority as one of the two most powerful men in the Roman state. One now finds a portrait of Antonius (*RPC* 2201; see Figure 2) or of Antonius and Octavia (*RPC* 2202; see Figure 3) encompassed by Antonius's name and the first part of his titulature, IMP·COS·DESIG·ITER·ET·TERT.[106] This use of the likeness of a living person on the obverse of a coin was of course nothing new in the Hellenistic world, as it was standard for royal coinages to bear the image of the king, queen, or aspiring dynast since the innovations of Ptolemy I Sōtēr at the close of the fourth century.[107] In the Roman system, however, a living official placing his own image on a coin was wholly unheard of until the issues of *denarii* struck for Julius Caesar at Rome in 44 (*RRC* 480/2-20).[108] Antonius was the first

[106] Here the term portrait refers to an image or representation with individualized features that is not necessarily a true likeness of the subject.

[107] Mørkholm 1991, 65

[108] These were the first issues of Roman currency to bear the likeness of Julius Caesar, but his portrait first appeared on civic bronze issues of Nikaia in Bithynia (*RPC* 2026), struck in 47/6 under the authority of the governor Caius Vibius Pansa (i.e., the bronzes carry the name and titles of Pansa, not Caesar).

Roman magistrate to have his portrait appear on eastern non-Roman denominations in an official capacity under his own name, in great quantity, and in all three metals.[109]

The reverse types of the Antonian *cistophori* are amalgamations of the usual vertical twisting serpents, to the left and right of center, and the *cista mystica* (without its emerging serpent), which traditionally formed the cistophoric obverse type. The two Antonian reverse types differ in the object that appears above the *cista*—a draped bust of Octavia (*RPC* 2201) and a standing Dionysos holding a *thyrsos* and *kantharos* (*RPC* 2202). To either side of the serpents III·VIR·R·P·C continues Antonius's titles from the obverse. The reverses of *RPC* 2201 and 2202 are in effect modified versions of the proconsular pattern, Latin text identifying a Roman magistrate and twisted serpents flanking a central motif, which now consists of a *cista* plus another image. At this stage in the evolution of the *cistophorus*, the presence of the *cista* and the serpents demonstrates a concern to retain the essential character of the currency as originally conceived, perhaps in order to maintain recognizability of and confidence in these coins as trusted currency in the open market. Of equal concern was the visual assertion of Antonius's authority as *triumvir* in the East, of which his marriage to Octavia was not an insignificant part in the early 30s. For reasons unknown, the mint (presumably Ephesos) struck two different issues of *cistophori*, which, in my opinion, is indicative of the experimentation that was happening not only with the *cistophorus* itself, but, more importantly, with Octavia's presence on Antonius's coinages. In particular, the reverse of *RPC* 2201 seems to me a compromise between Octavia herself as the reverse type, as seen in the *aurei*[110] (*RRC* 527, 533/3) of ca. 39-38 (Figure 11, Figure 12), and the retention of conventional cistophoric visual elements.

Before discussing further the Dionysiac character of the *cistophori* and the connotations for the Antonius-Dionysos pairing in the next section, allow me first

[109] In a way that was very different from the rare staters honoring Titus Quinctius Flamininus (see Chapter 2), essentially a royal Hellenistic coin with Latin legends, and bronzes of Nikaia in Bithynia (*RPC* 2026) and Lampsakos in Asia Minor (*RPC* 2268), on which the unnamed likeness of Julius Caesar appeared.

[110] The *aureus* was the gold denomination in the Roman coinage system.

to provide a few brief points regarding the portraiture of Antonius and Octavia. The identification of both individuals across various portrait media is a difficult matter, a circumstance of insufficient evidence, and requires a level of debate and investigation beyond the scope of the current discussion.[111] Full-length studies are lacking in publication and are very much needed.

The coinages of Antonius provide the only securely identifiable portraits, and these only in profile, of the *triumvir* known to exist. The impossibility of separating text from image on a coin (wear and corrosion aside) and the nature of coins as mass-produced objects set numismatic representations of individuals apart from sculpture in that heads easily become detached from bodies and statues separated from their inscribed bases. Additionally, bronze was the preferred medium for honorific statuary in antiquity, and reuse of the metal at some later time has destroyed a great deal of what once existed. The problem compounds when, as in the case of Antonius, sanctions against an individual's memory resulted in the destruction of images, erasure of inscriptions, and other actions meant to demonstrate the condemnation.[112]

Although the proliferation of Antonius's portraits preceded the visual consistency achieved for the imperial portrait made possible through centralized control, his many triumviral coin types do exhibit some overall regularity. Of course, although none has survived intact, statues of Antonius were on display and able to act as models for the artists, who could also copy the profile from existing coins.[113] Antonius's profile tends to have a stocky appearance characterized by a sturdy, often thickset, neck; a strong jawline and protruding chin; a supraorbital region defined by a heavy ridge projecting over the nose and eye; and an aquiline nose, the bridge of which ranges from nearly straight to

---

[111] Antonius (select bibliography): Brendel 1962; Inan and Rosenbaum 1966, 64 (cat. 20); Grimm 1970; Kyrieleis 1976; Johansen 1978; Holtzman and Salviat 1981; Grimm 1989. Octavia (select bibliography): Arias 1939; Marella 1942; Winkes 1995; Wood 1999, 27–63; Pollini 2002.

[112] Suet., *Calig*. 23.1; Suet., *Claud*. 11.5; Plut., *Ant*. 49.6, 86.5; Plut., *Cic*. 49.4; Cass. Dio, 51.19.3, 59.20.1; Babcock 1962; Hollard and Raymond 2014; Borgies 2016, 327 and nn. 181-185 (with bibliography).

[113] See Chapter 3 nn. 94-95 above.

a pronounced curve (Figure 13). His hairstyle consists of an arrangement of thick locks that sweep back in overlapping layers from forehead to crown, at which point they form a starfish-shaped cowlick, and then down to the nape. Framing the face are a ridge of locks overhanging the forehead and a pronounced sideburn reaching to the level of the cheekbone. One can see in Antonius's hairstyle hints of the Alexander-inspired styles worn by Hellenistic kings and male dynasts, particularly the less riotous versions of such rulers as Philetairos, founder of the Attalid dynasty, and several Seleukids (Figure 14).

The cistophoric portraits of Antonius exhibit a noticeable amount of variation, which is not unexpected given that the obverse dies appear to number at least 171. The hands of different die engravers are most evident in the rendering of the individual locks of Antonius's hairstyle, the degree of heaviness in his facial features and fleshiness in the neck, and the shape of his nose, which is sometimes rather angular and flat (Figure 15). What sets the images on the *cistophori* apart from all other known representations of Antonius is the wearing of the ivy wreath, which consists of spade-shaped leaves and clusters of berries as can be seen in the border of the *RPC* 2201 obverse type. The wreath encircles the head and is knotted at the occipital ridge with the end left to hang vertically behind the neck, very much like the royal *diadēma*.[114] As such, the ivy wreath may be doing double duty as an attribute of Dionysos and as an indicator of Antonius as the natural heir to the Hellenistic rulership tradition, which is not the same as formally claiming for himself the title of *basileus* (king). Antonius's personal and political relationship with Kleopatra Thea Philopatōr in no way resulted in the bestowal of kingship upon the Roman in Ptolemaic Egypt or elsewhere. Incontrovertible papyrological and epigraphic evidence demonstrates that Kleopatra ruled jointly with her son Ptolemy (XV) Theos Philopatōr kai Philomētōr (otherwise known as Caesarion), who held the title of *basileus*, as early as 42.[115] Antonius may very well have envisioned

[114] O. J. Brendel (1962, 367) erroneously identifies the ivy wreath as a *diadēma*.

[115] The double regnal date known from numismatic, papyrological, and epigraphic sources beginning in 37/6 B.C.E. refers to the territorial grants that expanded Kleopatra's empire, and not to the joint rule with her son; see Chauveau 1997; Bingen 2007, 57, 65, 74–5.

his version of the Roman Empire as a dynastic Roman-Ptolemaic superpower with the future resting upon Kleopatra's half-Roman offspring, but one can only hypothesize what his intentions may have been using his wide-ranging efforts to reorganize the East as a guide.[116] Also at play in the background is the influence the cultural life and magnificence of the Hellenistic world had exerted and were continuing to exert over Rome and Romans over the last several generations prior to the late first century. Without the necessary recourse within Roman Republican traditions, men like Pompeius Magnus, Julius Caesar, Antonius, and Octavianus looked to Hellenistic models, Alexander himself above all, in shaping their personal ambitions and presenting themselves as the most powerful men in the Roman state.[117] It is, of course, widely known that this desire to emulate Alexander's achievements and portray oneself as a new Alexander lived on through the Imperial period and well beyond.

Like her husband, Octavia is not securely identifiable outside of the numismatic record with the exception of a very likely sculpted herm-bust from Velletri, Italy.[118] That said, the numismatic representations of Octavia are all unnamed, the legends being wholly devoted to Antonius and his titles. Thus, the identification of Octavia on the *cistophori*, *aurei*, and certain bronzes[119] has relied on contextual circumstances, which dictate that the woman depicted could be no other female close to Antonius. That is to say that the physical features of the portraits absolutely do not correspond with Kleopatra and, on the basis of the coins belonging to the early 30s, cannot represent Fulvia, whose death had immediately preceded Antonius's marriage to Octavia. In addition, one obverse type within the bronze series known as the fleet coinage, struck ca. 38/7 by the *praefecti*

---

[116] Augustus, although he has historically received the credit, largely followed Antonius's arrangements and policies in the eastern part of the Roman Empire.

[117] Michel 1967; Zanker 1988, 9–10; Pollini 2012, 162–203.

[118] Museo Nazionale Romano (Palazzo Massimo alle Terme), Inv. 121221, Pentelic marble, h. 39.5 cm. For discussion with photographs and bibliography, see Marella 1942; Winkes 1995, cat. 226; Wood 1999, 52–63; Pollini 2002, 16–22, 30–5.

[119] Gold: *RRC* 527 (unique specimen), 533/3. Bronze (fleet coinage): *RPC* 1453-1456, 1459-1465, 1468-1470, 4088-4091.

classis (fleet commanders) Lucius Sempronius Atratinus, Marcus Oppius Capito, and Lucius Calpurnius Bibulus, features the jugate portraits of Antonius and Octavianus facing the portrait of a female who can only be Octavia (*RPC* 1454, 1463, 4089). She was, after all, the personification of the concordia established between the two rivals at Brundisium in 40. In this capacity she seems to have had some agency and influence, functioning as an intermediary between Antonius and Octavianus and even negotiating exchanges of military and naval resources.[120]

The Antonian *cistophori* present the observer with two views of Octavia, the unobscured form on the reverse on *RPC* 2201 (Figure 2) and the jugate form with the rear of the head obscured on the obverse of *RPC* 2202 (Figure 3). Both instances depict a woman with a long neck, prominent chin, full lips, an aquiline nose with a varying degree of curvature, a well-defined occipital ridge, and a deeply set eye with heavy lids. The hairstyle visible on the reverse of *RPC* 2201 is known as the *nodus*, a specifically Roman style worn by *matronae* (married women). The *nodus* style is so named for the twist, roll, or knot (Octavia's is usually more of a twist) above the forehead, which is then connected to a chignon by a braid running down the center and over the crown of the head. The hair on each side of the head is pulled taut in a downwards direction to the ear, rolled, and fed into the chignon. In the version particular to *RPC* 2201, the chignon sits low, either at or slightly below, the occipital ridge and projects backward in two or three coils. Typically, one or two locks are left loose on the neck and an additional lock falls in front of the ear. The jugate portrait of Octavia on the obverse of *RPC* 2202 shows primarily the *nodus*, formed with a clockwise twist. Note also that the jugate portrait of Octavia exhibits a handling of her facial features different from the standalone bust. Her face and underchin have an added fleshiness, and overall her profile has a more masculine cast. In fact, there is a similarity to a greater or lesser extent with Antonius's facial profile, which is to be attributed either to deliberate assimilation meant to underscore their marital bond or to a

[120] Plut., *Ant*. 35, 53, 54.1-3; App., *B Civ*. 5.93-95, 138; Cass. Dio, 48.54.3-4, 49.33.3-4, 38.1-2.

less intentional effect resulting from the natural tendencies of the die cutter's hand.[121]

The fact that Octavia appears on the *cistophori* and other of Antonius's coinages is another, more obvious, adoption of established norms within the Hellenistic rulership model. In contrast to the Roman *mos maiorum* (custom of the ancestors), the societal and cultural codes of the Hellenistic world did not shy away from politically powerful women and their place in the ruling structures of the kingdoms, the Ptolemaic and the Seleukid in particular. As wives, mothers, and sisters who secured dynastic futures, royal women were integral to the outward projection of kingship. Queens also possessed the ability to act as regents and as sole reigning monarchs, both of which became more common in the period of intermarriages between the Seleukids and Ptolemies, from the early second century to the collapse of the Ptolemaic dynasty. And, of course, royal women also received divine honors and were the subjects of ruler cult alone and/or in conjunction with their husbands and/or sons.[122] Not surprisingly, it was the coinages of the Ptolemaic and Seleukid kingdoms that accounted for the majority of numismatic representations of queens. The jugate portrait form seen on the obverse of *RPC* 2202 is a direct borrowing of a convention that first appeared with the issues of Ptolemy Philadelphos featuring his deified parents the Theoi Sōtēres on the obverse and him and his sister-wife Arsinoë Philadelphos, the Theoi Adelphoi, on the reverse (Figure 16). Use of the jugate form to depict a royal male-female pair, be it husband and wife or mother and son, visually expressed the close relationship between the king and the woman closest to him as part of the ideological underpinnings used to present legitimacy and the promise of dynastic continuance.[123]

---

[121] A similar difference in the rendering of Octavia's portrait occurs in the issues of *aurei*, *RRC* 527 (similar to *RPC* 2201) and *RRC* 533/3 (similar to *RPC* 2202).

[122] Roy 1998; Caneva 2012; Coskun and McAuley 2016.

[123] Queens who appeared on coinage with their own standalone portraits include Arsinoë Philadelphos (posthumously), Berenikē (II) Euergetis, Kleopatra (I) Thea Epiphanēs (as regent for her son Ptolemy [VI] Philomētōr, who appears on the obverse), and Kleopatra Thea Euetēria (as sole ruler).

The inclusion of the likeness of Octavia on the *cistophori* and other issues struck for Antonius in the first two to three years of the 30s represents a revolutionary moment in the development of Roman coinage. Never before had a principal denomination struck under the authority of Rome included the overt representation of a mortal woman. That said, Fulvia, on the basis of some difficult evidence, seems to have preceded Octavia as the first Roman woman on a coin on two issues of *quinarii*[124] of Lugdunum (*RPC* 512-513) and two series of local civic bronze—one from Tripolis in Syria (*RPC* 4509), the other from Eumeneia in Phrygia (*RPC* 3139-3141). The series from Tripolis is dated to Year 23 of what must be a Pompeian era so that Year 23 = 42/1 B.C.E. These coins bear an unnamed portrait of Antonius on the obverse and that of an unnamed female wearing the *nodus* hairstyle on the reverse. The portrait has been identified as Fulvia on the basis of the strike date of the coins. The series from Eumeneia, which briefly changed its name to Fulvia, are undated, but must belong to the approximate year between Antonius's arrival in Asia in 41 and Fulvia's death in 40. The obverse type of these coins consists of a draped bust of Nikē donning the *nodus* hairstyle. Because this hairstyle was a Roman Republican fashion that is completely inconsistent with hairstyles worn by female divinities, the Nikē is thought to be Fulvia in the guise of the goddess of victory. Civic bronzes were the initiative of the city to which they belonged and, due to their fiduciary value, circulated within localized areas. There was, therefore, a significant progression with the move to depict Octavia on coinages struck in gold (*RRC* 527, 533/3) and silver (*RPC* 2201-2202). The next phase, the appearance of a named portrait of a Roman woman, did not occur until Livia in the Tiberian period (14-37 C.E.).

The ambiguity of these unnamed numismatic images of women associated with Antonius did not apply to Kleopatra, who was queen in her own right. Among several silver and bronze coinages, the complexity of which lies well beyond the scope of this discussion, Antonius and Kleopatra do appear together, typically as standalone

[124] A *quinarius* was a Roman silver denomination equal to half of a *denarius*.

portraits on opposite sides of the coins (i.e., the coins are double-headed).[125] In these instances, Kleopatra takes precedence over Antonius and, save for a few bronze types, is accompanied by her titulature in full or in some abbreviated version, always beginning with the essential designation of *basilissa*. The most familiar of the double-headed variety are the worn Syro-Phoenician silver tetradrachms (*RPC* 4094-4096) struck in ca. 36 B.C.E. at one or more unknown eastern mints, the foremost suggestion being Antioch-on-the-Orontes (Figure 17).[126] The numismatic portraits of Kleopatra fall into two basic types: the Alexandrian, created near the beginning of her reign in 51; and the Syro-Roman, created about the time of the expansion of Kleopatra's kingdom at the behest of Antonius in 37/6 and used at several mints in Koile Syria, Phoenicia, and Ituraea.[127] The obverse type of the tetradrachms features the Syro-Roman type and may be the type's origin. Recognizable as Kleopatra are the prominent hooked nose of the Ptolemies; the *Melonenfrisur*, a hairstyle consisting of multiple melon segment-shaped braids running front to back and collected as a wrapped chignon at the occiput; and the presence of the royal *diadēma*, tied around the head with the ends left to hang down along the neck. Distinctive of this portrait type is the diminutive size of the chignon, the width of the *diadēma* (which is rather broad in the Alexandrian type) and its looped ends, the pronounced curls along the hairline, and the drop earring. Also unique is the queen's detailed costume, which appears to include a draped mantle adorned along the décolletage with beads (likely pearls), a broach at the right shoulder, and a beaded necklace (likely pearls). S. Walker has recognized in this manner of dress "the orientalising fashions of Parthia and other eastern kingdoms," which would seem to

---

[125] Tetradrachms: *RPC* 4094-4096, ca. 36 B.C.E. (Antioch?). *Denarii*: *RRC* 543, 34 or 33/2 B.C.E. (unknown eastern mint). Bronze: *RPC* 4741-4742 (Ptolemais), 35/4 B.C.E.; *RPC* 4771 (Syrian Chalkis), 32/1 B.C.E. Bronzes of Dora (*RPC* 4752), 34/3 B.C.E., depict Kleopatra and Antonius as jugate portraits with the queen to the front as the ruling authority.

[126] *Obv*. ΒΑCΙΛΙCCΑ ΚΛΕΟΠΑΤΡΑ ΘΕΑ ΝΕWΤΕΡΑ, around; diademed and draped bust of Kleopatra, r.; border of dots. *Rev*. ΑΝΤWΝΙΟC ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤWΡ ΤΡΙΤΟΝ ΤΡΙWΝ ΑΝΔΡWΝ, around; bare head of Marcus Antonius, r.; border of dots.

[127] Smith 1988, 32–4; Walker and Higgs 2001, 233–37; Walker 2003; Weill Goudchaux 2006. S. Walker (2003, 508) uses "Queen of Kings" rather than Syro-Roman in reference to this type.

signify the queen's new empire.[128] As was the case with Octavia, assimilation in the portraits of Kleopatra and Antonius on the tetradrachms is evident; however, given that the queen is in the place of prominence and the *triumvir* is the subordinate, one must ask who is being assimilated to whom.

Clearly there was a push to emphasize and honor the women who both contributed to the advancement of Antonius's career and wielded influence of their own at different levels.[129] The reconciliation between Antonius and Octavianus and the positioning of Octavia as the bond between them placed her in a position of great prominence during the early 30s, when she temporarily eclipsed Kleopatra. Representationally, Octavia and Antonius mirrored the Hellenistic royal couples of years past, as was also seen with the divine honors afforded to the couple as Theoi Euergetai in Athens (*Agora* XVIII H273).

4.4. Antonius and Ephesos

Having laid out the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the Antonian *cistophori* as the subject currently stands, the purpose of this section is to consider the significance of the Dionysiac focus of these coins beyond Antonius's personal predilections and the customary cistophoric motifs. Although Ephesos, the likely location of the mint responsible for the *cistophori*, possibly honored Antonius as Dionysos at some point in time, I suggest that euergetic interaction with at least one *koinon* of the *technitai* of Dionysos may be the reason for the iconographic scheme of the coins, especially the depiction of Antonius wearing the ivy wreath.

The question of what the *cistophori* communicate in regards to the deification of Antonius as Dionysos has languished under the same limited approach as the epigraphic evidence from Athens (*IG* II^2 1043 and *Agora* XVIII H273). The starting point is not the

[128] Walker 2003, 510.

[129] Kleiner 1992; Cluett 1998.

objects themselves, but the literary testimony and a preconceived assumption that the iconography of the coins can and must be explained as a function of the written word. In this case, interpretation has depended upon a link between Ephesos as the likely origin of the Antonian *cistophori* and the description of Antonius's entry into the city in 41 as related by Plutarch (*Ant*. 24.2-4). The passage seems to imply that the Ephesians offered *isotheoi timai* to Antonius as Dionysos on this occasion.

> εἰς γοῦν Ἔφεσον εἰσιόντος αὐτοῦ γυναῖκες μὲν εἰς Βάκχας, ἄνδρες δὲ καὶ παῖδες εἰς Σατύρους καὶ Πᾶνας ἡγοῦντο διεσκευασμένοι, κιττοῦ δὲ καὶ θύρσων καὶ ψαλτηρίων καὶ συρίγγων καὶ αὐλῶν ἡ πόλις ἦν πλέα, Διόνυσον αὐτὸν ἀνακαλουμένων χαριδότην καὶ μειλίχιον. ἦν γὰρ ἀμέλει τοιοῦτος ἐνίοις, τοῖς δὲ πολλοῖς ὠμηστὴς καὶ ἀγριώνιος. ἀφῃρεῖτο γὰρ εὐγενεῖς ἀνθρώπους τὰ ὄντα μαστιγίαις καὶ κόλαξι χαριζόμενος.
>
> Certainly, when he [Antonius] entered into Ephesos, the women dressed as Bakchants and the men and boys dressed as Satyrs and Pans led the way, and the city was full of ivy, *thyrsoi*, harps, pipes, and flutes, since they called him Dionysus Xaridotēs [Joy-giver] and Meilichios [Gracious]. For he was doubtless to those ones, but to many others he was Dionysus Ōmēstēs [Eater of Raw Flesh] and Agriōnios [Savage]. For he deprived well-borne men of their property, offering it willingly to rogues and flatterers.

Plutarch is the lone source for this particular event and the only author to place the identification of Antonius with Dionysos at a point prior to the winter of 39/8. In the absence of corroborating evidence, the degree of accuracy contained within the details is difficult to gauge. Thus, we cannot know whether the idea of Antonius as Dionysos was already circulating in the late 40s and came to the fore in the early 30s or whether Plutarch has projected the divine assimilation backward to serve the themes of the *Life*. Plutarch may also have intentionally exaggerated characteristics of an actual festal event that occurred upon the occasion of Antonius's arrival in Ephesos. That is, the staging of the ceremonial *apantēsis-apodochē* protocol deployed in eastern cities in response to visiting Hellenistic rulers, Roman magistrates, and foreign ambassadors may lie beneath the Dionysiac veneer of the passage quoted above. What Plutarch describes seems very much like the mobilization of the population to form a *pompē* to conduct the honorand

into the city in the performance of an *apantēsis*.[130] The fullest account of what constituted an *apantēsis* comes from the Pergamene decree related to the triumphant return to the royal capital of Attalos (III) Philomētōr Euergetēs from an unknown military expedition in the 130s (*OGIS* 332). In addition to a list of divine honors voted to the *basileus* (*OGIS* 332, lines 5-26), the decree stipulates the logistics of the upcoming *apantēsis*, including the participants of the *pompē*: the priests and priestesses, the archons, the *hieroneikai* (victors of the sacred games), the gymnasiarch and the ephebes, and the citizenry (including women and children) among others (*OGIS* 332, lines 26-37). The decree also calls for the opening of the temples, the wearing of garlands and white garments, and the offering of sacrifices. In short, the city and its population are to observe the occasion as they would a sacred festival.[131] Although not the Dionysiac cavalcade that reportedly led Antonius into Ephesos, the protocol outlined in *OGIS* 332 likely provides the broad strokes of the greeting the *triumvir* would have received. The possibility of a coincidence between Antonius's *apantēsis* and a festival of Dionysos could explain Plutarch's description of the event. An additional clue that the *apantēsis-apodochē* protocol was invoked for Antonius's arrival is found in Appian (*B Civ*. 5.4), who reports that Antonius sacrificed magnificently to the goddess, who must be Ephesian Artemis.[132] The acts of sacrificing and addressing the people, which Antonius also does (*B Civ*. 5.4-5), were aspects of an *apodochē* and may be indications that the protocol was in place.

No doubt the occasion of Antonius's entry into Ephesos on the heels of the victory at Philippi prompted some manner of divine honors from the Ephesians. The city had, after all, supported Marcus Brutus and Gaius Cassius in the recent internecine conflict; divine honors would have gone a long way toward currying favor and encouraging

---

[130] Plutarch may also have in mind the elaborate Hellenistic royal processions, most famously that of Ptolemy Philadelphos in the 270s or 260s B.C.E. (Caneva 2016, 81–127, 173–76), that echoed the Indian triumph of Dionysos in complex, choreographed religio-political displays of power, the royal apparatus, and *tryphē*.

[131] Perrin-Saminadayar 2009, 70.

[132] ὁ δὲ Ἀντώνιος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ γενόμενος τῇ θεῷ μεγαλοπρεπῶς ἔθυε.

clemency on Antonius's part.[133] In addition to the concern to make amends, incentive to honor Antonius would also have come from the constant competition between *poleis* to surpass one another in many arenas, including their overtures to Hellenistic rulers and Roman officials. Those hypothetical honors, however, could have, but did not necessarily, include an acclamation as Dionysos, and the *cistophori* alone are insufficient proof. Plutarch's invocation of Dionysos using the two opposed epithetic pairs Xaridotēs/Meilichios and Ōmēstēs/Agriōnios, which are not attached to local Ephesian cults of Dionysos, highlight the ambiguous nature of a god who is simultaneously beneficent and dangerous.[134] Remember that Antonius's purpose in Asia was not only the administrative and geo-political reorganization of the eastern *provinciae*, but also the extraction of even more wealth from an already financially ravaged *provincia* in order to pay the legions. Although Antonius did extract a rather large tribute from Asia, he also demonstrated generosity and leniency in that he pardoned supporters of Brutus and Cassius, exempted from the levies *poleis* that had suffered most in the recent war, and enacted grants of territory.[135] The parallel drawn between the dual natures of Antonius and Dionysos may be a rhetorical construction, one that invited erudite readers to ponder the different cults of Dionysos, assembled around anecdotes and anti-Antonian invective intended to highlight Antonius's *crudelitas* (cruelty characterized by a desire to invoke suffering and a lack of self-moderation) against Octavianus's better character.[136] Without a clearer picture of the situation, the question of Ephesos as the first *polis* to deify Antonius and grant him honors as Dionysos as early as 41, if at all, is unanswerable. Ephesos, therefore, may or may not have preceded Athens in this regard.[137]

---

[133] App., *B Civ*. 5.4.

[134] Borgies 2016, 179.

[135] App., *B Civ*. 5.7

[136] Borgies 2016, 107-09, 178–80. The same sort of invective also worked against Octavianus since the Roman People, suffering from famine, apparently called him Apollo Tortor (Tormentor) following the notorious banquet of the twelve gods (Suet., *Aug*. 70).

[137] E. Voutiras (2001) has put forth the possibility that Thessaloniki in Macedonia may have led the way in honoring Antonius due to the apparent use of an Antonian era connected with the free status afforded the city immediately after Philippi. Further evaluation of the evidence is needed.

What if one approached the visual testimony of the *cistophori* without the assumption that Plutarch's account of the reception at Ephesos must be involved? Are there other possibilities that account for the Dionysiac theme of the *cistophori* and, most especially, the unique depictions of Antonius with the ivy wreath found on these coins? A later scene in the biography (Plut., *Ant.* 56.3-57.1) provides at least one plausible alternative that looks to Antonius's essential role as a powerful benefactor in his dealings with the Dionysian *technitai*/τεχνῖται.[138] The argument outlined below, though plausible, must remain speculative because the evidence is circumstantial.

Around the end of the first quarter of the third century, groups of itinerant musical and dramatic performers began to organize themselves into associations described as κοινὰ or σύνοδοι τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνῡσον τεχνιτῶν (Associations of the Artists devoted to Dionysos), under the protection and internally dedicated to the worship of Dionysos.[139] The mobilization of artists from various areas of the Hellenistic world was a necessary condition of the explosion of festivals and festival culture as a result of such factors as royal patronage, the widespread proliferation of ruler cults, and the foundation of new cities during the Hellenistic age. The success of festivals depended in part upon the success of the constituent musical and dramatic performances, and the musicians, actors, dancers, and poets of the associations of *technitai* served as the staff needed to stage those performances.[140] The four major associations and their branches were regionally based: the *Synodos* of the *technitai* of Dionysos at Athens (σύνοδος τῶν ἐν Ἀθήναις περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνιτῶν), first attested in 279/8 or 278/7;[141] the *Koinon* of the *technitai* of Dionysos who travel together in Isthmia and Nemea (κοινὸν τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνιτῶν τῶν εἰς Ἰσθμὸν καὶ Νεμέαν συμπορευομένων), first attested in the first half of the third century, with branches in cities of the Peloponnesos, Euboia, and northern and

[138] Plut., *Ant.* 56.3-57.1.

[139] The standard work on the *technitai* is now Le Guen 2006.

[140] Le Guen 2001, 2:5-14; Lorber and Hoover 2003, 59; Aneziri 2009, 217–20, 229–31, 232–34.

[141] Pickard-Cambridge 1968, 279–86; Le Guen 2001, 2: 14-7; 2006; Aneziri 2009, 219 and n. 10.

central mainland Greece;[142] the *Koinon* of the *technitai* of Dionysos who are active in/travel to Ionia and the Hellespontine region (κοινὸν τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνιτῶν τῶν ἐπὶ Ἰωνίας καὶ Ἑλλησπόντου), first attested in the second half of the third century, then after 188 known as the *Koinon* of the *technitai* of Dionysos who are active in/travel to Ionia and the Hellespontine region and who are devoted to Dionysos Kathēgemōn (κοινὸν τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνιτῶν τῶν ἐπὶ Ἰωνίας καὶ Ἑλλησπόντου καὶ περὶ τὸν Καθηγεμόνα Διόνυσον) as a sign of close ties with the Attalid dynasty;[143] and the *Synodos* of the *technitai* of Dionysos and the Theoi Adelphoi (σύνοδος τῶν τεχνιτῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ θεοὺς Ἀδελφοὺς), established by the mid-third century, with a branch on Cyprus also explicitly linked to the Ptolemaic dynastic cult in reference to the Theoi Euergetai and the Theoi Epiphaneis.[144] Associations of *technitai* were also active in Magna Graecia (southern Italy and Sicily).[145]

One of the primary functions of the associations was to secure for their members the ancient equivalent of diplomatic immunity in a world where travellers faced significant risks ranging from frequent, large-scale warfare to the fluidity of geo-political borders to the growing threat of piracy. Membership status in the associations of the *technitai* of Dionysos "was linked with highly significant privileges, such as inviolability (*asylia*), security (*asphaleia*), immunity from taxation (*ateleia*), exemption from liturgies, contributions, billeting (*aleitourgēsia*, *aneisphoria*, *anepistathmeia*) … etc. During the Hellenistic period cities, kings, the Delphic Amphictiony and Roman officials collectively acknowledged these privileges and honours … , advancing as a basic argument the artists' need to be left undistracted in the service of the gods and to perform, when required, the

[142] Pickard-Cambridge 1968, 282–87; Le Guen 2001, 2: 17-26; Aneziri 2009, 219-20 and nn. 11–12.

[143] Pickard-Cambridge 1968, 291–94; Le Guen 2001, 2: 27-34; 2007; Aneziri 2009, 220 and nn. 13-15. Dionysos Kathēgemōn (Leader) was a royal cult deity particular to the Attalids. It is presumed that after the peace of Apameia the *technitai* of Ionia and the Hellespontine region, seated at Tēos (which was now subject to Eumenēs Sōtēr), united with the *technitai* of Dionysos Kathēgemōn, seated at Pergamon, who were closely aligned with the ruling house (Le Guen 2007, 261, 275–78).

[144] Pickard-Cambridge 1968, 287–88; Le Guen 2001, 2: 7-9, 37-6; Aneziri 2009, 220 nn. 16–17.

[145] Le Guen 2001, 2: 36-7; Aneziri 2009, 220 n. 18.

honours and sacrifices entrusted to them."[146] To this list of privileges can also be added exemption from military and naval service, but this privilege was not always granted as regularly as the others.[147] These rights and privileges facilitated the movements, and therefore the primary function, of the *technitai* by way of protection from unchecked reprisals against their persons or their property and the prevention of legal action against the artists with the exception of an unpaid debt to a city or a breach of contract.[148] In securing and maintaining these dispensations, the associations operated in a manner akin to an autonomous Hellenistic *polis* with the independent authority to exchange embassies with cities, Hellenistic royal courts, and the Roman state; to send their own envoys to festivals; and even to mint their own precious metal coinage, a testament to the extent of wealth the associations could amass.[149] Membership in an association thus provided an international citizenship of sorts and "an alternative identity which enjoyed prestige and recognition beyond the borders of the city from which they [the *technitai*] came and/or where their association was based."[150] The reaffirmation and renewal of their highly advantageous privileges, and thus the identity born from those privileges, was an issue of high priority for the associations of the *technitai* of Dionysos, particularly during volatile periods like the first century B.C.E.

The spring of 32/1 saw Antonius initially in Ephesos, the then de facto capital of *provincia Asia*, where he was amassing his fleet and arranging to transport his legions to Greece to face Octavianus. Kleopatra was with him, refusing to return to Alexandria for the duration of the coming war.[151] At some point during the preparations, Antonius and Kleopatra sailed to the nearby island of Samos and spent several days ensconced in a festival-like atmosphere. According to Plutarch (*Ant*. 56.4), "it was compulsory for the

[146] Aneziri 2009, 230.

[147] Pickard-Cambridge 1968, 279, 282.

[148] Aneziri 2009, 230-31 and nn. 78-80.

[149] Csapo and Slater 1995, 239–55; Le Guen 2001, 2: 77-82. On the minting of coinage, see Lorber and Hoover 2003.

[150] Aneziri 2009, 233.

[151] Plut., *Ant*. 56.1-3.

technitai devoted to Dionysos to present themselves at Samos. And when nearly all the inhabited world around resounded with wailing and was filled with lamentations, one island for many days resounded with flute-playing and stringed instruments while the theaters were filled full and choruses competed for prizes. And every city that sent an ox sacrificed together, and the kings [also summoned to Samos] intensely vied against one another with their entertainments and gifts."[152] Once all the festivities were done, Antonius "gave to the *technitai* devoted to Dionysos Priēnē as their dwelling-place (οἰκητήριον)."[153] As is not unusual in the works of ancient authors, Plutarch does not specify a particular association in his reference to the *technitai*.[154] Presumably, given that we are dealing with Asia Minor, the *Koinon* of the *technitai* of Dionysos of Ionia and the Hellespontine region and of Dionysos Kathēgemōn was involved. Given Kleopatra's presence, the Egyptian and Cyprian associations of Dionysian *technitai* may also have appeared on Samos, in which case the festivities could have had a component devoted to the Ptolemaic dynastic cult. The interlude on Samos was not the wedding of Antonius and Kleopatra as some have seen fit to label the event.[155]

There are two ways to think about Antonius's gift of Priēnē, either an award of property that the *technitai* could physically occupy in the city or an allotment of financial revenues. In the case of the Ionian and Hellespontine *technitai*, the association was from at least 207/6 based in Tēos, but major disputes between the *technitai* and the *polis* eventually ended the relationship during the reign of Attalos (II) Philadelphos (158-138) or Attalos (III) Philomētōr Euergetēs (138-133). According to the first century B.C.E./ first century C.E. geographer Strabo (14.1.29), the *technitai* migrated to Ephesos, then

---

[152] … πᾶσι τοῖς περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνίταις ἐπάναγκες ἦν εἰς Σάμον ἀπαντᾶν· καὶ τῆς ἐν κύκλῳ σχεδὸν ἁπάσης οἰκουμένης περιθρηνουμένης καὶ περιστεναζομένης, μία νῆσος ἐφ᾽ ἡμέρας πολλὰς κατηυλεῖτο καὶ κατεψάλλετο πληρουμένων θεάτρων καὶ χορῶν ἀγωνιζομένων. συνέθυε δὲ καὶ πόλις πᾶσα βοῦν πέμπουσα, καὶ βασιλεῖς διημιλλῶντο ταῖς ὑποδοχαῖς καὶ δωρεαῖς πρὸς ἀλλήλους.

[153] Γενόμενος δὲ ἀπὸ τούτων τοῖς μὲν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνίταις Πριήνην ἔδωκεν οἰκητήριον … .

[154] Le Guen 2006, 334.

[155] E.g., Csapo and Slater 1995, 241; D. Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death: The Hellenistic Dynasties* (London: Duckworth, 1999), 104. On the possible elements of invective present in the Samos episode, see Borgies 2016, 300.

to Myonnēsos under orders from one Attalos or the other, and then finally to the coastal town of Lebedos with the intervention of the Romans at the instigation of Tēos.[156] Strabo makes no mention of Priēnē, so traditionally the remark in Plutarch has been judged erroneous information or a measure made null and void by Antonius's defeat at Actium.[157] On the other hand, however, the act of giving Priēnē to the *technitai* could instead refer to the practice, known from Achaemenid and Hellenistic Asia Minor, of gifting a city as a means of providing financial resources.[158] If the portion in question was not taken from all the city's revenues, the funds allotted to the *technitai* could have been restricted to monies procured through festivals and *agōnes*. A fiscal arrangement such as this would have created considerable financial advantages for the association(s) of the *technitai* of Dionysos who were the target of Antonius's benefaction.[159]

Why should this interaction with the *technitai* have a bearing on the *cistophori* struck for Antonius some six years before the meeting on Samos? Because it is possible that the euergetism Antonius enacted in 32 was the continuation of an already existing euergetic relationship with the *technitai*, and surviving honorific inscriptions demonstrate that the associations awarded their benefactors with an ivy wreath. For example, two mid-second century B.C.E. honorary decrees from Ptolemaïs in the Fayum district of Egypt record resolutions of the *Synodos* of the *technitai* of Dionysos and the Theoi Adelphoi to crown the honorees with a wreath of ivy according to the ancestral custom

---

[156] εἶτα Λέβεδος, διέχουσα Κολοφῶνος ἑκατὸν καὶ εἴκοσι· ἐνταῦθα τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνιτῶν ἡ σύνοδος καὶ κατοικία τῶν ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ μέχρι Ἑλλησπόντου, ἐν ᾗ πανήγυρίς τε καὶ ἀγῶνες κατ᾽ ἔτος συντελοῦνται τῷ Διονύσῳ. ἐν Τέῳ δὲ ᾤκουν πρότερον τῇ ἐφεξῆς πόλει τῶν Ἰώνων· ἐμπεσούσης δὲ στάσεως, εἰς Ἔφεσον κατέφυγον. Ἀττάλου δ᾽ εἰς Μυόννησον αὐτοὺς καταστήσαντος μεταξὺ Τέω καὶ Λεβέδου, πρεσβεύονται Τήιοι δεόμενοι Ῥωμαίων, μὴ περιιδεῖν ἐπιτειχιζομένην σφίσι τὴν Μυόννησον, οἱ δὲ μετέστησαν εἰς Λέβεδον, δεξαμένων τῶν Λεβεδίων ἀσμένως διὰ τὴν κατέχουσαν αὐτοὺς ὀλιγανδρίαν.

[157] Le Guen 2001, 1: 344.

[158] E.g., Joseph., *Ap*. 1.153, where the term οἰκητήριον appears as in Plut., *Ant*. 57.1.

[159] Le Guen 2001, 1: 344; 2: 97 and nn. 470-472. Sulla (Plut., *Sulla* 33.3) reportedly gave the lands of nations and the incomes of cities to musicians and mimes as part of his outrages.

(στεφανῶσαι κισσοῦ στεφάνωι κατὰ πάτρια).[160] What is more, the epithet *neos* Dionysos has some connection with efforts of the associations of the *technitai* of Dionysos to honor Hellenistic kings and, at a later time, Roman emperors.[161] The Hellenistic example often cited is Mithradatēs Eupatōr Dionysos and the elaborate *apantēsis* staged by the Athenians in honor of the king's envoy Athēniōn upon his arrival in 88.[162] The *Synodos* of the *technitai* of Dionysos at Athens acted as ambassadors of the city, in which capacity members of the associations of *technitai* often served cities and rulers throughout the Hellenistic East, and figured prominently in the prayers and sacrifices offered on behalf of Athēniōn as ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ νέου Διονύσου, the messenger of the *neos* Dionysos.[163]

Although the *technitai* were not responsible for Mithradatēs' use of the title Dionysos, for that was a symptom of kings aligning themselves with the god (as well as Heraklēs) to evoke Alexander, their intimate attachment to Dionysos drew the *technitai* into the "royal dionysism" characterized by claims of dynastic descent from Dionysos and the processional demonstrations of royal *tryphē*.[164] The links with the royal court were most obvious in Asia Minor, Egypt, and Cyprus, where the associations of *technitai* were explicitly devoted to both Dionysos and royal cults (Dionysos Kathēgemōn of the Attalids and the dynastic cult of the Ptolemies). Under the Roman Empire, the regional associations of the Hellenistic period were eclipsed by a world-wide association of *technitai* and *hieroneikai stephaneitai* (sacred wreath-crowned victors) devoted to Dionysos and the emperor, most active in the second century. Hadrianus (117-138 C.E.), a renowned philhellene, is the best documented case of an emperor's dealings with

---

[160] *OGIS* 50-51; Le Guen 2001, 1: 293-300 (nos. 60-61). Online transcriptions and translations: R. A. Ascough, P. A. Harland, and J. S. Kloppenborg, *Associations in the Greco-Roman World*, http://www.philipharland.com/greco-roman-associations/?p=2939 and http://www.philipharland.com/greco-roman-associations/?p=2966 (accessed 3 October 2017).

[161] Garton 1964, 144–45; Pickard-Cambridge 1968, 295, 298, 300; Geagan 1972, 145–46; Csapo and Slater 1995, 241; Le Guen 2001, 1: 337; 2: 90; Le Guen 2006, 340, 353, 357.

[162] Athen., *Deipn*. 211d-215b; Le Guen 2001, 336–37; Le Guen 2006.

[163] Athen., *Deipn*. 212d.

[164] Le Guen 2001, 2: 90; Le Guen 2006, 354. Alexander claimed familial descent from Heraklēs and Achilles. The Ptolemaic dynasty claimed descent from Dionysos and Heraklēs (Diod. Sic., 1.20.33). The Attalid dynasty claimed descent from Heraklēs (Paus. 1.4.5-6)

the association, and in his reign the full title of the *synodos* appears as ἡ ἱερὰ σύνοδος τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ Αὐτοκράτορα Τραιανὸν Ἁδριανὸν Καίσαρα Σεβαστὸν νέον Διόνυσον τεχνειτῶν ἱερονεικῶν στεφανειτῶν καὶ τῶν τούτων συναγωνιστῶν, the Sacred *synodos* of the *technitai* and *hieroneikai stephaneitai* of the *oikoumenē*/inhabited world devoted to Dionysos and Emperor Traianus Hadrianus Caesar Sebastos *neos* Dionysos and of their fellow competitors."[165] His successor Antoninus Pius (138-161 C.E.) received the same distinction.[166] In these examples, the cult of the Roman emperor, which venerated the rule of one man over the *oikoumenē*, has taken the place of the Hellenistic royal cults, which represented the fractured and competing power structures of the three centuries after Alexander.

If a reciprocal euergetic relationship between Antonius and one or more associations of the *technitai* of Dionysos had begun sometime between the eastern tour of 42-41 and the minting of the Antonian *cistophori* in (presumably) the first half of 38, his role as benefactor to the *technitai* may explain a purposeful emphasis upon Dionysiac iconography and, more importantly, the depiction of the *triumvir* crowned with an ivy wreath. Unfortunately, no direct evidence currently exists. There has survived, however, a letter or letters from Antonius in his capacity as *triumvir* that addresses the privileges of the σύνοδος τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἱερονεικῶν καὶ στεφανειτῶν, the *synodos* of the *hieroneikai* and *stephaneitai* of the *oikoumenē*, whose members were likely athletes.[167] The letter is known from two documents, an Egyptian papyrus now in the British Library collection (*P. Lond*. 137)[168] and an inscription possibly from Tralleis (*SEG* 37.874). The

---

[165] E.g., *IGRR* III 209 = *SEG* 6.59 (Ankyra); *IGRR* III 210 = *SEG* 6.58 (Ankyra); *IAph2007* 12.27 = J. Reynolds, C. Roueché, and G. Bodard, *Inscriptions of Aphrodisias (2007)*, http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/iaph2007/iAph120027.html (accessed 4 October 2017).

[166] E.g., *IG* II^2 1350 (Athens); *IG* II^2 1348 (Athens), name of emperor can be restored as Hadrianus or Antoninus; *IGRR* 4.1361(Thyateira).

[167] Drew-Bear 1972, 461–62; Pleket 1973, 200-01; Sherk 1984, 105–06 (no. 85); Ebert 1987; Le Guen 2001, 1: 32-3; Aneziri 2009, 221. Pleket (1973, 200 and n. 10) insists that this association was purely athletic rather than a combination of athletes and stage performers.

[168] Translation found in Sherk 1984, 105–06 (no. 85). Greek text in C. G. Brandis, "Ein Schreiben des Triumvirn Marcus Antonius an den Landtag Asiens," *Hermes* 32.3 (1897): 509-22.

two documents are either copies of the same letter originally belonging to 42-41 or 32-31 B.C.E. or two different letters, one written in 42 shortly after Philippi (the epigraphic version) and the other in 33 (the papyrological version) confirming the privileges of the earlier letter.[169] Among the privileges are exemption from military service, freedom from liturgies and billeting, and *asylia* (*P. Lond*. 137, lines 11-18). It is, in my view, entirely possible that Antonius also recognized the privileges of some, if not all, the associations of the *technitai* of Dionysos in the wake of the war against the assassins of Julius Caesar and the Parthian invasion of Asia Minor, as Lucius Cornelius Sulla and the Senate had done for the *Koinon* of the *technitai* of Dionysos who are active in/travel to Ionia and the Hellespontine region and who are devoted to Dionysos Kathēgemōn in the second half of the 80s amidst the retributions visited upon eastern cities (e.g., Ephesos) after the first of the Mithradatic Wars.[170] Interestingly, Sulla, like Antonius, also had an affinity for actors and musicians and found himself among the *technitai* of Dionysos in 84 while recovering his health at Aidēpsos on Euboia, where there were branches of the Isthmian-Nemean *koinon*.[171]

The hypothetical renewal of the privileges of the *technitai* by Antonius could have earned him honors that included being crowned with an ivy wreath, which, if the timing were right, could have prompted the configuration of his portrait with the ivy wreath on the obverses of the *cistophori*. Given the limited area of circulation, specifying the influence of the Ionian-Hellespontine *koinon* of *technitai* in the design of the *cistophori* makes the most sense. An event such as this was also likely to generate commemorative

---

[169] One letter: Pickard-Cambridge 1968, 297; Drew-Bear 1972, 461; Pleket 1973, 201; Sherk 1984, 105-06, no. 85; Le Guen 2001, 1: 32-3. Two letters: Ebert 1987.

[170] Two letters of Sulla to the *technitai* are inscribed on a marble stele from Kos now in the Museum of Kos, Inv. ED 7; Garton 1964, 144–46; Sherk 1984, 74–5 (no. 62) with English translation; Le Guen 2001, 1: 284-88 (no. 56) with Greek text and French translation and commentary; P. A. Harland, "Letters from Sulla with Privileges for the Ionian Dionysiac Performers (81, 84 BCE)," *Associations in the Greco-Roman World*, http://www.philipharland.com/greco-roman-associations/?p=11438 (accessed 4 October 2017) with Greek text and English translation. The *Synodos* of the *technitai* of Dionysos at Athens ran afoul of Sulla because they had supported Mithradatēs (Garton 1964, 144–45; Le Guen 2007).

[171] Plut., Sull. 26.3; Garton 1964, 146; Le Guen 2001, 1: 337-38.

monuments in the form of inscriptions, detailing the diplomatic exchange and honorific decrees voted by the *technitai* in response, and of inscribed statues and/or paintings resulting from said honorific decrees (e.g., *OGIS* 51, *SEG* 6.814). These material representations of a reciprocal euergetic exchange between Antonius and the *technitai*, on display in or around temples and common spaces like theaters, would have disseminated the information that the coins alone could not contain. Seeing as how the *cistophori* were almost certainly minted to pay Antonius's soldiers on campaign against the Parthians, this reading of the iconography of the coins does not discount the links between Antonius, Dionysos and eastern conquest, but allows for the polysemy of a visual vocabulary absorbed in different ways by different individuals and/or groups.

Involvement with the *technitai* may also speak, at least in part, to the reason Antonius was known as *neos* Dionysos, that is, he received the title as an honor bestowed by the *technitai*. One possible occasion is the *apantēsis* at Ephesos in 41 (Plut., *Ant*. 2-4), which may have had such a Dionysiac atmosphere because the *technitai*, let us say the *koinon* of the Ionian and Hellespontine region, actively participated in the event. As Mithradatēs had been referred to as *neos* Dionysos in the context of the *apantēsis* of his ambassador Athēniōn,[172] so too Antonius could have received the same title at the instigation of the *technitai* in the context of his Ephesian *apantēsis*. The possibility of dealings with the *technitai* in Athens as part of Antonius's activities in the city could also have some bearing on the evidence of *IG* II^2 1043 (lines 22-23), where Antonius has gained the epithet Theos Neos Dionysos. As an additional suggestion next to the Parthian victory argument set forth in the previous chapter, honorific treatment by the *technitai* may lie behind this titulature. (Undoubtedly, the *technitai* would have been engaged for the celebration of the Antonieia.) If the *technitai* of Dionysos really were involved in

[172] Athen., *Deipn*. 212d; Le Guen 2006.

constructing Antonius's persona as Dionysos, then these associations are possibly the link between the epigraphic evidence from Athens and the Asian *cistophori*, which did not circulate outside the *provincia* on account of the reduced weight standard.

Chapter 5

Reconstructing and Rethinking Marcus Antonius

The stigma attached to the identification of Antonius with Dionysos, a consequence of the version of the *triumvir* transmitted to posterity through the ancient literary record, has led to the decontextualization of both the relationship itself and the small corpus of archaeological evidence attesting to its existence. In the absence of specific focus on the material texts and coins, the general assumption within Antonian scholarship is that the testimonies of Seneca the Elder, Plutarch, Cassius Dio, and others sufficiently explain (i) the Athenian Antonieia in honor of Antonius Theos Neos Dionysos (*IG* II^2 1043), (ii) the deification of Antonius and Octavia as Theoi Euergetai at Athens (*Agora* XVIII H273), and (iii) the cistophoric portraits of Antonius crowned with an ivy wreath (*RPC* 2201-2202). A lack of distinction among the objects in this small corpus of archaeological evidence has obfuscated subtleties of meaning and significance imparted by their original contexts. In continuing to overlook the contemporaneity of the inscriptions and the *cistophori* and the different conditions under which they were created and experienced, opportunities to step outside the anti-Antonian tendencies of a retrospective historical tradition go unrealized. It is in recognition of this need to broaden the parameters of scholarly debate that this dissertation has highlighted *IG* II^2 1043, *Agora* XVIII H273, and *RPC* 2201-2202 as standalone sources that clearly reflect the implementation by a *dēmos* or other sub-group of the subordinate population of customary honorific protocols attached to ruler cult. Taking into account that the offering of *isotheoi timai* was part of a reciprocal dialogue of euergetic exchange, how Antonius interacted with various groups as a benefactor capable of guaranteeing rights, freedoms, and protection leads to a much more textured view of his associations with Dionysos. However much personal predilections may have added fuel to the fire, similarities drawn

between Antonius and Dionysos at the level of lifestyle choices and manner of being are merely the more visible aspects of the relationship on account of the most intact evidence; more difficult to access but more revealing is what lies amid the murkiness of uncertainty and lost evidence.

The time of Antonius's return to the eastern Mediterranean and his ensuing residence at Athens for the winter of 39/8 has often been emphasized as the point at which his identification with Dionysos proliferated at the insistence of the *triumvir* himself. The initial publication of *IG* II^2 1043 dated the Antonieia, the panathenaic-rank eponymous festival honoring Antonius Theos Neos Dionysos, to 39/8 on the basis of the then current archontal chronology. This date found recourse in the historian Cassius Dio (48.39.2), who states that while in Athens Antonius called himself *neos* Dionysos and demanded that others do the same. This study has suggested two major amendments to this line of thinking. First, revisions of the Athenian archontal chronology since the publication of *IG* II^2 place the occurrence of the Antonieia in 38/7, the year of Antonius's second winter in Athens. Unless the attribution of archonships for the first century changes again, this lower date stands. Second, ancient literary references to Antonius calling himself or being called *neos* Dionysos (e.g., Plut., *Ant*. 60.3; Cass. Dio, 48.39.2) are not necessarily equivalent to the appearance of Theos Neos Dionysos as part of Antonius's nomenclature in *IG* II^2 1043 (line 23). Both impart the idea of being a second Dionysos, but the literary *neos* Dionysos is anecdotal in nature and the epigraphic Theos Neos Dionysos is an actual honorific title in the tradition of Hellenistic royal titulature and ruler cult practices. The establishment of the Antonieia, perhaps only celebrated the one time, was very much a prerogative of the civic governing bodies, and the decree that must have announced this and possibly other *isotheoi timai* for Antonius could have been responsible for the adoption of Theos Neos Dionysos as part of his nomenclature. Besides underscoring the *isotheos* status of the honorand, this epithet seems to have implied that Antonius was an incarnation of Dionysos in that he replicated qualities and achievements

of his divine alter ego. The timing of the Antonieia and the emphasis upon Dionysos suggests possible connections with the recent expulsion of the Parthians from Syria, whence Antonius returned to Athens victorious like an epiphany of Dionysos triumphant. Thus, what *IG* II^2 1043 (lines 22-23) actually suggests is a bottom-up process in which Antonius may not have been responsible, or at least not completely, for his identification with Dionysos, which was instead an initiative of Athens. At the same time, we cannot know whether the Athenians were the first to honor the *triumvir* in this way.

The other inscription from Athens, *Agora* XVIII H273 (ca. 39-32 B.C.E.), indicates something different yet. This fragment of an altar is extraordinary for its inclusion of Antonius's wife Octavia, who achieved a high level of popularity of her own among the Athenians. The inscribed text addresses Antonius and Octavia as a couple with the honorific title Theoi Euergetai, which recognizes husband and wife together as benefactors in the manner previously observed with Hellenistic royal couples. I have called attention to the fact that reliance upon a seventy-year-old article as the definitive word on the significance of *Agora* XVIII H273 (Raubitschek 1946) has perpetuated an argument built upon a flawed assumption. The assumption in question holds that the episode of the betrothal of Athena Polias to Antonius found in Seneca the Elder (*Suas*. 1.6) indicates that the Athenians identified Octavia with their poliad deity. On this basis, the appearance of Octavia as Thea Euergetis in *Agora* XVIII H273 is then explained as the deification of Octavia as Athena Polias. There is, however, no compelling reason to qualify the inscription in such a way with respect to either Octavia or Antonius because the Theoi Euergetai title imparts divine status in and of itself; the honoring of Antonius as Theos Neos Dionysos may or may not have any bearing. Occasion for honors emphasizing Antonius and Octavia as a married couple may have come during their first winter in Athens, perhaps as a result of their initial arrival in the city late in 39 and the observance of the *apantēsis-apodochē* protocol. The winter of 39/8 was also marked by Antonius playing the philathenian, participating in the civic and religious life of Athens,

performing acts of liturgical euergetism, and sponsoring feasts to celebrate the first of Publius Ventidius's successes against the Parthians in Cilicia and Syria (Plut., *Ant*. 33.4). Knowing something more Octavia's relations with the Athenians during her two-year residence in the city and what sort of *timai* she reportedly received on her own (Plut., Ant. 57.1) would really be enlightening, especially because she is the first known instance of the deification of a Roman woman before the imperial period.

Nowhere was Octavia's preeminent status as wife and sister of the two most powerful men in the Roman state more evident than the appearance of her portrait on Antonius's coinages, the *cistophori* (*RPC* 2201-2202) minted for the *triumvir* in *provincia Asia* in ca. 39/8 being of interest here. Whereas queens had long been present on Hellenistic royal coinages alone and in conjunction with their husbands or sons, this was not the Roman convention. Octavia was, in fact, the first living woman to appear in her own right on an official (not civic) Roman coinage, setting the precedent for Roman empresses and imperial coinages. The adoption of Hellenistic conventions as the recognizable way of representing a married couple occupying a position of power is evident in the obverse type of RPC 2202, which features the likenesses of Antonius and Octavia in the jugate format known from Hellenistic royal coinages.

More important for this study is the depiction of Antonius wearing the ivy wreath of Dionysos in the obverse types of both *RPC* 2201 and *RPC* 2202. I have made a concentrated effort to demonstrate that these coins must be understood as currency just as much as vehicles of visual information. Two observations are of primary importance. First, the *cistophorus* utilized a reduced-weight standard that limited its regular circulation to *provincia* Asia as the hoard evidence shows. Single coin finds outside the *provincia* do not indicate circulation and can usually be attributed to warfare and the movements of armies. Second, the *cistophori* were not struck because the standard iconographical scheme of this denomination had a distinct Dionysiac theme (*cista mystica*, ivy wreath, serpents) and, thus, offered opportunity for Antonius to

widely declare himself Dionysos. Currency was produced for financial and economic purposes; the timing of the Antonian cistophori suggests that the coins were minted to pay the legions dealing with the Parthian incursions into southeastern Asia Minor and Syria. Antonius's plans for a Median campaign may also have been a factor. If the intent were really to employ coinage to promote Antonius as Dionysos on as large a scale as possible, Attic-weight tetradrachms (or perhaps even *denarii*) would have served this purpose much better. The *cistophori* were more a statement of Antonius's authority since the legends were completely given over to his official titulature and the conventional obverse type dismantled to make way for his portrait and that of Octavia. The innovations represented in the Antonian *cistophori* represent a significant development in the visibility of Roman intervention in the provincial coinages of Asia, a development that led to the *cistophori* characteristic of Roman imperial coinage.

The fact that no other instance of Antonius's portrait on a coinage minted under the authority of either the *triumvir* or of Kleopatra (VII) Thea Philopatōr includes Dionysiac attributes begs the question of why the *cistophori*. The episode of the Dionysiac *pompē* that welcomed Antonius into Ephesos where he was subsequently hailed as Dionysos in the spring of 41, information known only from Plutarch (*Ant*. 24.2-4), has generally served as the rationale for the addition of an ivy wreath to Antonius's portrait on the *cistophori* because of the involvement of the Ephesian mint. The identification of Antonius as Dionysos at this early date in Ephesos may or may not be true, and there is no basis for the exclusion of the possibility at this point. The effect of the ivy wreath and the Dionysiac emphasis of the coins certainly invites the viewer to conceptually connect Antonius and Dionysos, conjuring recollections of the god as the divine prototype for Alexander III's conquest of the Achaemenid Empire and, in turn, Antonius's engagement with the Parthian Empire.

At the same time, this study has advocated thinking outside the box to seek additional interpretations in the immediate context of the coins. Consideration of

Antonius in the role of benefactor and the enmeshment of euergetism and ruler cult, a theme that has guided this study, led to the possibility that interactions with the Dionysian *technitai* may have played a part in the decision to depict Antonius wearing an ivy wreath. We hear from Plutarch (*Ant*. 56.4) that there was in the run-up to Actium a brief interlude on Samos in which Antonius, with Kleopatra at his side, summoned the *technitai* of Dionysos to the island and proceeded to gift to them either land in or financial contributions from Priēnē. How many of the regional associations of the *technitai* of Dionysos were present at the gathering on Samos is unclear; however, the *Koinon* of the *technitai* of Dionysos of Ionia and the Hellespontine region is the most likely recipient of Antonius's gift since their home base of Lebedos was nearby. It is quite possible that, prior to the Samian meeting of 32/1, Antonius had already had dealings with the *technitai* concerning their highly coveted privileges, such as inviolability and exemption from taxes. These privileges allowed the *technitai* to freely go about their business of travelling from place-to-place in service of staging festivals and were particularly important in times of volatility. The triumviral period was definitely a time of uncertainty throughout the Mediterranean region, and the technitai would very likely have felt the need to secure their special status when Antonius took control of the eastern *provinciae*. Since benefactors of the various associations of *technitai* sometimes received an ivy wreath as a customary symbol of gratitude, a euergetic exchange between Antonius and the Ionian-Hellespontine *technitai* of Dionysos prior to the minting of the *cistophori* could account for the addition of an ivy wreath to Antonius's portrait. It is difficult to gauge the uniqueness of the cistophoric portraits among the totality of images of Antonius in antiquity, and a very different perspective could emerge if ever a securely identifiable statue or other visual representation of Antonius with attributes of Dionysos were found.

The coincidence of evidence in and around 38 B.C.E. suggests the early 30s as a time of Antonius's associations with Dionysos beginning or significantly increasing as an accompaniment to his deification under the tenets of Hellenistic ruler cult. I think

it reasonable to say that the combination of Antonius's physical presence in his role as *triumvir* in the eastern Mediterranean and the successes of his armies against the Parthians generated opportunities and incentives for cities and other entities to offer divine honors that in some cases included references to Dionysos. This perspective shifts at least some of the responsibility for the association with the god from Antonius to the mechanisms of an honorific tradition embedded within the cultural norms shared throughout the Hellenistic East. That said, the Dionysos connection ought not to function as justification for indistinctly lumping together the evidence of the two Athenian inscriptions (*IG* II^2 1043 and *Agora* XVIII H273) with the evidence of the *cistophori* (*RPC* 2201-2202). Whereas the prerequisite for the Antonieia (*IG* II^2 1043, line 22) is the grant of *isotheoi timai* by decree of the *boulē* or *ekklēsia* and the titles Theos Neos Dionysos (*IG* II^2 1043, line 23) and Theoi Euergetai (*Agora* XVIII H273) typically reflect the same, the ivy-wreathed portraits of Antonius on the *cistophori* carry no such qualification. The coins, although they might allude to divine honors received, are not on their own proof of the bestowal of those honors. One cannot, therefore, draw a straight line between the divine honors for Antonius in Athens and the decisions of mint officials in Ephesos who were authorized to reproduce Antonius's likeness. Certainly the promotion of Antonius as Dionysos, the prominence of Octavia, the euergetic underpinning of ruler cult, and victory over the Parthians are shared messages, but the differences in the epigraphic and numismatic evidence originating on opposite sides of the Aegean are enough to warrant some distinction.

In reversing the standard approach to the associations between Antonius and Dionysos, the preceding discussion has advocated for the reversal of the marginalization of the related epigraphic and numismatic evidence in order to explore alternative outlooks on the relationship outside the limits of the ancient literary record. The inscriptions and *cistophori* present the enormous advantages of being securely datable to Antonius's lifetime, a rare condition given what has survived from antiquity, and of manifesting

processes and subjectivities not represented in the works of ancient authors, most of whom wrote with a century or more of historical hindsight. The connections this study has drawn between the development of Antonius's identification with Dionysos and the bases for honorific treatment through ruler cult—here military victory and extraordinary benefactions made to *poleis* like Athens and groups like the Dionysian *technitai*—are informed by, but not directly expressed in, the literary sources. That said, the combination of the physical and the literary cannot overcome unresolvable gaps in knowledge and chronology and the artworks, official documents, oral traditions, and written treatises irretrievably lost. For this reason, the preceding discussion has necessarily maintained a certain degree of uncertainty in linking together *IG* II^2 1043, *Agora* XVIII H273, and *RPC* 2201-2202 and historical events; the findings are circumstantial but, nevertheless, take greater account of the mutual effects of Antonius's close ties with the Hellenistic East.

The scope of this study limited the focus to the first phase of Antonius's career as *triumvir* in the East, from 42/1 to 38/7, and his associations with Dionysos as a function of Hellenistic ruler cult traditions. The next step is to continue this line of inquiry into the second phase of Antonius's triumviral career, from 37/6 to his death in August of 30/29, when his political and personal relationship with Kleopatra Thea Philopatōr ultimately took center stage. The central question for future research is how Kleopatra's identification as Isis/Aphrodite, which had much to do with the divinity that was hers by right of both Egyptian and Ptolemaic queenship, influenced and interacted with Antonius's identification as Dionysos. Earlier events such as the first meeting at Tarsos in 41 and the subsequent winter spent in Alexandria must, of course, serve as the starting points. The years 37/6 to 34/3 are notable for an apparent change in Antonius's approach to eastern politics. Initially, in 37/6, Antonius devoted considerable efforts to the reorganization of the eastern *provinciae* and in so doing he followed the standard Roman strategy of establishing client states along the frontier with local leaders loyal to Rome.

The expansion of Kleopatra's kingdom at this time, a move that granted her territories to which she had a hereditary claim as a descendant of both the Ptolemaic and the Seleukid dynasties, was in accordance with the client-state approach. Kleopatra had already regained Cyprus in 48, and to her domain Antonius added parts of Cilicia and Phoenicia, Koile-Syria, Ituraea, the forests around Jericho, Nabataean Arabia, Krete, and Kyrēnē. Ptolemy XV (Caesarion), her son by Julius Caesar, was confirmed as king alongside his mother. Several mints within her new empire struck bronze and silver coinages under the queen's authority, and some of these coinages (e.g., *RPC* 4094-4096, 4771) depicted Kleopatra and Antonius together with the *triumvir* in the subordinate position.

On the heels of the territorial grant, however, Antonius publicly acknowledged his three children by Kleopatra, the twins Alexander Hēlios and Kleopatra Selēnē (born in 40) and the infant Ptolemy Philadelphos (born in 36). Then came the so-called Donations of Alexandria in 34 whereby Antonius nominally distributed the Ptolemaic possessions, plus Armenia, Media, and the as yet unconquered Parthia, among the three children alongside their mother and elder half-brother. He also betrothed Alexander Hēlios to the daughter of the king of Media and also seems to have had plans for his legal Roman heir Marcus Antonius Antyllus, his eldest son by Fulvia. This pivot towards the dynastic political system inherent to the Hellenistic East was a departure from Roman policy, but just what Antonius intended is unclear because his plans went unrealized. Nevertheless, his actions suggest that Antonius's conceptualization of himself in relation to his current command in the East and his future position in the Roman state was evolving, and the possible implications for his associations with Dionysos need to be explored as fully as the available evidence allows. Because of the particular brand of rulership developed by the Ptolemies, the guiding theme of Hellenistic ruler cults must necessarily encompass both the *polis* and dynastic cults as well as the Egyptian concept of divine kingship.

Antonius was the latest, and most powerful, in a series of Roman magistrates who received divine honors as a matter of course in their interactions with populations

accustomed to dealing with the Hellenistic monarchies. The customary characterization of Antonius's identification with Dionysos in terms of moral character has segregated the *triumvir* from this pattern so that he has been regarded as an aberrant example. In fact, the contextual framework of ruler cult provides the necessary point of entry to explore the ways in which Antonius was a trendsetter and vital contributor to the development of the Roman imperial cult.

Bibliography

For abbreviations of periodical publications, standard references, and book series, see the lists provided by the *American Journal of Archaeology* (https://www.ajaonline.org) and *L'Année philologique* (http://www.annee-philologique.com).

Ager, S. L. 2013. "Marriage or Mirage? The Phantom Wedding of Cleopatra and Antony." *CP* 108.2: 139-55.

Amandry, M. 1990. "Le monnayage en bronze de Bibulus, Atratinus et Capito. Part III." *SNR* 69: 65-96.

Amandry, M. 2012. "The Coinage of the Roman Provinces Through Hadrian." In *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*, edited by W. E. Metcalf, 391-404. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Amela Valverde, L. 2004. "Los cistóforos proconsulares de Éfeso." *GacNum* 154: 11-28.

Aneziri, S. 2009. "World travellers: the associations of Artists of Dionysus." In *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism*, edited by R. Hunter and I. Rutherford, 217-36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arias, P. E. 1939. "Nuovi contributi all'iconografia di Ottavia Minore." *RM* 54: 76-81.

Ashton, R. 2012. "The Hellenistic World: The Cities of Mainland Greece and Asia Minor." In *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*, edited by W. E. Metcalf, 191-210. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ashton, R. 2013. "The Use of the Cistophoric Weight-Standard Outside the Pergamene Kingdom." In *Attalid Asia Minor: Money, International Relations, and the State*, edited by P. Thonemann, 245-64. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Austin, M. M. 2006. *The Hellenistic World From Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A selection of ancient sources in translation*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Babcock, C. L. 1962. "Dio and Plutarch on the *Damnatio* of Antony." *CP* 57.1: 30-2.

Bahrfeldt, H. 1904. "Über die Chronologie der Münzen des Marcus Antonius 710-724 U.C. (44-30 v. Chr.)." In *Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Storiche (Roma, 1-9 Aprile 1903). Volume VI. Atti della Sezione IV: Numismatica*, 187-200. Rome: Accademia dei Lincei.

Beard, M. 2007. *The Roman Triumph*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bell, A. 2004. *Spectacular Power in the Greek and Roman City*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bernareggi, E. 1973. "La monetazione in argento di Marco Antonio." *NumAntCl* 2: 63-105.

Bingen, J. 2007. *Hellenistic Egypt: Monarchy, Society, Economy, Culture*. Edited by R. S. Bagnall. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Borgies, L. 2016. *Le conflit propagandiste entre Octavien et Marc Antoine. De l'usage politique de la uituperatio entre 44 et 30 a. C. n.* Collection Latomus 357. Brussels: Éditions Latomus.

Brendel, O. J. 1962. "The Iconography of Marc Antony." In *Hommages à Albert Grenier*, edited by M. Renard, Vol.1, 359-67. Brussels: Latomus.

Bringmann, K. 1993. "The King as Benefactor: Some Remarks on Ideal Kingship in the Age of Hellenism." In *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*, edited by A. Bulloch, E. S. Gruen, A. A. Long, and A. Stewart, 7-24. Hellenistic Culture and Society XII. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bringmann, K. 2007. *A History of the Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Broughton, T. R. S. 1951-1960. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. 3 vols. New York: American Philological Association. *TAPA* 130: 411-58.

Bucher, G. S. 2000. "The Origins, Program, and Composition of Appian's *Roman History*." *TAPA* 130: 411-58.

Buraselis, K. 2008. "Woven into the Peplos: Aspects of the Combination of Ruler Cult with Elements of the Traditional Polis Identity in the Hellenistic World." In *Religion and Society: Rituals, Resources and Identity in the Ancient Graeco-Roman World: The BOMOS-Conferences 2002-2005*, edited by H. Rasmussen and S. Rasmussen, 215-23. Analecta Romana Instituti Danici Supplementum XL. Rome: Edizioni Quasar.

Buraselis, K. 2012. "Appended Festivals: The Coordination and Combination of Traditional Civic and Ruler Cult Festivals in the Hellenistic and Roman East." In *Greek and Roman Festivals: Content, Meaning, and Practice*, edited by J. Rasmus Brandt and J. W. Iddeng, 247-65. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion. Archaic and Classical*. Translated by J. Raffan. Malden: Blackwell.

Burkert, W. 1993. "Bacchic *Teletai* in the Hellenistic Age." In *Masks of Dionysus*, edited by T. H. Carpenter and C. A. Faraone, 259-75. Myth and Poetics. Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press.

Burnett, A. 2005. "The Roman West and the Roman East." In *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, edited by C. Howgego, V. Heuchert, and A. Burnett, 171-80. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buttrey, T. V., Jr. 1953. "Studies in the Coinage of Marc Antony." PhD diss., Princeton University.

Buttrey, T. V., Jr. 1960. "The Denarius of P. Ventidius." *ANSMN* 9: 95-108.

de Callataÿ, F. 2011. "More Than It Would Seem: The Use of Coinage by the Romans in Late Hellenistic Asia Minor (133-63 BC)." *AJN* 23: 55-86.

de Callataÿ, F. 2013. “The Coinages of the Attalids and their Neighbours: A Quantified Overview.” In *Attalid Asia Minor: Money, International Relations, and the State*, edited by P. Thonemann, 207-44. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

de Callataÿ, F., and C. C. Lorber. 2011. “The Pattern of Royal Epithets on Hellenistic Coinages.” In *More Than Men, Less Than Gods: Studies on Royal Cult and Imperial Worship. Proceedings of the International Colloquium Organized by the Belgian School at Athens (November 1-2, 2007)*, edited by P. P. Iossif, A. S. Chankowski, and C. C. Lorber, 417-55. Studia Hellenistica 51. Leuven: Peeters.

Caneva, S. G. 2012. “Queens and Ruler Cults in Early Hellenism: Festivals, Administration, and Ideology.” *Kernos* 25: 75-101.

Caneva, S. G. 2016. *From Alexander to the Theoi Adelphoi: Foundation and Legitimation of a Dynasty*. Studia Hellenistica 56. Leuven: Peeters.

Carbone, L. F. 2014. “Money and Power: The Disappearance of Autonomous Silver Issues in the Roman Province of Asia.” *OMNI* 8: 10-34.

Carbone, L. F. 2016. “‘Romanizing’ Asia: the impact of Roman *imperium* on the administrative and monetary systems of the *Provincia Asia* (133 BC - AD 96).” PhD diss., Columbia University. ProQuest (AAT 10099563).

Carter, G. F. 1983. “A simplified method for calculating the original number of dies from die-link statistics.” *ANSMN* 28: 195-206.

Carter, J. M., ed. 1982. *Suetonius Divus Augustus*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.

Casey, E. 2013. “Educating the Youth: The Athenian Ephebeia in the Early Hellenistic Era.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Childhood and Education in the Classical World*, edited by J. Evans Grubbs and T. Parking, 418-43. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cerfaux, L., and J. Tondriau. 1957. *Un concurrent du christianisme. Le culte des souverains dans la civilization gréco-romaine*. Bibliothèque de Théologie, Série III, Vol. V. Tournai: Desclée & Cie.

Chaniotis, A. 2005. “The Divinity of Hellenistic Rulers.” In *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, edited by A. Erskine, 431-45. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Malden: Blackwell.

Chaniotis, A. 2007. “La divinité mortelle d’Antiochos III à Téos.” *Kernos* 80: 151-73.

Chaniotis, A. 2011. “The Ithyphallic Hymn for Demetrios Poliorketes and Hellenistic Religious Mentality.” In *More Than Men, Less Than Gods: Studies on Royal Cult and Imperial Worship. Proceedings of the International Colloquium Organized by the Belgian School at Athens (November 1-2, 2007)*, edited by P. P. Iossif, A. S. Chankowski, and C. C. Lorber, 157-95. Studia Hellenistica 51. Leuven: Peeters.

Chaniotis, A. 2013. “Processions in Hellenistic Cities: Contemporary Discourses and Ritual Dynamics.” In *Cults, Creeds and Identities in the Greek City After the Classica Age*, edited by R. Alston, O. M. van Nijf, and C. G. Williamson, 21-47. Groningen-Royal Holloway Studies on the Greek City after the Classical Age 3. Leuven: Peeters.

Charlesworth, M. P. 1933. “Some fragments of the propaganda of Mark Antony.” *CQ* 27.3/4: 172-77.

Chauveau, M. 1997. “Ères nouvelles et corégences en Égype ptolémaïque.” In *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses*, Berlin 1995, edited by B. Kramer, W. Luppe, H. Maehler, and G. Poethke, 163-71. Archiv für Papyrusforschung, Beiheft 3. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Cluett, R. G. 1998. “Roman Women and Triumviral Politics, 43-37 B.C.” *EchCl* 42 n.s. 17: 67-84.

Coskun, A., and A. McAuley, eds. 2016. *Seleukid Royal Women: Creation, Representation and Distortion of Hellenistic Queenship in the Seleukid Empire*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Crawford, M. H. 1985. *Coinage and Money Under the Roman Republic: Italy and the Mediterranean Economy*. London: Methuen & Co.

Csapo, E., and W. J. Slater. 1995. *The Context of Ancient Drama*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

De Lozier, L. A. 2002. “Images of Antony: An Investigation of Ancient Testimonia About Visual Representations of the Triumvir Mark Antony.” PhD diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Dinsmoor, W. B. 1931. *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Drew-Bear, T. 1972. “Deux décrets hellénistiques d’Asie Mineure.” *BCH* 96.1: 435-71.

Drogula, F. K. 2007. “*Imperium, Potestas,* and the *Pomerium* in the Roman Republic.” *Historia* 56.4 419-52.

Duff, T. E. 1999. *Plutarch’s Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ebert, J. 1987. “Zum Brief des Marcus Antonius an das κοινον Ἀσίας.” *ArchPF* 33: 37-42.

Eckstein, A. M. 2013. “Hellenistic Monarchy in Theory and Practice.” In *A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought*, edited by R. K. Balot, 247-65. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Edwards, C. 1993. *The Politics of Immorality in ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Erskine, A. 2014. “Ruler Cult and the Early Hellenistic City.” In *The Age of the Successors and the Creation of the Hellenistic Kingdoms (323-276 B. C.)*. Studia Hellenistica 53, edited by H. Hauben and A. Meeus, 579-97. Leuven: Peeters.

Esty, W. W. 2006. “How to estimate the original number of dies and the coverage of a sample.” *NC* 166: 359-64.

Ferrary, J.-L. 1997. “de l’Évergétisme hellénistique à l’évergétisme romain.” In *Actes du Xe congrès international d’épigraphie greque et latine. Nimes, 4-9 Octobre 1992*, edited by M. Christol and O. Masson, 199-225. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.

Follet, S. 1998. “Chronologie attique et chronologie delphique (II^e siècle a. C. – I^er siècle p.C.).” *Topoi* 8.1: 243-60.

Follet, S. 2005. “Deux inscriptions attiques inédites copiées par l’abbé Michel Fourmont (Parisinus Suppl. gr. 854).” *RÉG* 118: 1-14.

Fontani, E. 1999. “Il filellenismo di Antonio tra realtà storica e propaganda politica: le ginnasiarchie ad Atene e ad Alessandria.” *Studi ellenistici* 12: 193-210.

Fraser, P. M. 1957. “Mark Antony in Alexandria—A note.” *JRS* 47 (1/2): 71-3.

Gabba, E. 1956. *Appiano e la storia delle guerre civili*. Biblioteca di Cultura 59. Florence: La Nuova Italia.

Garton, C. 1964. “Sulla and the Theatre.” *Phoenix* 18.2: 137-56.

Gauthier, P. 1985. *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*. *BCH Suppl.* 12. Athens: École Française d’Athènes.

Geagan, D. J. 1972. “Hadrian and the Athenian Dionysiac Technitai.” *TAPA* 103: 133-60.

Goldhill, S., ed. 2001. *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gowing, A. 1992. *The Triumviral Narratives of Appian and Cassius Dio*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Grimm, G. 1970. “Zu Marcus Antonius und C. Cornelius Gallus.” *JdI* 85: 158-70.

Grimm, G. 1989. “Die Porträts der triumvirn C. Octavius, M. Antonius und M. Aemilius Lepidus.” *RM* 96: 347-64.

Gurval, R. A. 1995. *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of Civil War*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Gygax, M. D. 2016. *Benefaction and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City: The Origins of Euergetism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Habicht, C. 1970. *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*. 2nd ed. Munich: Beck.

Habicht, C. 1997. *Athens from Alexander to Antony*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.

Hiltmann, B. 2014. “Les cistophores de Marc Antoine: typologie et destination.” *Bulletin de l’Association des Amis du Musée monétaire cantonal* 27: 4-19.

Hoff, M. C. 1989. “Civil Disobedience and Unrest in Augustan Athens.” *Hesperia* 3: 267-76.

Hoff, M. C. 2005. “Athens Honors Pompey the Great.” In *The Statesman in Plutarch’s Works. Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference of the International Plutarch Society. Nijmegen/Castle Hernen, May 1-5, 2002. Volume II: The Statesman in Plutarch’s Greek and Roman Lives*, edited by L. De Blois, J. Bons, T. Kessels, and D. M. Schenkeveld, 327-36. Mnemosyne Supplementa 250/II. Leiden: Brill.

Holtzmann, B., and F. Salviat. 1981. “Les portraits sculptés de Marc-Antoine.” *BCH* 105: 265-88.

Humble, N., ed. 2010. *Plutarch’s Lives: Parallelism and Purpose*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.

Huzar, E. G. 1978. *Mark Antony: A Biography*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Inan, J., and E. Rosenbaum. 1966. *Roman and Early Byzantine Portrait Sculpture in Asia Minor*. London: Oxford University Press.

Iossif, P. P., A. S. Chanowski, and C. C. Lorber, eds. 2011. *More Than Men, Less Than Gods: Studies on Royal Cult and Imperial Worship. Proceedings of the International Colloquium Organized by the Belgian School at Athens (November 1-2, 2007)*. Studia Hellenistica 51. Leuven: Peeters.

Johansen, F. 1978. “Antike Portrætter af Kleopatra VII og Marcus Antonius.” *Meddelelser Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek* 35: 55-81.

Jones, A. H. M. 1971. *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Jones, C. P. 1971. *Plutarch and Rome*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Jones, K. R. 2017. “Marcus Antonius’ Median War and the Dynastic Politics of the Near East.” In Arsacids, Romans, and Local Elites: Cross-Cultural Interactions of the Parthian Empire, edited by J. M. Schlude and B. B. Rubin, 51-63. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Kajava, M. 1990. “Roman Senatorial Women and the Greek East: Epigraphic Evidence from the Republican and Augustan Period.” In *Roman Eastern Policy and Other Studies in Roman History. Proceedings of a Colloquium at Tvärminne, 2-3 October 1983*, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 91, edited by H. Solin and M. Kajava, 59-124. Helsinki: Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters.

Keesling, C. M. 2007. “Early Hellenistic Portrait Statues on the Athenian Acropolis: Survival, Reuse, Transformation.” In Early Hellenistic Portraiture: Image, Style, Context, edited by P. Schultz and R. von den Hoff, 141-60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keesling, C. M. 2010. “The Hellenistic and Roman Afterlives of Dedications on the Athenian Akropolis.” In *Die Akropolis von Athen im Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, edited by R. Krumeich and C. Witschel, 303-27. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Kemezis, A. M. 2014. *Greek Narratives of the Roman Empire Under the Severans: Cassius Dio, Philostratus and Herodian*. Greek Culture in the Roman World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kinns, P. 1987. "Asia Minor." In *The Coinage of the Roman World in the Late Republic. Proceedings of a colloquium held at the British Museum in September 1985*, edited by A. Burnett and M. H. Crawford, 105-19. BAR International Series 326. Oxford: B.A.R.

Kirchner, J. 1898. "Zur Datirung einiger athenischer Archonten." *RhM* 53: 380-92.

Kleiner, D. E. E. 1992. "Politics and Gender in the Pictorial Propaganda of Antony and Octavian." *EchCl* 36 n.s. 11: 357-67.

Kleiner, D. E. E. 2005. *Cleopatra and Rome*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kleiner, F. S. 1972. "The Dated Cistophori of Epheus." *ANSMN* 18: 17-32.

Kleiner, F. S. 1978. "Hoard Evidence and the Late Cistophori of Pergamum." *ANSMN* 23: 77-106.

Kleiner, F. S. 1979. "The Late Cistophori of Apameia." In *Greek Numismatics and Archaeology. Essays in Honor of Margaret Thomson*, edited by F. S. Kleiner, O. Mørkholm, and N. M. Waggoner, 119-30. Wetteren: Éditions NR.

Kleiner, F. S., and S. Noe. 1977. *The Early Cistophoric Coinage*. Numismatic Studies 14. New York: The American Numismatic Society.

Kloppenborg, J. S., and R. S. Ascough. 2011. *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary. I. Attica, Central Greece, Macedonia, Thrace*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 181. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Kolbe, W. 1908. *Die attischen Archonten von 293/2-31/0 v. Chr*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.

Kraay, C. M. 1976. *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins*. London: Methuen &Co.

Kyrieleis, H. 1976. "Ein Bildnis des Marcus Antonius." *AA*: 85-90.

Korres, M. 2000. "Αναθηματικά και τιμητικά τέθριππα στην Αθήνα και τους Δελφούς." In *Delphes cent ans après la Grande Fouille. Essai de bilan. Actes du colloque international organisé par l'École française d'Athènes, Athènes — Delphes, 17-20 septembre 1992*, edited by A. Jacquemin, 293-329. *BCH Suppl*. 36. Athens: École française d'Athènes.

Kosmin, P. J. 2014. *The Land of the Elephant Kings: Space, Territory, and Ideology in the Seleucid Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lambrinoudakis, V. 1989. "Neues zur Ikonographie der Dirke." In *Festschrift für Nikolaus Himmelmann*, edited by H.-U. Cain, H. Gabelmann, and D. Salzmann, 341-50. Beiträge zur Ikonographie und Hermeneutik. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.

Lambrinoudakis, V. 1991. “The Sanctuary of Iria on Naxos and the Birth of Monumental Greek Architecture.” In *New Perspectives in Early Greek Art*, edited by D. Buitron-Oliver, 173-88. Studies in the History of Art 32. Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts Symposium Papers XVI. Hanover: University Press of New England.

Lambrinoudakis, V., and G. Gruben. 1987. “Das neuentdeckte Heiligtum von Iria auf Naxos.” *AA*: 569-621.

Le Guen, B. 2001. *Les associations de Technites dionysiaques à l’époque hellénistique*. Etudes d’Archéologie Classique 11. 2 vols. Nancy: Association pour la Diffusion de la Recherche sur l’Antiquité (ADRA).

Le Guen, B. 2006. “L’accueil d’Athéniôn, messager de Mithridate VI, par les Artistes dionysiaques d’Athènes en 88 av. J.-C.” *Studi ellenistici* 19: 333-63.

Le Guen, B. 2007. “Kraton, Son of Zotichos: Artists’ Associations and Monarchic Power in the Hellenistic Period.” Translated by P. Wilson. In *The Greek Theatre and Festivals: Documentary Studies*, edited by P. Wilson, 246-78. Oxford Studies in Ancient Documents. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lessie, A. J. 2015. “Becoming Mark Antony: A Metabiographical Study of Characterization and Reception.” PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles. ProQuest (AAT 3705025).

Lorber, C. C. 2012. “The Coinage of the Ptolemies.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*, edited by W. E. Metcalf, 211-34. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lorber, C. C., and O. D. Hoover. 2003. “An Unpublished Tetradrachm Issued by the Artists of Dionysos.” *NC* 163: 59-68.

Ma, J. (2002) 2005. Reprint. *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ma, J. 2013. *Statues and Cities: Honorific Portraits and Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World*. Oxford Studies in Ancient Culture and Representation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Macías Otero, S. 2013. “The Image of Dionysos in Euripides’ Bacchae: The God and his Epiphanies.” In *Redefining Dionysos*, edited by A. Bernabé, M. Herrero de Jáuregui, A. I. Jiménez Sa Cristóbal, and R. Martín Hernández, 329-48. MythosEikonPoiesis 5. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Mann, M. 1986. *The Sources of Social Power. Volume 1: A History of power from the beginning to A. D. 1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marella, M. L. 1942. “Di un ritratto di ‘Ottavia’.” *MemLinc* 3: 31-82.

McFayden, D. 1920. *The History of the Title Imperator under the Roman Empire*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Meadows, A. 2013. “The Closed Currency System of the Attalid Kingdom.” In *Attalid Asia Minor: Money, International Relations, and the State*, edited by P. Thonemann, 149-205. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meadows, A. 2014. “The Spread of Coins in the Hellenistic World.” In *Explaining Monetary and Financial Innovation: A Historical Analysis*, edited by P. Bernholz and R. Vaubel, 169-95. Financial and Monetary Policy Studies 39. Cham: Springer.

Mellor, R. 1999. *The Roman Historians*. London; New York: Routledge.

Metcalf, W. E. 2012. “Introduction.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*, edited by W. E. Metcalf, 3-11. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Michel, D. 1967. *Alexander als Vorbild für Pompeius, Caesar und Marcus Antonius. Archäologische Untersuchungen*. Brussels: Latomus.

Miles, M., ed. 2011. *Cleopatra: A Sphinx Revisited*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Millar, F. 1964. *A Study of Cassius Dio*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Millar, F. 1973. “Triumvirate and Principate.” *JRS* 63: 50-67.

Mørkholm, O. 1991. *Early Hellenistic Coinage: From the Accession of Alexander to the Peace of Apamea (336-188 B.C.)* edited by P. Grierson and U. Westermark. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mousheghian, Kh., A. Mousheghian, and G. Depeyrot. 2000. *History and Coin Finds in Armenia: Antiquity*. Collection Moneta 17. Wetteren: Moneta.

Muccioli, F. 2013. *Gli epiteti ufficiali dei re ellenistici*. Stuttgart. Franz Steiner Verlag.

Nock, A. D. (1928) 1972. “Notes on Ruler Cult, I-IV.” In *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, edited by Z. Stewart, 1: 134-59. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (Originally published in *JHS* 48.1 (1928): 21-43.)

Nock, A. D. (1930) 1972. “Συνναος Θεος.” In *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, edited by Z. Stewart, 1: 202-51. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (Originally published in *HSCP* 41 (1930): 1-62.)

Otto, W. F. 1965. *Dionysus: Myth and Cult*. Translated by R. B. Palmer. Bloomington; London: Indiana University Press.

Parigi, C. 2013. “The Romanization of Athens: Greek Identity and Connectivity between Athens and Rome in the 1st Century BC.” In *SOMA 12. Identity and Connectivity: Proceedings of the 16th Symposium on Mediterranean Archaeology, Florence, Italy, 1-3 March 2012. Volume 1*., edited by L. Bombardieri, A. D’Agostino, G. Guarducci, V. Orsi, and S. Valentini, 447-55. *BAR* International Series 2581 (I). Oxford: Archaeopress.

Parker, R. 2005. *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pélékidis, C. 1962. *Histoire de l'éphébie attique des origines à 31 avant Jésus-Christ*. École Française d'Athènes. Travaux et mémoires des anciens membres étrangers de l'École et de divers savants. Fasc. XIII. Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard.

Pelling, C. B. R. 1988. *Plutarch's Life of Antony*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pelling, C. B. R. 1996. "The Triumviral Period." *CAH*^{2} X: 1-69.

Perrin-Saminadayar, É. 2004-2005. "L'accueil officiel des rois et des princes à Athènes à l'époque hellénistique." *BCH* 128-129: 351-75.

Perrin-Saminadayar, É. 2009. "La preparation des entrées royales et impériales dans les cites de l'Orient hellenophone, d'Alexandre le Grand aux Sévères." In *Les entrées royales et impériales. Histoire, representation et diffusion d'une cérémonie publique, de l'Orient ancient à Byzance*, edited by A. Bérenger and É. Saminadayar, 67-90. De l'Archéologie à l'Histoire. Paris: De Boccard.

Petridou, G. 2015. *Divine Epiphany in Greek Literature and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pickard-Cambridge. 1968. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Pleket, H. W. 1973. "Some Aspects of the History of the Athletic Guilds." *ZPE* 10: 197-227.

Pollini, J. 1990. "Man or God: Divine Assimilation and Imitation in the Late Republic and Early Principate." In *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, edited by G. W. Bowersock, M. Toher, and K. A. Raaflaub, 333-63. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pollini, J. 2002. "A New Portrait of Octavia and the Iconography of Octavia Minor and Julia Maior." *RM* 109: 11-42.

Pollini, J. 2012. *From Republic to Empire: Rhetoric, Religion, and Power in the Visual Culture of Ancient Rome*. Oklahoma Series in Classical Culture 48. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Porres Caballero, S. 2013. "Maenadic Ecstasy in Greece: Fact or Fiction?" In *Redefining Dionysos*, edited by A. Bernabé, M. Herrero de Jáuregui, A. I. Jiménez San Cristóbal, and R. Martín Hernández, 159-99. MythosEikonPoiesis 5. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Price, M. J. 1987. "Southern Greece." In The Coinage of the Roman World in the Late Republic. Proceedings of a colloquium held at the British Museum in September 1985, edited by A. Burnett and M. H. Crawford, 95-103. *BAR* International Series 326. Oxford: B. A. R.

Price, S. R. F. 1984a. "Gods and Emperors: The Greek Language of the Roman Imperial Cult." *JHS* 104: 79-95.

Price, S. R. F. 1984b. *Rituals and Power: The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ramsey, J. T., ed. *Cicero. Philippics I-II*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Raubitschek, A. E. 1946. "Octavia's Deification at Athens." *TAPA* 77: 146-50.

Raubitschek, A. E. 1951. "Sylleia." In *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson*, edited by P. R. Coleman-Norton, 49-57. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Raubitschek, A. E. 1954. "Epigraphical Notes on Julius Caesar." *JRS* 44: 65-75.

Reinhold, M. 1988. *From Republic to Principate: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's* Roman History *Books 49-52 (36-29 B. C.)*. An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's *Roman History* 6. American Philological Association Monograph Series 34. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Richardson, J. S. 1994. "The Administration of the Empire." In *CAH* X^2: 564-98.

Robert, J. and L. Robert. 1948. "Bulletin épigraphique." *RÉG* 61.284-285: 137-212.

Roy, J. 1998. "The masculinity of the Hellenistic King." In *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, power and identity in classical antiquity*, edited by L. Foxhall and J. Salmon, 111-35. London and New York: Routledge.

Russell, B. Ford. 1998. "The Emasculation of Antony: The Construction of Gender in Plutarch's *Life of Antony*." *Helios* 25.2: 121-37.

Scott, K. 1929. "Octavian's Propaganda and Antony's *De Sua Ebrietate*." *CP* 24.2: 133-41.

Scott, K. 1933. "The Political Propaganda of 44-30 B. C." *MAAR* 11: 7-49.

Seaford, R. 2006. *Dionysos*. London: Routledge.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R., ed. and trans. 2009. *Cicero's Philippics*. Revised by J. T. Ramsey and G. Manuwald. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sherk, R. K., ed. and trans. 1984. *Rome and the Greek East to the death of Augustus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, R. R. R. 1988. *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 2011. *Athenian Myths and Festivals: Aglauros, Erechtheus, Plynteria, Panathenaia, Dionysia*. Edited by R. Parker. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stadter, P. A. 2014. *Plutarch and his Roman Readers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stevenson, T. R. 1996. "Social and Psychological Interpretations of Graeco-Roman Religion: Some Thoughts on the Ideal Benefactor." *Antichthon* 30: 1-18.

Stewart, A. 1993. *Faces of Power: Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Strootman, R. 2010. “Queen of Kings: Cleopatra VII and the Donations of Alexandria.” In *Kingdoms and Principalities in the Roman East*, edited by T. Kaizer and M. Facella, 139-57. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Stumpf, G. R. 1991. *Numismatische Studien zur Chronologie der römischen Statthalter in Kleinasien (122 v. Chr. – 163 n. Chr.)*. Saarbrücker Studien zur Archäologie und alten Geschichte 4. Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag.

Sutherland, C. H. V. 1970. *The Cistophori of Augustus*. Royal Numismatic Society Special Publication 5. London: Royal Numismatic Society.

Swain, S. 1990. “Cultural Interchange in Plutarch’s ‘Antony’.” *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, n.s. 34.1: 151-57.

Swain, S. 1997. *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*. Edited by M. J. Edwards. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Syme, R. (1939) 2002. Reprint. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taeger, F. 1960. *Charisma. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes. Zweiter Band: Rom*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag.

Tarn, W. W. 1932. “Alexander Helios and the Golden Age.” *JRS* 22.2: 135-60.

Taylor, L. R. (1931) 1981. Reprint. *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*. American Philological Association Monograph Series 1. Chico: Scholars Press.

Thériault, G. 2001. “Remarques sur le culte des magistrats romains en Orient.” In *Mélanges Pierre Rodrigue Brind’Amour*. Vol. 2, edited by P. Senay, 85-95. Trois-Rivières: Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières.

Thériault, G. 2011 “Honneurs cultuels et évergétisme: le cas de Potamôn de Mytilène.” In Mélanges offerts à Pierre Senay, edited by A. Daviault, 55-64. CEA Suppl. 1. Trois-Rivières: Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières.

Thériault, G. 2012. “Culte des évergètes (magistrats) romains et agônes en Asie Mineure.” In *Stephanèphoros. De l’économie antique à l’Asie Mineure: Hommages à Raymond Descat*, Mémoires 28, edited by K. Konuk, 377-87. Bordeaux: Ausonius Éditions.

Thompson, M. 1941. “Some Athenian ‘Cleruchy’ Money.” *Hesperia* 10.3: 199-236.

Thonemann, P. 2013a. *Attalid Asia Minor: Money, International Relations, and the State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thonemann, P. 2013b. “The Attalid State, 188-133 BC). In *Attalid Asia Minor: Money, International Relations, and the State*, edited by P. Thonemann, 1-47. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Troncoso, V. A., and E. M. Anson, eds. 2013. *After Alexander: The Time of the Diadochi (323-281 BC)*. Oxford; Oakville: Oxbow Books.

Versnel, H. S. 2011. *Coping With the Gods: Wayward Readings in Greek Theology*. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 173. Leiden: Brill.

Vessberg, O. 1941. *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik*. Lund.

Voutiras, M. 2011. "Des honneurs divins pour Marc Antoine à Thessalonique?" In *More Than Men, Less Than Gods: Studies on Royal Cult and Imperial Worship. Proceedings of the International Colloquium Organized by the Belgian School at Athens (November 1-2, 2007)*. Studia Hellenistica 51, edited by P. P. Iossif, A. S. Chanowski, and C. C. Lorber, 457-73. Leuven: Peeters.

Walker, D. R. 1976. *The Metrology of the Roman Silver Coinage. Part I: from Augustus to Domitian*. BAR Supplementary Series 5. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.

Walker, S. 2003. "From Queen of Egypt to Queen of Kings: the portraits of Cleopatra VII." In *Faraoni come dei, Tolemei come faraoni. Atti del V Congresso Internazionale Italo-Egiziano, Torino, Archivio di Stato, 8-12 dicembre 2001*, edited by N. Bonacasa, A. M. Donadoni Roveri, S. Aiosa, and P. Minà, 508-17. Turin: Museo Egizio.

Walker, S., and P. Higgs, eds. 2001. *Cleopatra of Egypt: From History to Myth*. London and Princeton: British Museum Press and Princeton University Press.

Walker, S., and S.-A. Ashton, eds. 2003. *Cleopatra Reassessed*. *BMOP* 103. London: British Museum.

Weill Goudchaux, G. 2006. "Die Münzbildnisse Kleopatras VII." In *Kleopatra und die Caesaren*, edited by B. Andreae et al., 130-35. Munich: Hirmer.

Winkes, R. 1995. *Livia, Octavia, Julia. Porträs und Darstellungen*. Providence; Louvain-La-Neuve: Art and Archaeology Publications.

Wood, S. E. 1999. *Imperial Women: A Study in Public Images, 40 B.C. – A.D. 68*. Leiden: Brill.

Zanker, P. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Translated by A. Shapiro. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Figure 1. Altar fragment from Athens naming Marcus Antonius and Octavia as Theoi Euergetai, Agora XVIII H273 (= Agora Inv. I 3071), Hymettian marble, h. 0.21 m, w. 0.252 m, d. 0.102-0.115 m (courtesy American School of Classical Studies at Athens: Agora Excavations).

Figure 2. Silver cistophorus of Marcus Antonius (*RPC* 2201), ca. 39/8 B.C.E., Ephesos (uncertain), 11.89 g, ANS 1935.117.40, coin reproduced 2:1 (courtesy American Numismatic Society).

Figure 3. Silver cistophorus of Marcus Antonius (*RPC* 2202), ca. 39/8 B.C.E., Ephesos (uncertain), 11.57 g, 25 mm, Münzkabinett der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, 18213381, coin reproduced 2:1 (courtesy Münzkabinett - Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 DE: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/de/deed.en).

Figure 4. Gold stater of T. Quinctius Flamininus, ca. 196 B.C.E., Greece, 8.53 g, 20 mm, Münzkabinett der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, 18201660, coin reproduced 2:1 (courtesy Münzkabinett - Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 DE: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/de/deed.en).

Figure 5. Gold stater of Lysimachos depicting Alexander III, ca. 260-190 B.C.E., Thrace, 8.48 g, British Museum, 1928,0608.36, coin reproduced 2:1 (courtesy Trustees of the British Museum, CC BY-NC-SA 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0).

Figure 6. Silver tetradrachm of Philip V, 220-170 B.C.E., Macedon, 16.94 g, ANS 1967.152.211, coin reproduced 1.5:1 (courtesy American Numismatic Society).

Figure 7. Silver cistophorus of Attalid kingdom, 160-150 B.C.E., Pergamon, 12.61 g, ANS 1959.254.37, coin reproduced 1.5:1 (courtesy American Numismatic Society).

Figure 8. Silver cistophorus dated by Ephesian era, 123-95 B.C.E., Pergamon, 12.1 g, ANS 1951.5.33, coin reproduced 1.5:1 (courtesy American Numismatic Society).

Figure 9. Silver cistophorus of the proconsul M. Tulius Cicero, 51-50 B.C.E., Apameia, 11.81 g, 26 mm, Münzkabinett der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, 18204062, coin reproduced 1.5:1 (courtesy Münzkabinett - Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 DE: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/de/deed.en).

Figure 10. Silver cistophorus of proconsul T. Ampius Balbus, 58-58 B.C.E., Ephesos, 12.29 g, ANS 1959.48.2, coin reproduced 1.5:1 (courtesy American Numismatic Society).

Figure 11. Gold aureus of Marcus Antonius (*RRC* 527), ca. 39-38 B.C.E., moving mint, 8.01 g, 22 mm, Münzkabinett der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, 18202297, coin reproduced 2:1 (courtesy Münzkabinett - Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 DE: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/de/deed.en).

Figure 12. Gold aureus of Marcus Antonius (RRC 533/3), ca. 39-38 B.C.E., moving mint, 8.08 g, 20 mm, Münzkabinett der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, 18215843, coin reproduced 2:1 (courtesy Münzkabinett - Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 DE: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/de/deed.en).

Figure 13. Silver denarius of M. Barbatius Pollio depicting Marcus Antonius (*RRC* 517/2), 41 B.C.E., moving mint, 3.98 g, 18 mm, Münzkabinett der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, 18215792, coin reproduced 2:1 (courtesy Münzkabinett - Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 DE: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/de/deed.en).

Figure 14. Silver tetradrachm of Attalos (I) Sōtēr depicting Philetairos, 241-197 B.C.E., Pergamon, 17.03 g, 32 mm, Münzkabinett der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, 18203102, coin reproduced 1:1 (courtesy Münzkabinett - Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 DE: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/de/deed.en).

Figure 15. Silver cistophorus of Marcus Antonius (*RPC* 2201), ca. 39/8 B.C.E., Ephesos (uncertain), 12.24 g, British Museum, G.2204, coin reproduced 2:1 (courtesy Trustees of the British Museum, CC BY-NC-SA 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0).

Figure 16. Gold octodrachm of Ptolemy (II) Philadelphos, 285-246 B.C.E., Alexandria, 27.79 g, 28 mm, British Museum, 1964,1303.3, coin reproduced 1:1 (courtesy Trustees of the British Museum, CC BY-NC-SA 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0).

Figure 17. Silver tetradrachm of Kleopatra (VII) depicting Marcus Antonius on the reverse, ca. 36 B.C.E., Antioch-on-the-Orontes (uncertain), 14.72 g, 28 mm, Münzkabinett der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, 18204040, coin reproduced 1.5:1 (courtesy Münzkabinett - Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 DE: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/de/deed.en).