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Two ‘Double’ Dedications at Ephesus and the Beginning of Ptolemaic Control of Ionia

Abstract: This paper reconsiders the texts of two inscriptions found in the Austrian excavations at Ephesus in Hanghaus II: IEphesos 199 and SEG 33 942. Proposed restoration of the texts suggests that both stones preserve rare ‘double dedications’ to both the royal couple of Ptolemy and Arsinoe, and Sarapis and Isis. Comparison with other known examples suggests that these belong to the reign of Ptolemy IV Philopator, not, as has been suggested in the past, to the reign of Ptolemy II. They are evidence for the promulgation of royal cult and the worship of Sarapis and Isis, by senior military officials, perhaps in the years following the Battle of Raphia. The re-attribution of these stones to this later period removes any evidence for Ptolemaic control north of the River Maeander before the Third Syrian War.
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Two inscriptions recently republished by Annalisa Calapà, if correctly dated, would constitute the sole evidence for Ptolemaic control of the important city of Ephesus under Ptolemy Philadelphus.1 Indeed they would provide the only clear evidence for Ptolemaic rule north of the Maeander before the Third Syrian War.2 It is worth examining carefully, therefore, whether her dating of them to Philadelphus’ reign is necessarily correct. Both inscriptions have a somewhat chequered history of publication, and it is as well to start at the beginning. The two stones were found by Austrian archeologists at Ephesus in the excavation of Hanghaus II, but initially published separately.

(1) The first appeared in 1979 in the second volume of Die Inschriften von Ephesos as no. 199 under the heading ‘Ptolemaios (Philadelphos) und Arsinoc’ with the following text drawn from İplikçıoğlu’s note book, and with a suggestion of Knibbe:

<references>
</references>

∗ Dr. Andrew Meadows, The American Numismatic Society; 75 Varick St, 11th Floor; New York; NY 10013 (meadows@numismatics.org).

My thanks to Dorothy Thompson and Christian Habicht for comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

1. The status of Ephesus at this period is tied up in the convoluted problem of the sons of Ptolemy. Athenaeus (593a–b) refers to the death of one son in the city while commander of the garrison (Πτολεμαῖος τε ὁ τὴν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ διέπων φρουρὰν ὑιὸς ὠν τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου βασιλέως). Some have assumed this to be the son who is attested in official documents as co-regent with Philadelphus until late 259 BC, and thus that Ephesus was subject to a Ptolemaic garrison in the 250s. See, e.g., Momigliano 1950, 110. However, the more plausible identification of the son who died at Ephesus is with Ptolemy Andromachou, who is also stated (in P.Haun 6) to have died at Ephesus. Since Ptolemy Andromachou was eponymous priest in Alexandria in 251/0 BC, his death must have followed this. See Buraselis, Makedonien 203–206: ‘Ephesos war bis zum Jahr 246 seleukidisch’ (203).

2. Ephesus aside, the only other epigraphic evidence cited for possible Ptolemaic activity in Ionia before the 240s is a decree of Erythrae (SIG 4 442 = IEryth. 29) which may date to the 260s BC, and which honours generals for actions during a period of war that preserved the city’s democracy. However, date and circumstances are vague, and the text in no way implies the existence of Ptolemaic control of the region. For discussion of the date see Orth, Machtanspruch und Freiheit 95–96; for the suggestion that Erythrae played a significant role in the Second Syrian War see Huss, Ägypten 281. The evidence from coinage is inconclusive. There was certainly a period of coin-production at the mint of Ephesus under Antiochus II: see Houghton – Lorber, Seleucid Coins 193–195. As Lorber will demonstrate in her forthcoming corpus of Ptolemaic coinage, no issues of Ionia can plausibly be attributed to the reign of Philadelphus.
In 1981/2 Knibbe and İplikcioğlu returned to the stone and raised Knibbe’s suggestion for line 3 to the main text, but now dotting the iota of καὶ in line 3.3 The heading of their text now read simply ‘Ptolemaios und Arsinoe’, and to their text was appended the note: ‘Ptolemaios IV. Philopator (221–204 v. Chr.) und seine (Schwester)gattin Arsinoe. 3. Die Lesung des Erhaltenen bleibt ebenso fraglich wie die Ergänzung der Zeile.’ In 1989 Knibbe, Engelmann and İplikcioğlu re-read the stone and presented a new text with additional letters in lines 1 and 3:4

[Βασιλεῖ Πτ]ολεμαίωι καὶ βασιλίσσῃ Ἀρσινόηι Σάραπι Δικαι αἰ]

On the new reading of line 3 they commented: ‘Mit Δικαι am Ende der 3. Zeile dürfte der Name des Dedikanten beginnen.’ In 1993, they returned a final time to line 3, offering the improved interpretation of the letters they had read: ‘Die Lesung Σαράπιδι καὶ Ἴσιδι ist besser als die … Worttrennung Σαράπι Δικαι[--].’5 Calapà, for her part, accepts most of her predecessors’ readings, and publishes the following text, accompanied by an excellent photograph of a squeeze of the stone:6

[Βασιλεῖ Πτ]ολεμαίωι καὶ βασιλίσσῃ Ἀρσινόηι Σαράπιδι καὶ Ἴσιδι]

The general sense of the text is thus clear. We have a ‘double dedication’ to the royal couple and Isis and Sarapis, of a type that is familiar from elsewhere in Ptolemaic territory, the significance of which will be discussed below. It is plain, however, that the text that has been offered cannot be correct. As is clear from the photograph, the basic layout of the surviving traces first offered in the editio princeps (IEphesos 199) must be correct. The stone is clearly broken on its left and right sides, as well as at the bottom. The break on the left is close to perpendicular, although the stone seems to narrow very slightly towards the top. On the right the break is irregular, the top corner having been broken off diagonally.

From the secure restoration of the beginning of line 1 we can be sure that approximately 9 letters ([Βασιλεῖ Πτ]) have been lost to the left of the surviving portion. This being the case, and given the obvious restoration of the same number of letters at the beginning line 2 ([καὶ βασιλί]) it is equally clear that there are no more than two letters absent at the end of line 1: probably a very broad, flat omega, of which traces were visible to Knibbe (et al. 1989) and seem also to be visible on the squeeze illustrated by Calapà (2010). As result, it seems likely that there is no more room at the end of line 2 beyond the letters Ἀρσι that remain visible. Turning to line 3, we can see that there is room for perhaps 8–9 letters

3 Knibbe – İplikcioğlu 1981/2, 92, no. 11.
5 Knibbe et al. 1993, 150 (SEG 43 749).
6 Calapà 2010, 209 (photograph) and 200 (text), with no. 15 on the disservices done to the text by Walters 1995, Kotsidu, ΤΙΜΗ ΚΑΙ ΔΟΞΑ and Pfeiffer, Dynastiekulte. A deficient text was also published by Bricault, RICIS 432 no. 304/0601, with the καὶ wrongly suppressed at the beginning of line 2.
7 For the term see Fraser 1960, 5.
before the first alpha of Ἰάραπιδι, since 9 letters are missing from the beginning of lines 1–2, and the slightly diagonal break in the stone may have preserved a little more of this line than the preceding three. Plainly, therefore, the restoration of the single sigma of the beginning of Sarapis’ name is insufficient to fill this line. As we have seen, we must probably also allow for the terminal -[νόηι] of Arsinoe’s name to be restored here rather than at the end of line 2. There remains room in the gap at the beginning of line 3 for the καὶ that must link Arsinoe and Sarapis. Finally, if we have correctly identified the physical end of line 2 after Ἀρσι-, then there is no room at the end of line three for Isis, who must be restored at the beginning of line 4. We may opt here for the form Εἴσιδι on the basis of the spelling preferred in stone 2 (see below). The more likely restoration of the text thus becomes:


‘To King Ptolemy and Queen Arsinoe and Sarapis and Isis ….’

The lines thus reconstructed fit the disposition of the letters on the stone, and have the by-product of removing the asyndeton posited by previous editors between the names of Arsinoe and Sarapis. Moreover, the text of IEphesos 199 now begins to look very much like that by which it is accompanied in Calapà’s publication.

(2) The second stone was first published by Knibbe and İplikçioğlu in 1981/2 under the heading ‘Isidoros und die Hegemones und Strategen opfern König Eumenes II. und Stratoneike’, with the following text:8


Rightly dissatisfied with this text, Knibbe, Engelmann and İplikçioğlu returned to the stone in 1989 and produced an improved version as follows:9


In a number of places there are clear improvements, as can be seen from the photograph provided by Calapà, who adopts Knibbe et al.’s (1989) text in its entirety.10 However, once again it is clear that the text leaves a certain amount to be desired and, in this case, the nature of the inscription has not yet been fully appreciated. Once more it is necessary to start from the beginning. The stone is obviously

8 Knibbe – İplikçioğlu 1981/2, 134–135 no. 142 (SEG 33 942).


10 Calapà 2010, 201 (text) and 210 (photograph). She removes the indentation of lines 9–11 introduced by Knibbe et al. 1989. In lines 9 and 11 she is clearly right to do so. There does, however, appear to be a gap of one letter space before the sigma of συντελο in line 10.
broken on the right. The break seems to be essentially straight down the stone, but an additional portion has been eaten away at the end of lines 3, 4, 5 and 6. The left side is intact, the first line is partially preserved, and a considerable blank space follows the last line, suggesting that we have the end of, and thus potentially the whole of the inscription. The line length of approximately 17 letters is retrievable from the secure restoration of lines 1 and 2 leading into line 3:

| ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΠΤ[ΟΛΕΜΑΔΩ] | (17) |
| ΚΑΙΒΑΣΙΑΙ[ΣΣΗ ΑΡΣΙ] | (17) |
| [Ν]ΟΗΙΚΑΙΣ[. . . . . . .] |

It is thus immediately clear that there is a problem with the restoration of line 3. Here the break on the right side of the stone cuts one letter-space deeper into the text than in lines 1–2, and only the last 7 of 8 letters are readable, instead of the 9 of the previous two lines. There is thus a gap of around 9 letters at the end of line 3, which is to say considerably more than the five posited by the editors. More seriously, there is absolutely no trace of the omega at the end of the line that is read uncertainly by Knibbe (et al. 1989) and Calapà. It is possible to discern a curved trace on the stone tightly following the sigma, but this surely cannot be the remains of a letter: sigma on this stone is always followed by a substantial space. A similar uncertainty hangs over the end of line 4, the shortest preserved on the stone. The first four letters (ΕΙΣΙ) are clear, as is the left-hand oblique and the bottom of the letter delta that follows them. After that, however, the surface of the stone appears to be grazed, before it breaks off, and little can be read with certainty. The previous editors all read omega with confidence, but it is impossible to see this letter on the photograph provided by Calapà.

In fact the solution to understanding the first four lines of this second inscription is not far to seek, since they seem in content and disposition exactly to replicate the text of the first stone, and we may propose the following:

| βασιλεὶ Πτ[ολεμαίω] |
| καὶ βασιλ[ισση Ἀρσι]- |
| ν[ό]ῃ καὶ [Σαράπιδι καὶ] |

4 Εἰσοδ[ι—] |

The remainder of line 4 (11–12 letters) must contain the name and patronym (or ethnic) of the primary dedicator. Thereafter the dedicator is joined by some military colleagues. Knibbe and İplikçıoğlu proposed for lines 5–7: καὶ οἱ ἡγεμόνες καὶ οἱ στρατηγοὶ οἱ τε[]/τε(ταγένες). With the restoration of line 5 there can be little quarrel, either with the sense or, since it yields a 16-letter line, the fit on the stone. After that, however, the surface of the stone appears to be grazed, before it breaks off, and little can be read with certainty. The previous editors all read omega with confidence, but it is impossible to see this letter on the photograph provided by Calapà.

11 This finds an attractive parallel earlier in the third century at Thyatira: βασιλεὶ Σελεύκω <&gt; τῶν ἐν Θυατείροις | Μακεδόνων οἱ ἡγεμόνες καὶ οἱ στρατιωταὶ (TAM V/2 901), and in a Ptolemaic context in a dedication on behalf of Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III, made by Ἀλέξανδρος Συνδαίος Ὀροςαννεύς, | ὁ συναποσταλεῖς διάδοχος | Χαριμόρτωι τοῖς στρατηγῶι ἐπὶ τὴν θήραν τῶν ἐλεφάντων, καὶ | Ἀπόσας Μιορβόλλου Ἐτεννεὺς | ἡγεμόνος καὶ οἱ τεταμενοὶ στρατιώται. 12

12 OGI 86, Pan 85, ll. 6–12. Note also Breccia, Iscrizioni, no. 33 (SB 1. 3993): [βασιλεὶ Πτολεμαίω] | θεῷ Ἐπιφανείᾳ | Κολλίστρατος ὁ ἡγεμόνος καὶ οἱ τεταμενοὶ | ἕπι αὐτῶν στρατιῶται. Herrmann had cited TAM V/1 528 of the imperial period (ll. 3–5: ἡγεμόνοι καὶ στρατιώται οἱ διατηρεῖτες εἰς τὸ χαριόν...).
Hamon suggests that this might be followed by ἐπὶ or ἐν τῇ | [ἀκ]ραί |, which must be entertained as a serious possibility.\textsuperscript{13} It certainly fits the traces, since there seems to be room for about 6 letters at the end of line 7. In any case, it seems clear that this dedication is being made by Ptolemaic garrison troops and their commanders at Ephesus. We should probably envisage a hierarchy of command in descending order. The most senior commander, perhaps the \emph{phourarch} or even the provincial \emph{strategos}, was named first followed by more junior officers and then the rank and file.\textsuperscript{14}

Lines 8–11 are more problematic, and no satisfactory restoration has yet been published for them. In line 8 Knibbe and İplikçioğlu (1981/2) initially read [—]PA. . . O. . [—], but subsequently (1989) suggested that they could see [ . . ]PAΙΤΟΒ. [.—]. Hamon’s AKPAI fits well at the beginning, but it is difficult to make any sense of the sequence TOB. Of these letters the \textit{tau} is clear on the squeeze, there is no sign of a letter at all where the editors record an \textit{omicron}, and thereafter, rather than the \textit{beta} which they read with confidence there appears to be the top left hand corner of a letter with a left vertical hasta from which a diagonal extends downwards to the right. The traces are consistent with a \textit{mu} or a \textit{nu}. There is room after this letter for approximately 7 more. If Hamon’s [ἀκ]ρα at the beginning of the line is right, or close to the sense, then it is likely that we begin a new clause thereafter, and that the next words are the object of the verb that starts line 8, of which the dedicants are the subject. An obvious possibility is reference to the stone itself, and τῇ(ό)γυ [βωμον] would fit the gap comfortably. At the beginning of line 8 the verb [ἀ]νέθηκα is certain, and the gap that follows has room for about 7 letters. If it is correct to restore the object of the verb in the previous line then here we must have something explanatory or elaborative, presumably leading to the mention of the sacrifices in the following line. A causal construction such as εἰς τὴν/τάς ή ἐπὶ τῇ/ταῖς would work well (the last of these at 7 letters would fit best), and the contents of the following two lines would then need to fall into agreement. συντελού[ the second upsilon is clear on the squeeze] at the beginning of line 10 is followed by room for 6 letters. [—ντε] of previous editors is short: συντελού[μενα] fits perfectly. Line 11 would thus fall into place as αὐτοίς θυ[σίας].

We may thus propose a text along the following lines:

```
4 Εἰσίδη[ ὁ δείνα —]
καὶ οἱ ἡγε[μόνες καὶ]
oi στρατ[ώτα i oi τε—]
```

\emph{‘To King Ptolemy and Queen Arsinoe and Sarapis and Isis [Name] and the officers and the soldiers stationed on the acropolis set up this altar for the sacrifices to be carried out in their honour.’}

Remarkably, then, these two stones, found within the same building on the side of the Ephesian acropolis, both seem to contain ‘double dedications’ to Ptolemy and Arsinoe and Isis and Sarapis, couched in similar terms, with a similar disposition on the stone and, as Calapà (2010) has noted, similar style of lettering. Such dedications are all but unknown outside Egypt, and it is surely no coincidence that these two were found together. They were presumably taken from the same spot for reuse in the later \emph{Hanghaus}, and had originally stood close together when erected by the Ptolemaic garrison. But when were they erected?

\textsuperscript{13} Hamon, ibid., noting the parallel of IRhamn. 17, an honorific decree of the 230s for Dikaiarchos, νῦν τεταγμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλείου Δημητρίου ἐν τῇ | ἀκρᾳ τῇ Ἔρετρην (ll. 17–18), and suggesting that the citadel may have been on Bülüıldag, on the side of which the inscriptions found their re-use in Hanghaus II.

\textsuperscript{14} On such dedications and the potential role of the \emph{phourarch}, citing this inscription, see Chaniotis 2003, 441. For a dedication to Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III on the part of a Ptolemaic \emph{phourarch} at Itanos see ICr. iii. 4.18: βασιλεί Πτολεμαίωι Φιλοπάτορι | καὶ βασιλέος Ἀρσινόη | τὸ ὄργεμα καὶ τὸ συμφαίον | Λέωνος Γαίου Ρωμαίος φρουράρχων.
Opinions, as we have already seen, have varied. Stone 1 was originally published as belonging to the reign of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II, but when republished in 1981/2 was given to the reign of Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III. Stone 2 was initially attributed to the reign of Eumenes II in the 2nd century, before being ascribed to the reign of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II early in the third. Plainly there is nothing in the letter forms of these stones that can help us decide between a period c. 279–c. 268 or 220–209 BC. Nor is there anything within these particular texts, on the readings offered here, that can allow us to decide which of the two royal couples was being honoured. Calapà, while noting that an attribution to the reign of Philopator might represent a ‘lectio facilior’, was drawn to the reign of Philadelphus by the supposed reference to a cult of the Soteres (καὶ Ζωήτηροι) in l. 3 of inscription 2. As we have seen, however, that reading of the inscription is best rejected.

Further progress can be made only by considering the broader phenomenon of the ‘double dedication’. This is one of the five categories of dedications to Sarapis and related Egyptian deities identified by Peter Fraser in his classic study of the spread of the Egyptian cults. Altogether just nine other examples of this type are known to me:

i. Canopus. IGLA 14 (SB 1. 585); IDelta p. 235, 5 (240–221 BC). ‘Stèle de calcaire’: 16h x 30w x 5d Σαράπιδι καὶ Ἡσίδι καὶ Νείλωι καὶ βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίωι καὶ βασιλείας Βερενίκηι καὶ θεοῖς Εὐεργέταις | Ἀρτεμίδωρος Ἀπολλονίου | Βαργυλίωτης.

ii. Canopus. IGLA 15 (SB 1. 586); IDelta p. 234, 4 (240–221 BC). ‘stèle... sans décoration, en calcaire nummulitique’: 20h x 33w x 8d Σαράπιδι καὶ Ἡσίδι καὶ βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίωι καὶ βασιλείας Βερενίκηι καὶ θεοῖς Εὐεργέταις.


iv. Philae. OGI 62; IPh. 3 (240–221 BC). ‘Bloc de grès, encastré dans le paroi ouest du mur du portique de l’avant cour’: 45h x 105w βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίωι καὶ βασιλείας Βερενίκηι καὶ θεοῖς Εὐεργέταις, καὶ Ἡσίδι καὶ Σαράπιδι καὶ Ἀρτεμίδωρος Πτολεμαίωι.


vi. Apollonopolis Magna (Edfu). Brooklyn 7; OGI 82; SB 1.174; 5.8866. Pan, p. 194, 77 (217–204 BC). ‘tablette de granit noir’: 19.3h x 34.5 w x 4.8d

---

15 Calapà 2010, 203–204 assuming that the mention of the (Theoi) Soteres was a reference to the deified parents of Philadelphus and Arsinoe II, Ptolemy I and Berenice I.

16 Fraser 1960, 5–6 and 11; cf. Fraser, Ptolemaic Alexandria, 263 with no. 593. The form is known for dedications to the royal couple and other gods too. Cf. OGI 111 republished as Thèbes à Syene 302 (βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίωι καὶ βασιλείας | Κλεοπάτρα ἡ ἐδέσθη, θεοῖς Φιλομήτορος[ι]), καὶ τοῖς τοιοῦτον τέκνοις καὶ Ἀμώνιοι | τοὺς καὶ Χνοῖς [ἐ]μεί Χροα [ἡ] καὶ Σάτης, καὶ Ἑσίον [ἡ] καὶ Ανοίκου[ε] καὶ Διονύσων | τοὺς καὶ Πετεύμπουχες χάλα τοῖς ἄλλοις | θεοῖς,...) and Pan no. 84 (below n. 000).

17 For the dates of nos. i–iv, see the comments of A. and E. Bernand on the date of iv (IPh., p. 71–73).

18 For the restoration of line 1, where the stone is broken, see Bricault, RICIS, ad loc.

19 For the date see Pan p. 194 (Bernand). Compare also the near identical dedication by the same Lichas, Pan no. 84, where Dionysus is substituted for Sarapis: [βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίωι καὶ | [βασιλείας Αρησόνη, θεοῖς | [Φιλο-
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βασιλεὶ Πτολεμαίωι καὶ βασιλίσσῃ Ἀσφαλίνη, θεοὶ | Φιλοπάτορσι, καὶ Σαράπιδι καὶ | Ἰσιδὴ Λίχας Πύρρου Άκαρνάν, στρατηγὸς ἀποστάλεις | ἐπὶ τὴν θήραν τῶν ἐλεφάντων να. τὸ δεύτερον.


βασιλεὶ Πτολεμαίωι καὶ βασιλίσσῃ | [Κ]λεοπάτραι τῇ γυναικὶ, θεοὶ Εὐεργέτας | καὶ τοῖς τούτων τέκνοις. [Ε]ἰσιδή, Σαράπιδη.[

viii. Philae. *ISyène* no. 318. (124–116 BC?). ‘Bloc trouvé près de la porte de Philadelphie’: 66h x 11w x 41d

[βασιλεὶ Πτολεμαίωι καὶ βασιλίσσῃ] | [Κ]λεοπάτραι τῇ ἀδελφῇ καὶ | [βασιλίσσῃ Κλεοπάτραι τῇ γυναικῇ] | [θεοὶ Εὐεργέτας καὶ] τοῖς τούτων[ | [τέκνοις Ἰσιδῆ Σαράπηδη] | ὎ρωι | καὶ τοῖς ἐν τοῖς Ἀβάτωι καὶ | [Φίλαις θεοὶ]

ix. Philae. *ISyène* no. 320. (116 BC). ‘Trois blocs, trouvés dans le mur extérieure occidental’: 44h x 74.5w x 34.5d; 44h x 43.5w; 44h x 32w.

(ἔτους) νό’. Πλοῦτος κρ.’ | βασιλεὶ Πτολεμαίωι καὶ | βασιλίσσῃ Κλεοπάτραι τῇ ἀδελφῇ καὶ βασιλίσσῃ Κλεοπάτραι[ | τῇ γυναικὶ, θεοὶ Εὐεργέτας, καὶ τοῖς τούτων τέκνοις Ἰσιδῆ, Σαράπιδη, ὎ρωι | καὶ τοῖς ἐν τοῖς Ἀβάτωι.

First we may note the geographic distribution. Eight of the nine stones are from Egypt. Of the ninth, from Salamis in Cyprus, Fraser offered the following commentary: “*OGI* 63… is a ‘double dedication’ of Alexandrian type, and Philinos is probably father of the priestesses of the eponymous cults in Alexandria at the beginning of the 2nd century (see the Rosetta stone, *OGI* 90, line 5 and various demotic texts: see *JEA* 40, 1954, 48 nos. 11–12, and evidently a courtier or public official. (Mitford, *Opusc. Athen.* 4′, 2, 1953, p. 131 n. 5 suggests that he was governor of Cyprus). He made the dedication no doubt when serving in a civil or military capacity in Cyprus, and it cannot be regarded as truly Cypriot….”20 Our two Ephesian examples aside, this form of dedication looks to be essentially an ‘Alexandrian’ habit, exported only by elite functionaries to the provinces, at least in its early years.

This brings us to the question of dates. As is clear from the above lists, the earliest known examples of this phenomenon (inscriptions i–v) date to the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes I. One (no. vi) belongs to the reign of Philopator. Thereafter there is a gap of sixty years or more, before the final three examples (nos. vii–ix), all from Philae in Upper Egypt, and taking on a fundamentally different form.

Form too is of interest, since there seems to be a development. The earliest five examples, all from the reign of Euergetes I, are engraved on small *stelai*. The sixth too, from the reign of Philopator, is inscribed on a compact block of black granite. The last three, in Fraser’s words, are ‘not quite on all fours with the other inscriptions’.21 All date from the second half of the second century and all are from Philae where they were apparently engraved on architectural elements: one on an architrave and one across three conjoined blocks. There seems here to be a move from the more personal to the public.

Our two Ephesian stones seem to find their closest analogue neither in the spare dedications from Euergetes I’s reign, nor in the later monumental stones, but rather in the stone from Edfu and the reign of Philopator. It is, like the Ephesian stones, dedicated by a Ptolemaic military office-holder, and offers some explanation for its existence beyond the bare name of the dedicant.

A date for the Ephesian dedications in the reign of Ptolemy IV is attractive for two further reasons. First, it would be highly surprising, if these inscriptions did indeed date from the reign of Philadelphus, to find the earliest evidence for what seems otherwise to be a characteristically Alexandrian (or

---

20 Fraser 1960, 46 n.4. For the daughters of Philinos who served as priestesses see now Clarysse – Van der Veken, Priests 20–23 nos. 94 (197/6 BC), 104–106 (187/6–185/4 BC) and 109 (182/1 BC).
21 Fraser, Ptolemaic Alexandria, ii. 416 no. 593 (only the first of the three was known to Fraser).
Egyptian) form of dedication occurring in the provinces. It seems far more likely that this form of dedication spread outwards from Alexandria, and that our Ephesian stones should therefore postdate the earliest attestation of the practice in Egypt. Second, the reign of Philopator saw an increased focus on the figures of Isis and Sarapis, and their association with the royal couple of Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III, both within Egypt and elsewhere in the Ptolemaic empire. As L. Bricault has pointed out, there exists a series of dedications to Isis and Sarapis who are qualified as Θεοὶ Σωτῆρες. In three cases these are dedications made ‘on behalf’ of Ptolemy and Arsinoe. A fourth reveals that a substantial temple was dedicated in a prominent position on the main street in Alexandria to Isis and Sarapis the Soter gods, together with the royal couple. One of the dedications on behalf of the royal couple (SEG 38.1571), as Bricault notes, was found in the Beqa’ in territory that must have been recovered for the Ptolemies as a result of the battle of Raphia in 217 BC. He goes on to suggest that victory at this battle may have been attributed to an intervention on the part of Isis and Sarapis, who took on the epithet Θεοὶ Σωτῆρες as a result. This in turn may explain the subsequent dedication of the temple in Alexandria.

There is further evidence, as Bricault notes, for the propagation of the images of Isis and Sarapis in Egypt and abroad in the coinage of Ptolemy IV issued in Alexandria, Sidon and Ascalon, probably in the context of this conflict. In a remarkable departure from the standard types of Ptolemaic silver, these coins bore on the obverse the jugate heads of Isis and Sarapis (Fig. 1). These coins, we might suggest, form an iconographic analogue to the ‘double dedication’, by placing depictions of Isis and Sarapis in the place usually reserved for portraits of the King and Queen.

![Fig. 1. Silver tetradrachm of Ptolemy IV, mint of Alexandria. ANS 1944.100.77211 (E.T. Newell bequest)](image)

Our two Ephesian inscriptions sit far more comfortably in the reign of Philopator than that of Philadelphus, and indeed there is no strong reason to place them in the earlier reign at all. If we accept the

---

22 SEG 38 1571: ὑπὲρ βασιλέως | Πτολεμαίου καὶ | βασιλισσῆς Ἀρσινόης | θεῶν Φιλοπατόρων | Σαράπιδος Ἰσιδορὶς | Μαρσυὰς Δημητρίου | Ἀλεξάνδρεις | ὑπὲρ βασιλείας | Πτολεμαίων | Κόσμου Λεοννατές. ІIр. 5, ОГІ 87: ὑπὲρ βασιλείας Πτολεμαίων καὶ βασιλισσῆς Ἀρσινόης Φιλοπατόρων. Сαράπιδος Ἰσιδορὶς. Compare also the dedication made on behalf of Ptolemy alone: [ὑπὲρ βασιλείας Πτολεμαίου θεοῦ] | [μεγάλου Φιλοπατόρος Σωτήρα | καὶ Νικηφόρου, καὶ τοῦ νικῆτος Πτολεμαίου] | Ἰσιδορὶς, Σαράπιδος, Ἀπόλλωνι | Κόσμου Ἀσκληπιάδου | οἰκονόμων τῶν κατὰ Ναύκρατιν (IΔείτα, p. 749 no. 13).

23 ΣΒ 1. 2136; Tod 1942; ΙΑλεξ.Πτολ. no. 18: Σαράπιδος (καὶ) Ἰσιδορὶς θεῶν Σωτῆρων | καὶ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου καὶ βασιλισσῆς Ἀρσινόης Φιλοπατόρων. See further McKenzie, Architecture 64.

24 SEG 28 1571 with Bricault 1999, 337 for the date.


26 Bricault 1999, 340–342 and Bricault, SNRIS 84, Alexandria 2. For the nature and date of these issues see now Landvatter 2012. A fourth mint at Soli in Cilicia seems to belong to the reign of Ptolemy V, and the period of the Fifth Syrian War: see Lorber – Kovacs 1997 and Landvatter 2012, 80–1.
later date, then some further chronological precision may be possible. However, we are hampered by the abbreviated nomenclature of the two rulers, which lacks any filiation or epiklesis. Such abbreviation is rare for both Ptolemy II and Ptolemy IV and may well be the result of the restricted space available on the stones (or altars) on which the texts were engraved. This being the case, omission of elements of nomenclature is to be treated with caution when seeking a date.

That said, clearly the dedication occurred after the marriage of Ptolemy and Arsinoe in or before 220 BC. The absence from the dedication of the young Ptolemy V, who does appear associated with the couple after his birth in 209 in a number of dedications, cannot necessarily be pressed here, both because of the confined space available on the stone and the ‘double’ nature of these dedications. The significance of the absence of the royal title Θεοὶ Φιλοπάτορες, is more difficult to gauge. It is present in Lichas’ dedication (above, no. vi), and indeed there are virtually no known dedications to Ptolemy and his queen that lack it. If significant, this might suggest that the Ephesian dedications both belong before the incorporation into the dynastic cult of Ptolemy and Arsinoe at Alexandria in 216/5. As has been suggested by Lanciers, it appears from the few clearly dated texts that we possess that the title Θεοὶ Φιλοπάτορες appears first in Egyptian documents, before the couple were admitted to the Alexandrian dynastic cult. This would give us a fairly tight window of c. 220–216 in which to insert these dedications, and place them in the immediate period of the Fourth Syrian War, and potentially in the very immediate aftermath of Raphia. However, it is not completely clear when the epiklesis Θεοὶ Φιλοπάτορες came into common use in Greek documents. The earliest datable attested use in Greek appears to be in the Raphia Decree of 15 November 217.

Whatever their precise moment(s) of dedication, these two important Ephesian inscriptions bear witness to the export of the cult of Isis and Sarapis from Egypt to a Ptolemaic outpost in Asia Minor, and the association of those gods with the Ptolemaic royal couple. The figure behind these dedications is likely to have been the senior commander within the city of Ephesus, which was singled out at this time by Polybius as a major Ptolemaic garrison. He is likely to have been a member of the Alexandrian elite, and to have been taking his cue from developments back in Egypt. We are reminded again of Lichas son of Pyrrhos, the Akarnanian (Pros. Ptol. 4422). He is one of a series of commanders of the Elephant hunt in the south, who are attested both by the dedications they made, and in their impact

---

27 The priest Annōs who died on June 8th 217 BC. was described in a hieroglyphic text as having held the priesthood of the Theoi Philopatores at Memphis, so the cult there must predate this: see Quaegebeur 1971, 248–249 no. 60 on the stele Vienna no. 153; Gorre, Les relations 297–304 no. 60. This in turn may suggest that a demotic papyrus (Pdem. Vatic. 2037B, P.Ehevertr. 22; TM 2993) dated to the month of Thoth, Year 3 (=17 October–15 November 220) may be correctly read as referring to the Theoi Philopatores. See Lanciers 1988 (SEG 38 1670). This in turn provides a terminus ante quem for their marriage.

28 E.g. OGL 86 (Pau 85; SB 5.8771): ὑπὲρ βασιλείου Πτολεμαίου καὶ βασιλούσης Ἀρσινόης καὶ Πτολεμαίου | τοῦ νιόυ, ΘΕΩΝ Φιλοπατόρων κλ. | cf. OGI 183 (IPh. 7).

29 However, the royal children do appear in the later double dedications from Philae (above nos. vii–ix).

30 The first attestation of the title for the eponymous priest comes in Year 7: BGU 6, 1283; Clarysse – Van der Veken, Priests 16 no. 75.

31 Δεδοθαί | [τοις κατα τὴν χώραν ιερεί][]|σιν τάς τε προφυσαρχόσας τιμᾶς | |[ἐν τοῖς ἴεροις βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίων | [ και βασιλούσης Ἀρσινόης] ΘΕΩΝ Φιλο(κο)τάρων... ἐπάξιον μεγάλως (SEG 8 467; SB 5.7172, ll. A 28–36). The decree is dated 1 Artemiosios (=Paophi), year 6. Other inscriptions from Coele Syria have been associated with the Fourth Syrian War and in two cases with the period after Raphia (SEG 20 467 now republished by Lupu [2003] = SEG 53 1846 (from Joppa); Strack 1903, 544 no. 21 (from Beit Guvrin). See Lanciers 1988, 27–28. A third dedication found at Khoraihe, near Qana, has been dated to 219 by Huss (Aussenpolitik 44), but the date is far from secure, and this dedication may also belong to the aftermath of Raphia: SEG 7 326 made by the Aetolian Dorymenes. See Bagnall 1977, 189 no. 1.

32 Polyb. 5.35.11 (ἱστοριῶν πλῆθος έν τοῖς κατ’ Έφεσον).
on the toponymy of hunting grounds. Strabo records both an area known as Lichas’ Hunting Ground and notes the altars and stelai set up by Lichas and others. Like another of the commanders of the hunt, Charimortus the Aetolian (Pros. Ptol. 4428), Lichas was undoubtedly a major figure at the Ptolemaic court. His double dedication, like those set up at Ephesus, are likely to be the product of a royal ideology promoted within the highest echelons of the Alexandrian elite.

Our two fragmentary Ephesian inscriptions seem, then, to have nothing to tell us of Ptolemaic control of Ephesus or Ionia in the reign of Philadelphus. Rather, they provide an interesting window on the image of Ptolemy and Arsinoe Philopator that was being portrayed in the provinces, in what would turn out to be the last generation of Ptolemaic rule in Asia Minor. This picture drew on, and perhaps sprang out of revised practice at home in Egypt, and was reinforced in the silver coinage of the empire as well as, it seems, by the religious activities of senior military officials.
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Efes'te Bulunan İki ‘Çifte’ Adak ve İonya’da Ptolemaioslar Kontrolünün Başlaması


Yazar ikincisi olarak Knibbe ve İplikçioğlu tarafından 1981/2 yılında ‘Isidoros und die Hegemones und Strategen opfern König Eumenes II. und Stratonike’ başlığı altında ilk kez yayımlanan ve 1989 yılında Knibbe, Engelmann ve İplikçioğlu tarafından tekrar ele alınan ve son olarak da yine Calapà tarafından tamamen 1989 yılındaki yayımdan alınan yazıta yeni bir okuma önerisi sunulmuştur. Buna göre yazarın tamamlama önerisi ve çevirişi şöyledir:


Anahtar Sözcüklər: Ptolemaios IV Philopator; Kral Kültü; Sarapis; Isis; Ephesos; Ionia.