

Afterword

This book was conceived as a contribution to the reassessment of cultic honours for political leaders and benefactors as a constitutive part of the history of Greek religion in the Hellenistic period. Drawing on a large set of source types and methodological approaches has served the purpose of shedding light on common aspects as well as on specific traits concerning the practical dimension of ritual honours, including their administration and funding systems. It is now time to attempt a balance of this endeavour by drawing attention to some of the points highlighted by the studies collected here. I will articulate these final reflections around four main topics: space, time, material, and agency. Where possible, I will also add references to other documents that can confirm the conclusions of the papers and point to new paths for future research.

Space. The spatial footprint of honours for political leaders and great benefactors has concerned the authors of the contributions at various scales (cities, villages, sanctuaries, private estates, households) and with varied configurations of the interaction between human honorands and traditional deities. Strootman and Williamson's discussion of Hekatomnid Karia has drawn attention to some strategic architectural and urbanistic solutions by which a dynasty could reshape the sacred landscape of important sanctuaries in the *chōra*, such as that of Zeus at Labraunda, and reinvent the complex spatial organization of a royal capital like Halikarnassos. Moreover, it has pointed to the Hekatomnid dynasty as a prominent model for later configurations of the royal space in the capitals of Hellenistic kingdoms. The organization of royal space in Hekatomnid Karia goes far beyond the creation of a static theatrical staging of monarchic supremacy: it establishes topographical associations between royal dwellings and existing deities (cf. Zeus at Labraunda, Apollo at the Zephyrion promontory in Halikarnassos) and creates the setting in which cultic honours for a monarch or a dynasty shall take place.

By drawing on the binary 'guest—host' model which I have proposed in my contribution on the honours for Attalos III, we may state that royal initiatives create multi-faceted configurations of royal space by reinventing what is available on the terrain. At Halikarnassos, the palace of Maussollos was added to a part of the city that already hosted the sanctuary of Apollo, thus letting the newly constructed royal space

share, as a guest, in the sacred space of the god. At Labraunda too, the *andrones* of Maussollos and Idrieus nested the space of the dynasts within the existing sacred landscape of the hosting god Zeus.¹ On the other hand, in the centre of Halikarnassos, the complete reorganization of the city landscape around the sacred platform of the Maussolleion made the dynasts the owners of a major sacred space, which became a political and religious landmark of the city.

The ‘guest—host’ scheme fits particularly well the dynamics of organization of sacred space underlying the categories of temple- and altar-sharing honorands. The case of Attalos III at Pergamon clearly shows that the relationship between old and new recipients of cult was not fixed once and for all, but continuously changed in compliance with locations and occasions. In some cases, the honoured person is the owner of a cultic structure and thus the principal recipient of cults, whereas when rituals are accomplished at existing cult facilities (temples, altars) belonging to deities of the civic pantheon, the new honorands tend to appear as secondary co-recipients of the cult. These different honorific patterns can coexist in the same city and even in the same decree, forcing us to consider them as complementary rather than as alternative models. In the same way, offerings addressed to human benefactors as to gods (in the dative) can coexist in the same time and space with other rituals accomplished to traditional deities for the wellbeing of these same leaders, revealing a multi-faceted and negotiable relationship between the holders of supreme political power, the honouring community, and the divine. The Hellenistic documentation therefore provides no support to those scholars who might search for standard evaluations of the hierarchical relationship between ritually honoured political leaders and the gods. The need to put order in the theological implications of cultic honours may appear, with a polemic purpose, in literary works of authors embracing a distinctive political or philosophical position against the possibility that legal decisions affect the organization of the divine; however, we must wait for the impact of the Roman Principate and of its procedural approach to the divinization of political leaders before honorific inscriptions testify to straightforward reflections about the religious implications of cultic honours in the general terms of hierarchical relationship between human recipients of cult and the divine sphere.²

-
1. Examples could be multiplied at pleasure: see, for instance, the case of the Attalid *basileia* being added to the citadel of Pergamon, which was dominated by the pre-existing terrace of Athena. This case also shows that the host-guest relationship is not a stable one, but is subject to change through time. Starting from the monumental reorganization of Athena’s terrace under Attalos I and Eumenes II, the balance between sacred and royal space in the citadel of Pergamon was reversed as the precinct of Athena was progressively encapsulated in the royal space; this process is attested by the creation of the Library and by Attalos III’s royal addition of the cult of Zeus Sabazios to the *temenos* of Athena.
 2. See PRICE (1984b) on the difference between the fluid status granted to the recipients of ritual honours in the Greek Hellenistic East and the juridical definition of the religious category of *Dimi* in Rome. A revealing case of a new approach to cultic honours is provided by a decree for L. Vaccius Labeo (*IK Kyme* 19; *IGR* IV 1302; 2 BC – 14 AD). This member of the local elite of Kyme rejected

Discussing the flexible mechanisms that rule the organization of shared sacred space brings us to reassess the category of *synnaos theos*. This concept has often been dealt with by scholars working on textual evidence as a somewhat abstract category. However, the spatial applications of this general definition must be verified on the field from case to case: a statue of a human benefactor erected within the premises of a sanctuary can occupy different places in relation to the divine statue;³ moreover, its attributes and measures may vary, and the material composition of the statues erected in a sanctuary also offer some decisive information about the relationship between the host deity and the guest human honorand. Furthermore, even if we limit ourselves to the analysis of textual sources, we must observe that the distinction between *agalmata* and *eikones* only provides a general orientation about which portraits of a human being, and when, could become the recipients of a ritual action. This is not only to say that, as already acknowledged in the scholarship, in the Hellenistic period the borders between cultic *agalmata* and honorific *eikones* could be blurred in certain cases. More importantly, the analysis of the ritual treatment of statues of both royal and non-royal benefactors shows that on specific festivals or eponymous days, honorific statues could become the addressees of ritual actions. Accordingly, the dynamic relationship between cultic and non-cultic statues appears to be a matter related not only to the vocabulary of our sources, but also and more concretely to the honorific logic that constitutes an important part of the religious life of a community.

The reorganization of the sacred space to accommodate ritual honours for human leaders does not only occur at the macro and durable level of urbanization, architecture, and sculpture. Small and movable inscribed objects could largely contribute to the configuration of sacred material landscapes pertaining to the cultic honours for human beings at the micro-level of personal dedications in sanctuaries (or portions thereof), in semi-public buildings like gymnasia and other meeting places of non-official associations, and even in private houses—both in inner spaces and in the public area in front of the house doorways. The multiplication of places where the ritual honours for the political leaders could be accomplished opened up a large variety of options to establish associations between the honorands and the deities

the establishment of civic honours comprising a temple to be erected in the gymnasium and the grant of the epithet *Ktistes*, arguing that such honours exceeded those suitable for men: cf. KUHN (2017), p. 202-205. Labeo's Italic origins (he was a member of an important family of *negotiatores*) may have made him particularly sensitive to the ongoing Augustan process of re-definition of the system of cultic honours for political leaders. His *recusatio* is reported in detail at lines 11-20 of the decree: "although he accepted the resolution of the city with pleasure, Labeo, also considering the initiatives taken for him and measuring his luck in relation to what can be reached by a human being, declined this excessive honour, fitting the gods and those equal to the gods (*isotheoi*)—that is, the consecration of the temple and the denomination as Founder—and since he considered as sufficient the decision taken by the city and its manifestation of benevolence, he accepted with joy the honours suitable for good men". I will discuss diachronic changes in the use of the adjective *isotheos* and other key expressions of the vocabulary of Hellenistic ritual honours in CANEVA (in preparation).

3. This point was already convincingly made by STEUERNAGEL (2010).

worshiped by the community. Not all of these associations necessarily followed a leading top-down model set up by a city or promoted by the royal house. Thus, for instance, the dissemination of altars of Attalos I and Eumenes II in sanctuaries and other public spaces in Pergamon largely exceeds the preferential bonds that the dynasty claimed with Dionysos (and Herakles). In the Ptolemaic documentation, the extraordinary dissemination of altars, blocks and plaques inscribed with the name of Arsinoe Philadelphos testifies to the existence of multiple choices for individual agents to pay ritual honour to the deified queen in domestic environments, in sanctuaries of deities closely related to the queen in court ideology (cf. Aphrodite, Isis), but also in relation to gods who played an important role in a local, bottom-up perspective, like Apollo Amyklos at Idalion.

Time. We have already observed that festivals provided suitable occasions to promote the community's involvement in the official rituals for political leaders and benefactors, also connecting the public and private sphere via the regulation of the participation of non-official groups (including families) in the processions and offerings organized by the state. When we narrow down our focus to basic sequences of ritual actions, we realize that regulating the time of cultic honours was also necessary to define the precise moment at which the new rituals for human honorands should be nested within the ceremonies for the gods. Thus, the singing of hymns and paeans appears to have been regulated by cities not only as regards the occasions for the competitive selection of the best poets and compositions, but also, when the evidence allows us to see in detail, at the precise level of the sequence of ritual actions that compose a sacrifice or a procession. In this respect, artistic performances in the form of singing and of choreographed dancing play a function comparable with the solution of letting a human benefactor share in the sacred space of the gods. In Erythrai, the regulation concerning ritual singing exposed in the sanctuary of Apollo contained an appendix with the texts of the paeans for this god and for his 'sons' Asklepios and Seleukos I; the honours for the king were therefore given a special place in the sacred space and in the ritual timings of the two guest deities.

When talking about cultic honours in relation to time, we may distinguish three main aspects: occasion, frequency, and duration. The first two points are closely related to the organization of the religious calendar. Institutions—civic, royal, of a sanctuary, but also private in the case of non-official associations—regulate occasion and frequency to fit the new festivals into the sacred time of the community. New rituals for human honorands may occupy a new position in the calendar of a city or of another social group, for instance when they are meant to commemorate the birthday or day of coronation of a monarch, or an event such as a victory or a particular benefaction for which the honorand shall be remembered and worshiped. In other cases, new festivals are appended to existing ones, letting the human honorands share in the time of the gods. From a practical perspective, the reasons justifying this solution relate to the augmented chance of promoting a new festival by adding it to one that already enjoys popular success at a local, regional, or even international level. From

an ideological point of view, the combination of old and new festivals may contribute to the characterization of the religious figure of the honoured political leader—see the case of Aigai for the combination of rituals for Seleukos I and Antiochos I with a major festival of Apollo. However, this is not the only explanation that emerges from our sources. The association of the festival Seleukeia with the Dionysia in Aigai and Erythrai does not seem to entail the bestowal of a Dionysiac allure upon Seleukos. It rather responds to the more general purpose of letting the honoured king share in the time and ritual events of a prominent local festival. The artistic contests organized during the Dionysia may have played a role in the choice of this festival. First of all, in the Hellenistic period, artistic and other contests were a major occasion for the civic institutions to announce public honours for benefactors in front of the gathered population: by appending the Seleukeia to the Dionysia, which traditionally hosted artistic contests, the city placed a central moment in the administration of civic prestige and honours under the name of the euergetic king, in addition to the traditional god of the festival. Moreover, the contest itself probably provided a suitable occasion for the competitive selection of the hymn which the city would dedicate to the ritually honoured king.

Duration is related to the survival of cultic honours for human beings across time. Despite the common claim of decrees that honours established by cities shall last forever, the unstable political scenario of the Hellenistic age implied that many of the new cults were bound to decline within a short time after their establishment. A clue of the awareness the honouring cities had of the instability of political balances and their related honours is that civic honorific decrees for monarchs never concretely attempted to prevent future changes to, or the cancellation of, the decreed honours by means of entrenchment clauses, fines, imprecations, or the institution of controlling committees, as it often happens instead in other types of ritual regulations and cultic foundations.⁴ Therefore, civic commitment to preserve the practice of ritual honours for eternity belongs to a purely discursive register, while their effective duration relies on the preservation of the equilibrium of powers, both internal and external, which resulted in the establishment of honours. This means, for instance, that unless future excavations shed new light on the archaeological remains of Seleucid honours at Aigai, we cannot exclude the possibility that the erection of the sanctuary of the kings as Saviours near the precinct of Apollo, which was stipulated by the civic institutions

4. On the role of the entrenchment clause in public regulations, see HARRIS (2006), p. 23-25 and (2015), p. 66, 69 (specifically on the so-called 'sacred laws'); on juridical devices to ensure the duration of private cultic foundations, LAUM (1914), p. 178-211. A remarkable difference between civic honorific decrees and private foundations pertaining to ruler cults emerges from the sacred regulation of Antiochos I of Kommagene. Here the content of the foundation is related to the dynastic cult of the king and his ancestors; however, because the endowment is private (royal), the juridical and religious devices activated to ensure the perpetuation of the cults attached to the principal capital provided by the king are comparable to those of non-royal private foundations. On the foundation of Antiochos, see *IGLS I*, 1 (from the *hierothesion* of Nemrud Dağ) and the new texts collected in *SEG LIII* 1763.

shortly after Kouroupedion, was never fulfilled as a consequence of the imminent death of Seleukos.⁵

Another issue related to duration concerns the possibility that cults for rulers may have gone through a period of decline in a certain place before they were renovated for specific ideological purposes. For instance, it remains uncertain whether the attention paid to the statues and rituals of the Attalids by the Pergamene benefactor Diodoros Paspáros after the Mithridatic War should be seen as the proof of an uninterrupted practice of an Attalid dynastic cult in republican Pergamon, or as a revival responding to the need of celebrating the memory of the grandeur of the city in a time of crisis, and as a smart solution to grant Diodoros himself a place on the side of the great dynasty of Pergamon's past.

Material. The evidence discussed in this book has shed light on some material aspects of ruler cults, in particular as regards the types of vegetal and animal offerings involved in the celebration of rituals for political leaders and benefactors. Paganini's and Lorber's contributions have provided a closer look at the types of spaces, tools and commodities that cultic associations needed in order to ensure the celebration of their feasts and offerings. At this private level as well as in the public context of civic rituals, ritual honours for human beings were not set apart from those for the traditional gods, but were modelled after them, and combined with them as part of the routine ritual life of the community. The same process of accommodation of the rituals of ruler cults within the traditional patterns of the materiality of religion is documented in non-Greek milieus: in this respect, the example provided by texts and reliefs concerning the celebration of Ptolemaic ancestor cult in Egyptian sanctuaries can be compared with the rituals for Seleucid kings mentioned in the cuneiform evidence from Hellenistic Babylon and Uruk.⁶

A point deserving attention with regard to the materiality of rituals is that the size and costs of the offerings principally depended on the possibilities of the donors and on the occasions of the offering rather than on the prestige of the person ritually honoured. Civic institutions could establish lavish offerings on important occasions, both for routine festivals (cf. the two bulls for Seleukos and Antiochos at Aigai) and for special events (e.g. the sacrifice "as beautiful as possible" to Attalos III, on Zeus' altar on the agora, on the day of his return). They also could schedule multiple sacrifices on the same occasion by assigning different types of offerings, with different costs, to various parts of the population organized in demographic sub-units, such the city's *phylai*. Access to the sacrificial banquet also varied in relation to the type of occasion, ranging from broad events embracing the whole population to banquets only involving the civic authorities, down to the exclusive parties run by private associations. In some regulations of civic rituals, the citizens are called to participate in public festivals with their own offerings, in which case the rule is that

5. On early Hellenistic Aigai, see HABICHT (2020).

6. See LINSSEN (2004), p. 124-128; GLADIĆ (2007).

each person is allowed to sacrifice in compliance with his own financial possibilities. That such offerings often consisted of perfumes and vegetables rather than of blood sacrifices is suggested by Satyrus' excerpt of a ritual regulation for Arsinoe's procession in Alexandria and confirmed by the small size and rather shallow surface of the preserved altars of ruler cults in the Hellenistic world.

Only in a few cases can we observe a specific attempt of institutions at precisely characterizing the religious *persona* of the honorands via the regulation of the material content of the offerings. The ritual norm of Alexandria for the procession of Arsinoe Philadelphos provides the only known case of sacrificial interdiction in relation to ruler cults, revealing a rare, if not unique, intention of the institutions to precisely position the newly created goddess within the pantheon of the Greek and Egyptian subjects of the Ptolemies. Ritual regulations can also modulate the material content of offerings to establish an internal hierarchy between various recipients. This solution usually responds to the need of distinguishing between the offerings for guest and host recipients of the cultic structures, but here we may add a reference to a decree passed by the inhabitants of two villages near Laodikeia on the Lykos for the Seleucid client dynast Achaïos and two of his officials having ransomed several prisoners taken during the war with Celtic tribes: this is a rare case where the higher-standing honorand, Achaïos, is granted the yearly sacrifice of a bull whereas his lower-ranking collaborators are honoured with less expensive animals, two rams.⁷

The material features of a dedication, a cultic tool, a sculptural or architectural monument can also say a lot about the economic possibility and aspirations of the dedicants as well as of their cultural/ethnic background and intentions. As I argued in the opening chapter of this book, the use of marble for dedications in contrast to other materials may reveal important details about the status and prestige of the donor(s), but to avoid generalizations we must combine this feature with other important pieces of information, some of which can be inferred from the document itself (quality of writing, prosopography, content of the dedication), while others point to the broader socio-economic background of the dedication and comprise factors such as the availability of marble on the local market and the level of connectivity between royal centres and peripheral sanctuaries. Such connections may have a regional scale, as, for instance, when we consider the choices of materials (marble and andesite) in Pergamon and in the neighbouring mountain sanctuary of Mamurt Kale; or they can concern a broad international network, such as the circulation of marbles between the Aegean world, Cyprus, and Egypt in the 3rd-century Ptolemaic kingdom.

Concerning the study of portraits of honoured dynasts, Palagia has shown that the choice of marble in contrast to bronze, and especially the use of the acrolithic technique, constitute important factors in the identification of a statue meant for

7. *IK Laodikeia am Lykos* 1; January 267 BC. The two offerings are also to take place in distinct locations: that for Achaïos in the sanctuary of Zeus at Baba Kome, those for his collaborators in the sanctuary of Apollo at Kiddiou Kome. On the status and honours of Achaïos in the area, see MCAULEY (2018), p. 38-39.

cultic use and possibly erected within a sacred space, thus making a monarch a *synnaos theos* in a temple. Another important aspect in the material characterization of portraits of political leaders is their iconography: the presence of divine attributes may point to association with gods, even though it is not always easy to understand whether this approximation should be interpreted as a sign of identification of a human with a god or as the visual mark of a privileged status of the monarch as the god's favourite and *protégé*. On the other hand, the transfer of a god's attributes is not the only way to create a new sculptural or numismatic iconography for a ritually honoured monarch. The *agalma* depicting Attalos III in arms standing on the war booty in the sanctuary of Asklepios did not point to any specific deity but applied a visual motif brought to success by Attalid *anathēmata* for their victories over the Celts. This new iconography therefore provided a suitable solution to depicting Attalos as *Galatonikēs*. Like the famous elephant *exuvia* in the numismatic portrait of Alexander, which evoked his successes in India, Attalos' Pergamene iconography may therefore be seen as a visual device to encapsulate the echo of a military event into a deifying iconography. This solution offers an iconographic parallel to what A. Chaniotis has identified as a typical trend of Hellenistic religious life: the tendency to integrate major political and military exploits among the events that could be religiously commemorated by a community and thus inspire the origins of new festivals.⁸ In the case of Attalos III at Pergamon, the victory of the king resulted into both the creation of a yearly civic festival and into the definition of a new deifying iconography for the ritually honoured monarch.

The visual attributes and the material composition of the statue provide together a rich set of instruments by which agents can express a variety of configurations of the special link between the supreme holders of personal power and the divine sphere. The functioning of this visual semantics of honour can be compared with the discursive toolkit of cultic epithets giving shape to the relationship between political leaders and the divine. Just like visual attributes, denominations could have a local application or gain larger success at a regional or even international level. The analysis of hymns for benefactors has revealed that the choice of epithets and even the promotion of narratives of divine kinship for political leaders passed through an elaborate interaction between poetic creativity, civic strategies, and the dynasts' self-representation. Moreover, in a way comparable to the iconography suggesting a link between political leaders and the divine, the religious honours bestowed upon a person could be accompanied by the creation of a distinctive epiclesis (cf. Arsinoe Philadelphos), while in other cases the chosen denomination established a direct link between the honorand and a specific deity (Queen Aphrodite Laodike in *IK Iasos* I 4); sometimes, the honouring community opted for a broader and less clear-cut association between the honorand and a god, as in the case of the famous altar of Zeus Philippios at Eresos.⁹

8. CHANIOTIS (1995).

9. RHODES – OSBORNE (2007), no. 83, γ.front.ii, lines 5-6.

Agency. The interaction between personal, civic, and royal initiatives must be taken into account to understand the complementary roles of different agents in the diffusion of ruler cults and in the fashioning of their ideological and practical features. In our discussion of ritual singing for political leaders, we have seen that poetic creativity on the one hand, and the solutions adopted by civic institutions on the other, could contribute in a significant way to the definition of cultic associations between monarchs and traditional deities as well to the creation of legitimating narratives and foundation myths of kingship. The promotion of mythological kinship between a dynasty and one or more deities is an important example of this process, and the reassessment of the case of Apollo in the cities of Western Asia Minor in the period between Ipsos and Kouroupedion has shown that a network of bottom-up associations between a king and a god in various cities could contribute in a decisive way to the fashioning of the religious *persona* of a monarch; the product of this process, or at least some of its features, could then be appropriated by royal agents at a later stage and eventually play an important part in the construction of a centralized, top-down message of dynastic legitimacy.

Lorber's meticulous study of the financial underpinnings of ritual honours in the Aegean world and in Egypt has provided an invaluable instrument for future investigations of the various sources of financial support for Hellenistic ruler cults across time and space.¹⁰ A major contribution of this study is that it has drawn attention to the interaction between top-down and bottom-up initiatives in the establishment and funding of cultic honours. In Ptolemaic Egypt, we can recognize the coexistence of at least three complementary streams of financial support for ruler cults: the first led by the state and relying on taxes, the second based on the occasional initiatives of individual donors belonging to the administrative and military elite, the third related to the regular funding mechanisms of private religious associations. A combination of voluntary and obligatory sources of income has emerged, as well as a variety of agendas leading individual persons and non-official groups to finance the ruler cult as a way to express wealth, status, and allegiance to the central power.

We may confidently assert that only a small part of the dedications and offerings of ruler cults accomplished in the Egyptian *chōra* could actually aim at having the royal house itself as their direct public. As pointed out by Paganini, local initiatives would in most cases principally respond to the logic of self-affirmation of the local elites, providing the members of cultic associations with the occasion to advertise their privileged status as a closed community of respectable and pious peers. In some documented cases, however, a cultic association could thrive thanks to the initiative of

10. We also hope that her comparative effort with the Seleucid evidence will encourage further analyses of the finances of honours for other Hellenistic dynasties. The finances of honours did not figure among the topics dealt with in the Freiburg conference *Comparing the Ptolemaic and Seleucid Empires*, 30 June – 2 July 2016. Another dynasty for which we have abundant evidence allowing for a detailed study of the financial mechanisms of honours is that of the Attalids. For some preliminary remarks in this direction, see KAYE (2012); CHIN (2018).

top-ranking members of the court elite. Such local benefactors could use cultic associations as an instrument to magnify their own prestige, while their special link with the court would increase the association members' chances for visibility by reducing the social distance between the elite of a village community and the royal house in Alexandria. Indeed, the role of high-standing functionaries and royal collaborators in the dissemination of ruler cults can hardly be overestimated, in Egypt as elsewhere. As pointed out by Lorber and Pfeiffer, individual members of the royal administration and of the court society would have every interest to use part of their wealth to patronise a lavish manifestation of religious allegiance to the kings. For these social categories, (re-)founding a shrine or financing ritual honours for the monarchs was a good strategy to gain prestige in the local community and to draw the attention of the king. It could also prove a good investment in case of political uncertainties: since Hellenistic royal officials constituted a movable elite based on personal bonds with the sovereigns, establishing a valuable connection with the king could provide collaborators with new opportunities of career and enrichment even in case war and political instability would endanger their local interests. This holds true especially for Ptolemaic oversea provinces, which were more directly exposed to the risks of change of domination. Thus, for instance, the history of the family of Thraseas of Aspendos, which provided three generations of top-ranking officials serving first Ptolemy II and III, then Antiochos III after the Seleucid conquest of Koile Syria, shows to what extent support for ruler cults was entangled with the self-promotion of the international elite of royal collaborators.

While elite members and non-official associations contributed everywhere to the dissemination of ruler cults, their particular importance in Egypt can be explained because of the limited role of Greek cities and their honorific initiatives in the heart of the Ptolemaic kingdom in contrast to other regions of the Hellenized world. Conversely, the analysis of the funding mechanisms of ruler cults in the Aegean world points to the central role of the *polis*, even though the interaction between civic and royal initiatives can show a variety of possible configurations: independent cities proactively used cultic honours as a leverage to engage sovereigns in euergetic initiatives; in some cases, however, the royal establishment could play a more direct role in steering local responses, as in the case of the Nesiotic League under Ptolemy II or in Antiochos III's failed attempt to establish a centralized dynastic cult in Asia Minor.

As seen above, civic institutions were aware of the diplomatic implications of ruler cults and of the possibility that their investments might not pay back in times of rapidly changing international politics. Moreover, cultic honours were often granted by cities directly after moments of great danger and financial distress. These observations can at least partly explain why ruler cults have left so few monumental traces in Greek cities other than in royal capitals. The direct commitment of the monarchs and the greater political stability in the heart of their kingdoms made capital cities suitable settings for ambitious projects leading to the erection of monumental cultic structures, including temples dedicated to members of the ruling houses. Conversely, out-

side royal capitals, it is very difficult to find traces of actual temples of the ruler cult. In many cases, cities and kings seem to have been satisfied with the funding of ritual performances, small altars, and statues. References to actual sanctuaries are often to be understood as open-air precincts hosting minor cultic and honorific structures.¹¹ The civic solution to make great political leaders *synnaoi theoi* of the local gods or to append new festivals for human beings to existing ones for gods and heroes can perhaps also be better understood against this background: integrating honours for great political leaders in existing spaces and events for which the city already had to pay would reduce the investment while optimising the prestige of the granted honours.

Political instabilities did not, however, prevent the cultic honours for rulers from becoming in some cases a durable component of the religious practice of a community, and even a reference in its civic identity.¹² On the other hand, when cults survived for a long time, they could undergo a significant change in their ritual and social organization. Thus, we have seen that if the cult of Arsinoe Philadelphos lasted throughout the history of the Ptolemaic kingdom, its epigraphic and archaeological footprint from the second century was very different from that of the early period of its dissemination in the Ptolemaic Eastern Mediterranean, under the reigns of Ptolemy II and III. At Pergamon, the palaeographic analysis of the altars of Attalos I has suggested that this cult might have survived the end of the dynasty, but when we find new traces of the Attalid dynastic cult in 1st-century Pergamon, these have taken up the new form of statues and rituals connected with the gymnasium and with the life of the political elite that gathered there.

A last point warrants attention since it allows us to reflect upon the entanglement between the financial and ideological dimension of agency. Paganini and Lorber have shown that from a financial point of view, no difference can be ascertained between the economy and administration of ritual acts accomplished to the sovereigns as to gods (in the dative) and of those addressed to traditional deities in favour of (*hyper*) members of the ruling house. This point relates to another one concerning the syntax of rituals and dedications. A thorough analysis of the evidence concerning offerings of ruler cults in Egyptian temples has enabled Pfeiffer to show that *hyper*-formula dedications did not express a different understanding of the interaction between donors, gods, and monarchs in Egyptian milieu than in Greek or Jewish ones. Their particular success in Egypt does not point to an Egyptianization of Ptolemaic royal worship but can be explained in relation to the special social and cultural background of Ptolemaic Egypt. Firstly, in a system whereby administrative interactions largely relied on interpersonal negotiations rather on the initiative of civic institutions, the

-
11. See the cases of the precinct of Ptolemy III and Berenike II at Itanos and the Laodikeion at Sardis. In some cases, the creation of open-air cultic spaces would be in line with local traditions: cf. the Arsinoeion created inside the sanctuary of Apollo/Reshef at Idalion, whose interpretation as an uncovered precinct fits the traditional structure of pre-Hellenistic Cypriot sanctuaries.
 12. See CHANKOWSKI (2010b) on cults surviving the death of the ruler for whom they had been created, or even the extinction of a dynasty.

habit of accomplishing rituals to gods in favour of a king or of another superior served the purpose of fostering positive relationships between various degrees of the royal and/or temple hierarchy. Secondly, the *hyper* formula provided donors with a useful tool to advertise their euergetic initiatives by exploiting the different ways Greek and Egyptian texts traditionally described agency in the financing of sanctuaries. Hieroglyphic texts, which were only addressed to the closed group of the Egyptian priestly elite, traditionally ascribed the foundation or renovation of a temple to the pharaoh even when the benefactor was a non-royal agent; however, this same donor could publicly claim his own merits via the different communication channels established by Greek and Demotic texts. It is for this purpose that the Greek *hyper* and some Demotic derivative formulae could be used by non-royal donors to commemorate their euergetic initiatives within their community and thus enhance their prestige in terms of wealth, piety, and allegiance to the central power.

Finally, the evidence of ritual honours expressed in the form of *hyper*-style dedications grows in number during the late Hellenistic period (mid-second/first cent. BC) to the detriment of dative dedications, even though dative formulae did not entirely disappear from the late-Hellenistic honorific system,¹³ and they would even know a renewed success with the beginning of the Principate.¹⁴ The fact that this trend is particularly evident in Egypt seems to depend on the abundant evidence of ritual honours for rulers in this region rather than on a Ptolemaic peculiarity, since the same phenomenon is documented in other parts of the Eastern Mediterranean as well.¹⁵ The predominance of the *hyper* formula in ritual honours for political leaders was already noticed by Price in his study of the rituals of imperial worship in Asia Minor.¹⁶ It is now tempting to consider the evidence of the Imperial period as the

13. Dative dedications are still well documented in the Ptolemaic kingdom under Ptolemy VI and VIII. For a later period, see also PFEIFFER in this volume for the coexistence of the dative and *hyper* formulae in a decree from Cyrene, *SEG IX 5*; *JGCJr011100* (109/108 BC).

14. KANTIREA (2007), *passim*; KAJAVA (2011).

15. I limit myself to a few sparse examples from outside Egypt. Since gymnasia played a paramount role in the celebration of ritual honours for rulers in the late Hellenistic period, the documentation from this type of institution is particularly useful for us here: see e.g. *IG XII Suppl. 250* (Andros; mid-second cent.), mentioning a sacrifice accomplished by a gymnasiarch during a civic festival for the health and salvation of an Attalid king, probably Eumenes II; *TAM V 2, 855* (Thyateira; mid-second cent.), probably with a monthly sacrifice accomplished by the gymnasiarch *hyper* Attalos II or III; *IG XII 3, 331* (Thera, shortly before 145 BC), referring to the celebration of the festival Hermeia and Herakleia in the gymnasium *hyper* Ptolemy VI; *SEG I 466* (Tyana, second half of the second cent.), a list of gymnasiarchs dedicated to Hermes and Herakles *hyper* Ariarathes IV. Arguing for a growing success of the *hyper* formula in late Hellenistic dedications for rulers, PRICE (1980), p. 38 adds to the documentary dossier an inscription from Delphi mentioning the festival Attaleia (*LSCG 80*), whereby sacrifices are accomplished *hyper* Attalos II. However, this example should be treated with particular care since the festival was a royal foundation of this king (like the Delphic Eumeneia of *LSS 44*, founded by Eumenes II). The festival was named after the donor and its logic was different from that of ruler cult festivals established by cities to honour a king.

16. PRICE (1980), p. 30-32.

long-term development of a shift in the ritual honorific practice, whose origins can already be traced back to the late Hellenistic period. In the future, the increasingly successful category of a “long Hellenistic Age”¹⁷ can be expected to pave the way to a better understanding of changes in social and cultural history that can only be properly appreciated beyond a historiographic framework shaped by the abrupt military break of Actium. The vocabulary and materiality of ritual honours for human beings, with their balance between durable patterns and diachronic developments, is certainly among the fields that can profit from this approach, showing that by embracing the challenge of working on the big picture of a complex phenomenon we can better identify, contextualize, and assess its most refined details and variations across time and space.

Stefano G. CANEVA

17. See in particular CHANIOTIS (2018).