

# Welcoming the New Gods

## Interactions between Ruler and Traditional Cults within Ritual Practice

Stéphanie Paul

DOI – 10.7358/erga-2016-002-paul

ABSTRACT – Among the finds uncovered during recent excavations in the small city of Aigai in Aeolis, an opisthographic stele features, on its front side, a decree introducing civic and cultic honours for Seleukos I and Antiochos I. Based on the text of this decree and a few similar inscriptions, this paper discusses how Hellenistic *poleis* associated rulers with traditional cults as a mechanism to integrate the new gods into their religious landscape. It further appears that such associations were also a means for these *poleis* to articulate the rhetoric surrounding the notion of *Soteria* against the ideological backdrop of the liberation of cities from tyranny in the context of ruler cults.

KEYWORDS – Aigai (Aeolis), Hellenistic period, religious dynamics, ruler cults, Seleucids, *Soteria*. Culto del sovrano, dinamiche religiose, Ege (Eolide), periodo ellenistico, Seleucidi, *Soteria*.

### 1. CULTIC HONOURS FOR SELEUKOS I AND ANTIOCHOS I AT AIGAI

When Greek *poleis* instituted new cults for Hellenistic rulers, they had at their disposal a variety of strategies. To integrate the new gods into the religious landscape, they built sanctuaries, temples, altars or statues. To integrate them into the religious calendar, they introduced processions, sacrifices, libations, prayers, and contests<sup>1</sup>. These options were rather limited and did not vary greatly from one *polis* to the other. However, the association of rulers with gods belonging to the civic pantheon was one of the mechanisms that *poleis* could use to give these new cults a truly local flavour.

One fine example of such cult dynamics has recently come from Aigai, a city in Aeolis, whose urban centre is located approximately 35 kilome-

---

<sup>1</sup> The interactions between ruler and traditional cults has been approached notably by Chaniotis 2003; Buraselis 2008 and Buraselis 2012.

tres south of Pergamon, on the shores of the river Pythikos<sup>2</sup>. Among the finds that have been uncovered during recent excavations is a particularly remarkable opisthographic stele which features, on its front side, a decree introducing civic and cultic honours for Seleukos I and Antiochos I<sup>3</sup>. Unfortunately, the stone suffered considerable damage due to its secondary use as the threshold of a Byzantine church: the upper part has been recut, resulting in the loss of several lines at the beginning, and a portion of the text in the middle has been erased by being walked upon. This resulted in a few unresolved difficulties in the establishment of the text. The inscription is nevertheless very informative as regards the history of Aigai in Hellenistic times, as well as the introduction of ruler cults in civic contexts.

The decree has been dated, on historical and palaeographic grounds, to the beginning of the third century BC, and more precisely, to the year 281, when Seleukos I defeated Lysimachos at Kouropedion and thus acquired control over the western part of Asia Minor. The city of Aigai, which had been under the rule of Lysimachos, perceived – or at least promoted – this change of power as a liberation<sup>4</sup>. Consequently, the *polis* issued a decree to honour Seleukos I and his son and co-regent Antiochos as θεοὶ οἱ ἐπιφανέ[ν]τες, «visible gods» (ll. 4-5) and to grant them with the epithet *Soteres*, «Saviours» (ll. 12-13 and 17). The subtext of this sentence appears very close to the notion of *isotheoi timai*, an expression attested elsewhere in the context of ruler cults, which defines their honours as equal to those intended for the gods<sup>5</sup>. Thus, the new cult for Seleukos and Antiochos features all the markers of the so-called «traditional» cults, such as the delimitation of a sanctuary, the election of a priest, and the performance of sacrifices, libations, and prayers. The similarity to traditional cults does not end here, but remains apparent in the details of the cult organisation itself.

First of all, the *polis* of Aigai decided to circumscribe a precinct (*peribolos*) and to build a temple (*naos*) near Apollo's precinct<sup>6</sup>. There, the cult

<sup>2</sup> On Archaic and Classical Aigai, cf. Hansen - Nielsen 2004, 1038-1039. Remains of public buildings were discovered as early as the 19th century, but systematic excavations only begun in 2004: cf. Doğer *et al.* 2008, Doğer - Sezgin 2009; Doğer *et al.* 2010; Doğer *et al.* 2012.

<sup>3</sup> The inscription has been published by Malay - Rici 2009. Cf. also the thorough commentary by P. Hamon and M. Sève in *BE* 2010, 522; A. Chaniotis in *SEG* LIX 1406; *EBGR* 2009 [*Kernos* 2012], 98.

<sup>4</sup> As suggested by the ll. 19-20 of the text, which prescribe monthly sacrifices on the day when the city was freed (ἐν ἡ ἡμέραι ἐλευθ[ερ]οὶ ἐγνόμεθα).

<sup>5</sup> On *isotheoi timai*, cf. Chaniotis 2003, 433.

<sup>6</sup> Ll. 5-8: να[ό]ν τε οἰκοδομησαι ὡς κάλλιστ[ον] πρὸς τῶ[ι] περιβόλωι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ [τῶ]πον πε[ρι]βαλέσθαι.

statues (*agalмата*) of both kings were to be dedicated with the inscription in the accusative form, Σέλευκον καὶ Ἀντίοχον<sup>7</sup>, while an altar of the *Soter*es was to be set up facing the temple, with the inscription in the genitive form, Σελεύκου καὶ Ἀντιόχου<sup>8</sup>. A *temenos* was also to be delimited next to the sanctuary, perhaps with the purpose of creating income to finance the cult<sup>9</sup>.

In addition, the *polis* planned to sacrifice to the kings on several occasions. First, they ought to lead bulls towards the *Soter*es' precinct during the Hecatomb and to sacrifice them in the same way as to Apollo<sup>10</sup>. Similarly, the inscription prescribes that the people of Aigai should sacrifice a bull in the month of *Seleukeion* in the same way as the sacrifice offered to Apollo in the month of *Thaxios*<sup>11</sup>. Those sacrifices are the ritual expression of the concept of *isotheoi timai* mentioned above. Additional monthly sacrifices were prescribed on the day when the city regained its freedom<sup>12</sup>. A priest, chosen from among the citizens, was responsible for these sacrifices together with the *timouchoi*, in addition to the preliminary rites (κατάρξεται) to be accomplished on the *Soter*es' altar at every assembly, in the same way as for the other gods<sup>13</sup>.

Further cultic honours include the recitation of prayers to the *Soter*es by the *hierokerux* at every public sacrifice<sup>14</sup>, and libations poured by magistrates accompanied by the offering of incense, the recitation of prayers, and the singing of a paean by the winner of the musical contest<sup>15</sup>. Seleukos and Antiochos were also the object of civic honours: the *polis* created two tribes named *Seleukis* and *Antiochis*, and named a month *Seleukeion*. They

<sup>7</sup> Ll. 8-10: ἀγάλματα ἀναθ[ε]ῖναι δύο] ὡς κάλλιστα, ἐπιγράψαντας Σέ[λ]ευκον καὶ Ἀντίοχον.

<sup>8</sup> Ll. 11-14: ἰδρύσασθαι [δ]ε καὶ βωμὸν τοῦ ναοῦ κατεναντίον σωτή[ρ]ων ἐπιγεγραμμένον Σελεύκου καὶ Ἀντιόχου.

<sup>9</sup> Ll. 14-15: ἀνεῖναι δὲ καὶ τέμενος ὡς κάλλιστ[ο]ν.

<sup>10</sup> Ll. 15-18: ἀνιέναι δὲ καὶ ταύρους ἐν τῇ ἐκατόμ[β]ητῃ εἰς τὸν περιβόλον Σελεύκωι καὶ Ἀντι[ό]χωι σωτήρσι καὶ θύειν καθάπερ καὶ τῶι [Ἀπό]λλ[ων]ι τὰς λαχούσας τῶν .ΞΙΚΝΙΩΝ. The reading at the end of line 18 is difficult, and the meaning of λαχούσαι, «women who obtained by lot (?)» remains unclear. On this passage, cf. the remarks by P. Hamon, *BE* 2010, 522 (p. 830).

<sup>11</sup> Ll. 35-37: θύειν δὲ κα[ὶ] ταῦρον ἐν τῶι μηνι τῶι Σελευκεῶνι καθάπερ καὶ τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι ἐν τῶι Θαξίωι.

<sup>12</sup> Ll. 18-20: ἄγ[ειν δὲ] κα[ὶ] κατὰ μῆνα γ' ἕκαστον δύο θυσία[ς] ἐν ἡμέραι ἐλεύθ[ερ]οι ἐγνόμεθα.

<sup>13</sup> Ll. 37-44. On the meaning of *katarchesthai*, cf. Jim 2011.

<sup>14</sup> Ll. 45-47: [—] ὁ ἱεροκῆρυξ ἐμ πάσαις ταῖς θυσίαις ταῖς δημοτελέσει τοῖς σωτήρσι Σελε[ύ]κωι καὶ Ἀντιόχωι. Although the verb at the beginning of line 45 is now lost, the sacred herald suggests that the context relates to some kind of prayer or proclamation.

<sup>15</sup> Ll. 47-51.

furthermore decreed to rebuild two public buildings, the *prytaneion* and the *strategion*, and to rename them after the two kings<sup>16</sup>.

As to how the significant expenses incurred by construction works and cult performances of this scale would be covered, the text curiously remains silent, although we cannot exclude the possibility that the funding had been regulated in the lost part of the inscription. It has been suggested that the kings themselves had contributed a sum of money for the purposes of introducing a cult in their honour<sup>17</sup>, in which case the «benefactions» twice mentioned in the decree (ἐὐεργετημάτων, l. 4; ἐὐεργεσία, ll. 58-59) would have alluded less to the kings' military achievements than to their generosity. Following this line of thought, we may wonder whether the introduction of the cult was the result of a spontaneous gesture from the city of Aigai, or rather encouraged or commissioned by the kings<sup>18</sup>. Be that as it may, the citizens would have not lacked autonomy to regulate the details in the organisation of the cult as they saw fit.

Thus far, the example of Aigai does not particularly stand out in comparison with what we already knew about Hellenistic ruler cult. Indeed, insofar as rituals for the kings were modelled after those for the gods, as expressed by the idea of *isotheoi timai*, the case of Aigai recalls in many ways the cases of Ilion, Erythrae, or Teos, to mention just a few Seleucid cases<sup>19</sup>. Although the cult practice lacked specificity *in abstracto*, the mechanisms put in place by a particular civic community may have differed considerably, inasmuch as they corresponded to a local context that is *specific*. In this respect, the Hellenistic ruler cult should not be viewed as a completely distinct phenomenon from other cults and institutions, as cities strove to integrate these honours into their own local religious landscape – even if for a short time. At Aigai, this integration happened at two different levels: (1) through the installation of the cult within the civic and religious landscape; (2) through association with the gods and goddesses of the local pantheon.

---

<sup>16</sup> Ll. 22-25, 36, 51-54. We have parallels of a tribe named *Seleukis* in the same historical context in Magnesia-on-the-Meander (*I.Magnesia* 5, l. 4) and in Kolophon (*AJPb* 56, 1935, 380-381, nr. 6). A month *Seleukeion* is also attested in Ilion (*I.Ilion* 31, l. 11).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. M. Sève, *BE* 2010, 522, who also suggests that the purpose of the *temenos* was to cover the cost of the cult in the future.

<sup>18</sup> For another example of the king's financial contribution to honours decreed by a community, cf. *I.Milet* I 9, 306, concerning the *Pantonia* at Miletus. Cf. Horster 2013, 201-202.

<sup>19</sup> Ilion: cf. below. Erythrai: Habicht 1956, 85-87; Buraselis 2012, 250-251, on the *Dionyseia kai Seleukeia*. Teos: *SEG* XLI 1003, and Chaniotis 2007.

## 2. THE INTRODUCTION OF A NEW CULT WITHIN THE CIVIC AND RELIGIOUS LANDSCAPE

The decree of Aigai prescribes the building of a sanctuary of Seleukos and Antiochos *Soteres* near Apollo's precinct. Although the god's epithet is never mentioned in the inscription, it is assumed to be the sanctuary of Apollo *Chresterios*, located approximately 3 kilometres east of the urban centre of Aigai, on the shore of the river Pythicos. Architectural remains of a temple have been found there, with an inscription (re)dedicating the temple during the time of Publius Servilius Isauricus, proconsul of Asia in 46 BC<sup>20</sup>. During the third century BC, the sanctuary seems to have been under the influence of the Attalids: two inscriptions declare that Philetairos of Pergamon and Eumenes I dedicated a piece of land to Apollo *Chresterios*<sup>21</sup>. Although the cult-epithet points towards an oracular function, not much can be drawn from the epigraphic evidence as regards the specifics of this cult. It seems safe to assume, at least, that Apollo *Chresterios* was one of the main gods of the *polis* of Aigai at that time. As a further indication of this assumption, a few issues of the city coinage represent the laureate head of the god on the obverse, with a goat, the symbol of the city, on the reverse<sup>22</sup>.

Beyond this extra-urban sanctuary, a fragmentary section of the inscription refers to an installation in the *prytaneion* (renamed *Seleukeion*) – perhaps a statue or an altar – which would have embedded the cult of the kings within the heart of the city as well<sup>23</sup>. At the very least, a second altar of Seleukos and Antiochos must have been built someplace in the urban centre, as the priest had to perform preliminary rites there at every assembly<sup>24</sup>. It would have been highly impractical for the priest to travel all the way to the sanctuary outside the city to perform such frequent rituals. Introducing cultic honours for rulers in the heart of the civic institutions was a powerful way to connect the benevolence of the kings to the fate of the *polis*. At Pergamon, performances to commemorate the victorious return of Attalos III comprised sacrifices on the altar of Hestia *Boulaia* and Zeus *Boulaios*<sup>25</sup>. A cult of Zeus *Boulaios* and Hestia *Boulaia* is also attested in Aigai and might

---

<sup>20</sup> Clerc 1886, 291-294; Bohn - Schuchhardt 1889, 46-49; Malay 1999, 21-23.

<sup>21</sup> SEG XXXVI 1110; Malay 1999, 22, nr. 3.

<sup>22</sup> BMC Troas, Aiolis, Lesbos, pp. 95-96. Other issues show Athena and Zeus.

<sup>23</sup> L. 27: [— κ]αὶ στῆσαι ἐν τῷ πρυτανείῳ [—].

<sup>24</sup> Ll. 42-44: καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις κατάρξετ[αι] ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τῶν σωτήρων καθάπερ καὶ τοῖς ἄ[λ]λοις θεοῖς.

<sup>25</sup> OGIS 332, ll. 47-49. On this inscription, cf. Robert 1984; Robert 1985, and more recently Hamon 2004.

have been similarly connected with Seleukos and Antiochos<sup>26</sup>. The *polis* of Teos set up a statue of Antiochos III in the *bouleuterion*, where magistrates sacrificed on the common altar to the king, Mneme, and Charis upon entry into office. The personifications associated with Antiochos emphasized the wish of the *polis* to remember with gratitude the royal benefactions<sup>27</sup>. Similarly at Iasos, magistrates sacrificed to Antiochos III and to the gods while handing over the keys to the city to their successors<sup>28</sup>.

Back at Aigai, we observe a mirror effect at work between the main sanctuary dedicated to the kings, located outside the urban centre and close to the sanctuary of one of the main gods of the *polis*, and a cult area connected with the civic centre and institutions. The provisions concerning the publication of the decree correspond to this double articulation of the cult locations: two copies were to be set up, one in the sanctuary of Apollo and the other in the sanctuary of Athena, next to the altar of Zeus *Soter*. The latter was presumably located on the acropolis, in the area where our copy of the inscription has been found<sup>29</sup>. A similar connection between centre and periphery may also be observed later in the famous decree from Pergamon mentioned above, dated between 138 and 133 BC and regulating honours for Attalos III upon his return from battle<sup>30</sup>. On this occasion, the whole community gathered to greet the victorious king upon his formal entry in the city, a phenomenon known as *apantesis*<sup>31</sup>. The decree also prescribes cultic honours for the long-term. In the first place, a statue (*agalma*) was to be dedicated in the temple of Asklepios *Soter*, whose sanctuary was located approximately 3 kilometres south of the acropolis of Pergamon. This made the king *synnaos* of the god, *i.e.* sharing his temple. Furthermore, an equestrian statue (*eikon*) of the king was to be erected in the most visible spot in the agora, next to the altar of Zeus *Soter*, where incense was offered to the king. In this case, the proximity is not only spatial, but also ritual<sup>32</sup>. Additional sacrifices were made on the altar of Hestia *Boulaia* and Zeus *Boulaios*, patrons of the council, so as to further connect the cult of the king with the institutions of the *polis*. Finally, in order to commemorate

---

<sup>26</sup> *Altertum von Aegae*, nr. 34 (1st cent. BC).

<sup>27</sup> SEG XLI 1003, II, ll. 29-38. Cf. Chaniotis 2007, 162-163.

<sup>28</sup> *I.Iasos* 4, ll. 68-75.

<sup>29</sup> Ll. 61-65. On the temple of Athena, cf. Bohn - Schuchhardt 1889, 35-38.

<sup>30</sup> OGIS 332.

<sup>31</sup> On royal entries, cf. Perrin-Saminadayar 2009.

<sup>32</sup> Ll. 9-13: ... ἐπιθυέτωσαν λιβανωτὸν ἐπὶ τ[ο]ῦ βωμοῦ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Σωτήρος τῷ βασιλεῖ. The fact that the dative is used rather than the formula «ὐπὲρ + genitive», suggests that sacrifices were indeed performed to the king and not simply «on behalf of» him, *pace* Robert 1985, 475. On *hyper* and genitive, cf. lately Jim 2014 and Stefano Caneva in this volume.

the arrival of Attalos in the territory of Pergamon, an annual procession departed from the *prytaneion*, i.e. the centre of the *polis*, to reach the extra-urban sanctuary of Asklepios where they performed a sacrifice funded by sacred money.

Despite the later date of the inscription from Pergamon compared with the decree from Aigai, both cases present similarities as regards the organisation of the sacred space. Also conspicuous are the association of the rulers with deities belonging to the local pantheon and the permanence of the notion of *soteria*. Both deserve a closer look.

### 3. OLD GODS AND NEW GODS IN INTERACTION

At Aigai, topographical proximity to the sanctuary of Apollo *Chresterios* is just one of the means used by the *polis* to express an association between divine and royal powers. Another way consisted in modelling the new rituals after those already in place for the god. Sacrifices to Seleukos and Antiochos introduced both at the Hecatomb and in the month of *Seleukeion* were to be performed in the same manner as for Apollo. As pointed out by P. Hamon, the Hecatomb must be a pre-existing festival celebrated in honour of Apollo *Chresterios*<sup>33</sup>. Presumably some of the sacrificial animals from the procession were simply reoriented towards the precinct of the kings. This would explain why nothing further is specified concerning which sacrifice to Apollo was meant, as opposed to the second regulation of the kind, which refers to a specific sacrifice to Apollo that took place in the month of *Thaxios*. It is also worth noting that the priest of Seleukos and Antiochos had to wear a wreath made of laurel, a plant closely associated with Apollo. This suggests that the priestly outfit took its inspiration from the cult of Apollo as well.

The pattern is not a particularity of Aigai, as modelling new rituals after traditional cult practice is a general feature of ruler cults. At Athens, it was proposed to welcome Demetrios Poliorketes, every time he would come to the city, with the same reception (*xenismos*) as the one organised for Demeter and Dionysos, two deities closely associated with the honouree<sup>34</sup>. A decree from Teos regulating honours for Antiochos III and Laodike prescribed the priest of the king to initiate the sacrifice (*κατάρχεσθαι*) and oversee the libations and other rituals performed during the festival

---

<sup>33</sup> P. Hamon, *BE* 2010, 522 (p. 830).

<sup>34</sup> Plut. *Vit. Demetr.* 12. On the relations between Demetrios Poliorketes and Athens, cf. Mikalson 1998, 75-104.



in the same way as did the priest of Poseidon at the *Leukothea*<sup>35</sup>. At Aigai, however, sacrifices were not only modelled after, but apparently also integrated into pre-existing festivals. The provisions concerning the sacrifices at the Hecatomb remind us, to a certain extent, of the phenomenon of «appended festivals», as K. Buraselis phrased them, *i.e.* festivals dedicated to rulers that were combined with pre-existing festivals to traditional deities and named after both the ruler and the god<sup>36</sup>.

As regards the significance of this association of the ruler cult with Apollo, two hypotheses can be advanced. The first would rely on the tradition that made Apollo the founder of the Seleucids, although no such reference is made explicit in the text of the decree from Aigai and it is uncertain whether this tradition dates back to Seleukos himself, or appeared later<sup>37</sup>. Beyond this potential dynastic reference there was certainly another, local one. The cult of Apollo *Chresterios* was undoubtedly one of the main cults at Aigai, and was therefore particularly appropriate to be associated with the honoured kings of the *polis*. Similarly, in Teos, Antiochos III and Laodike were associated to the cult of Dionysos, patron deity of the city<sup>38</sup>.

In this respect, the divine associations that were implemented in Ilion are also significant. A decree praises a king Antiochos, son of Seleukos, for having restored the peace in his kingdom (it remains a matter for debate whether the text concerned Antiochos I or III)<sup>39</sup>. As a result, the city decided to increase the prayers and sacrifices that were offered on behalf of the king and his family. Prayers were directed to Athena *Ilias*, Apollo, named ἀρχηγ[ῶν] τοῦ γένους, Zeus, Nike and all the other gods and goddesses. In addition, an equestrian statue of Antiochos was to be set up in the sanctuary of Athena and the king was to be named *Soter* on the inscription. The convocation of this small pantheon is almost self-explanatory: while Athena is intimately connected with the identity of Ilion and its mythical past, Apollo is invoked as patron of the Seleucid dynasty; Zeus and Nike embody the victory of the king and freedom from invaders, also echoed in the epithet of *Soter* attributed to Antiochos. As opposed to the case of Aigai, the king is not the recipient of sacrifices and prayers, but they are performed *on his behalf*, which is expressed by the formula *hyper* with the genitive. The king thus acts as an intermediary between the community and the gods. Favoured by divine protection, he is able to accomplish good

---

<sup>35</sup> SEG XLI 1003, II, ll. 13-17. Cf. Chaniotis 2007, 161.

<sup>36</sup> Buraselis 2012.

<sup>37</sup> On the role of Apollo in the Seleucid dynasty, cf. Iossif 2011.

<sup>38</sup> SEG XLI 1003. On Dionysos as patron deity of Teos, cf. Cole 1995, 313-316.

<sup>39</sup> *Ilion* 32. On this inscription, cf. Robert 1966; Piejko 1991; Jones 1993; Ma 1999.



deeds for the city. In reciprocity, the *polis* continuously prays and sacrifices on his behalf, to ensure the continuity of the gods' protection and of the royal benefactions. Yet, Antiochos must have benefited from a cult in Ilios at the time, since a priest of the king is mentioned in the decree<sup>40</sup>. This exemplifies particularly well the diversity of mechanisms used by *poleis* to express their relationship to the royal power.

#### 4. SOTERIA AS RELIGIOUS RHETORIC, FROM DIVINE TO ROYAL CULT

The decree of Aigai contains multiple references to the notion of *Soteria*, the most obvious being the cult-epithet *Soteres* that is attributed to both kings<sup>41</sup>. The inscription further specifies that the stele was to be set up in the sanctuary of Athena, next to the altar of Zeus *Soter*. The presence of this god in association with ruler cults has many parallels<sup>42</sup>, and the cult-epithet in this context evidently relates to the concepts of political safety and freedom from tyranny or barbarian invasions. In this regard Zeus *Soter* appears very close to Zeus *Eleutherios*<sup>43</sup>. Finally, an intriguing section of the text concerns the setting up of a statue (*agalma*) and an altar of *Soteira* in front of the temple of Seleukos and Antiochos<sup>44</sup>. Dedicating a statue of a king in the temple of a god, so that the former would become *synnaos* of the latter, is a common phenomenon that we have already observed in Pergamon, for Attalos and Asklepios<sup>45</sup>. In Teos, too, statues of the royal couple Antiochos III and Laodike were set up in the temple of Dionysos<sup>46</sup>. In Aigai, it is, so to speak, the other way around, as the goddess is settled in the sanctuary of the kings. Although the text does not expand on the details of this cult, the presence of an altar, next to the cult statue, strongly suggests that ritual performances took place.

---

<sup>40</sup> L. 26.

<sup>41</sup> On the epithet *Soter* attributed to rulers, cf. Muccioli 2013, 159-178.

<sup>42</sup> Thrace (JOAI 1926, 151, nr. 87): votive to Zeus *Soter*, Athena *Nikephoros* and Apollo *Pythios* for the king Eumenes, *Soter*, *Evergetis*, and founder of the city, for his brothers and for the queen Stratonike. Telmessos (Kotsidu 2000, nr. 290): altar of Zeus *Soter* on the agora on behalf of Ptolemaios, son of Lysimachos. Cyprus (*I.Kition* 2003): votive to Zeus *Soter* and Athena *Nikephoros* on behalf of the king Ptolemy IX *Soter* and his children. Cf. also the mention of a festival *Soteria kai Philetaireia* in Kyme (*I.Kyme* 17). Cf. Buraselis 2012, 252.

<sup>43</sup> On Zeus *Soter* and Zeus *Eleutherios* in Athens, cf. Lebreton 2013, 190-237.

<sup>44</sup> Ll. 10-11: καὶ πρὸ τοῦ ναοῦ στηῆσαι ἄγα[λ]μα καὶ βωμὸν τῆς Σωτείας.

<sup>45</sup> OGIS 332, ll. 7-9. Nock 1930 was the first to tackle the concept of *synnaoi theoi*.

<sup>46</sup> SEG XLI 1003, I, ll. 44-52.

The cult-epithet *Soter/Soteira* became increasingly popular during the Hellenistic period and qualified a great number of gods and goddesses. The reason can undoubtedly be found in its polysemy: the notion of *Soteria* could refer to contexts as diverse as illness, plague, famine, perils of traveling by sea or by road, and dangers provoked by foreign or civil wars. The question at hand is which goddess hides behind this bare epithet in our inscription, and whether we ought to presuppose the presence of a specific goddess at all. The editors suggested the identification of *Soteira* as either Artemis or Athena<sup>47</sup>. Both goddesses are plausible candidates, since they appear alongside Apollo and Zeus on another inscription from Aigai, dated to the reign of Antiochos I, concerning taxes imposed on royal lands<sup>48</sup>. Athena is moreover mentioned in connection with Zeus *Soter* at the end of our decree. The joint cult of Zeus *Soter* and Athena *Soteira* is well known thorough the Greek world and it would not be unusual to find it also in Aigai<sup>49</sup>. Perhaps the goddess was so prominent in the local pantheon that it sufficed to refer to her simply through her cult-epithet, but we should also consider the possibility that *Soteira* acted here independently as some personified form of the concept of *Soteria*<sup>50</sup>. A letter addressed by Seleukos I to Miletus dated to 288/7 BC, a few years before Kouropedion, contains a list of offerings dedicated to the *Theoi Soteres* to be set up in the sanctuary of Apollo<sup>51</sup>. The identification of these gods is a matter for debate, but what particularly interests our purpose is the fact that the list records a wine-cooler set reading the inscription «Of *Soteira*». Did the cult of *Soteira* in Aigai form part of a wider programme of religious propaganda surrounding Seleukos I? In any case, it is clear that the emphasis was placed here on a specific function or power, namely the deity's ability to save, rather than on an individual goddess.

On a more general level, we observe a strong interaction, in the context of ruler cults, between the epithet *Soter* and the cult of Zeus against an ideological backdrop related to the liberation of cities from tyranny. For instance, Plutarch reports that the citizens of Sicyon were offering an annual sacrifice called «*Soteria*» to Aratos to commemorate the liberation of the city from tyranny. The preliminary rites for this sacrifice were conducted by the priest of Zeus *Soter*<sup>52</sup>. Similarly, a few years before the battle

---

<sup>47</sup> Malay - Riel 2009, 45. P. Hamon seems to prefer Artemis (*BE* 2010, 522, p. 830).

<sup>48</sup> Malay 1983, 349-353.

<sup>49</sup> On Athena *Soteira*, cf. Paul 2016.

<sup>50</sup> Other cases of *Soteira* used as a bare epithet are analysed by Jim 2015 (cf. esp. 66-68 for a discussion on Aigai).

<sup>51</sup> RC 5. I would like to thank Stefano Caneva who kindly pointed out this inscription to me.

<sup>52</sup> Plut. *Vit. Arat.* 53. Cf. Buraselis 2003, 194.

of Ipsos, in 307 BC, Demetrios Poliorketes defeated Cassander, freed the city of Athens from the tyrant Demetrios of Phaleron, restored the democracy and provided the city with a large quantity of grain. Consequently, Demetrios and his father Antigonos were named *Soteres* and *Euergetai*, «saviours and benefactors». According to Plutarch and Diodoros, the Athenians passed a decree to institute a number of honours: they set up gold statues of both kings next to Harmodios and Aristogeiton, the tyrannicides, created two tribes named Demetrias and Antigonis, erected an altar with the inscription «of the Saviours», and instituted a priesthood. In addition, they planned to perform every year a procession, sacrifices, and contests, and ordered that the figures of the kings be woven into the *peplos* of Athena<sup>53</sup>. According to an inscription from the same period, an equestrian statue of Demetrios was to be placed in the agora, next to *Demokratia*, as a means of emphasizing the king's contribution to the restoration of the once lost democracy<sup>54</sup>. The configuration of these honours presents several common threads with those bestowed upon Seleukos and Antiochos at Aigai. Particularly, the topographical association with *Demokratia* in Athens may be further indication that we should interpret the figure of *Soteira* in Aigai in a more abstract way.

Yet, the ideology based on the notion of *Soteria* is not an exclusive feature of ruler cults. Just three years after the battle of Kouropedion, in 278 BC, the Greeks repelled a Galatian invasion that had threatened the sanctuary of Delphi. This miraculous victory was attributed to the intervention (*epiphaneia*) of the gods. That same year, the city of Cos passed a decree that regulated ritual performances in order to thank Apollo for his epiphany in a time of crisis and for the salvation (*soteria*) of the Greeks<sup>55</sup>. The Coans planned to send an embassy to Delphi to sacrifice an ox with gilded horns to Apollo *Pythios*, and additional sacrifices were to be offered to Apollo *Pythios*, Zeus *Soter* and Nike at home. In this way, they chose to honour the god of Delphi, the god who brought salvation, and the goddess who personified the victory of the Greeks over the barbarians. Similarly, the Delphians instituted the festival of *Soteria* to commemorate the Greek victory, where Apollo *Pythios* was honoured alongside Zeus *Soter*. The rhetoric of the Coan decree shares a few common features with the rhetoric used as grounds for the institution of the cult of the Seleucids in Aigai

---

<sup>53</sup> Diod. XX 46, 1-4; Plut. *Vit. Demetr.* Cf. Mikalson 1998, 78-83; Buraselis 2008.

<sup>54</sup> *SEG* XXV 149.

<sup>55</sup> *IG* XII 4, 68, ll. 16-20: ὅπως οὖν ὁ δᾶμος φανερός ἢ συναδόμενος ἐπὶ τῇ γεγενημέναι νίκαι τοῖς Ἑλλάσι καὶ τῷ θεῷ χαριστήρια ἀποδιδούς τὰς τε ἐπιφανείας τὰς γεγενημένας ἔνεκεν ἐν τοῖς περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν κινδύνοις καὶ τὰς τῶν Ἑλλάνων σωτηρίας.

and of Demetrios in Athens. The rulers are acclaimed as saviours, as visible gods, because they had freed the city from a threat, in this case a tyrant. The epiphany of gods in times of crisis is of course a *topos* that dates back to Homeric epic and became increasingly popular in the epigraphic evidence from the third to the first century BC<sup>56</sup>. Thus, the rhetoric surrounding the notion of *Soteria* employed in ruler cults forms part of a wider trend that will develop even further throughout the Hellenistic period.

STÉPHANIE PAUL  
Université de Liège  
ste\_paul@icloud.com

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bohn - Schuchhardt 1889 R. Bohn - C. Schuchhardt, *Altertümer von Aegae* (Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Institut, Suppl. 2), Berlin 1889.
- Buraselis 2003 K. Buraselis, Political Gods and Heroes or the Hierarchisation of Political Divinity in the Hellenistic World, in A. Barzanò - C. Bearzot - F. Landucci (a cura di), *Modelli eroici dall'antichità alla cultura europea*, Roma 2003, 185-197.
- Buraselis 2008 K. Buraselis, Woven into the Peplos: Aspects of the Combination of Ruler Cults with Elements of the Traditional Polis Identity in the Hellenistic World, in A.H. Rasmussen - S.W. Rasmussen (eds.), *Religion and Society: Rituals, Resources and Identity in the Ancient Graeco-Roman World. The BOMOS-Conferences 2002-2005* (Analecta Romana Instituti Danici, Suppl. 40), Rome 2008, 215-223.
- Buraselis 2012 K. Buraselis, Appended Festivals: The Coordination and Combination of Traditional Civic and Ruler Cult Festivals in the Hellenistic and Roman East, in J. Rasmus Brandt - J.W. Iddeng (eds.), *Greek and Roman Festivals: Content, Meaning, and Practice*, Oxford 2012, 247-265.
- Chaniotis 2003 A. Chaniotis, The Divinity of Hellenistic Rulers, in A. Erskine (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, Malden (MA) 2003, 431-445.
- Chaniotis 2007 A. Chaniotis, La Divinité Mortelle d'Antiochos III à Téos, *Kernos* 20 (2007), 153-171.
- Clerc 1886 M.A. Clerc, Les ruines d'Aegae en Éolie, *BCH* 10 (1886), 275-296.

---

<sup>56</sup> On this phenomenon, cf. Paul 2013.

- Cole 1995 S.G. Cole, Civic Cult and Civic Identity, in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State. Symposium August 24-27, 1994. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre* (Historisk-Filosofiske Meddelelser 72), II, København 1995, 292-325.
- Doğer *et al.* 2008 E. Doğer *et al.*, Aigai 2004-2006 Yılı Kazıları, in 29. *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı. 1. Cilt*, Ankara 2008, 207-232.
- Doğer *et al.* 2010 E. Doğer *et al.*, Aigai 2007-2008, in 31. *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı. 2. Cilt*, Ankara 2010, 343-356.
- Doğer *et al.* 2012 E. Doğer *et al.*, Aigai, in *Ege Üniversitesi Arkeoloji Kazıları*, İzmir 2012, 184-207.
- Doğer - Sezgin 2009 E. Doğer - Y. Sezgin, Aigai, *Aktüel Arkeoloji* 11 (2009), 12-13.
- Habicht 1956 Ch. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum Und Griechische Städte* (Zetemata 14), München 1956.
- Hamon 2004 P. Hamon, Les prêtres du culte royal dans la capitale des Attalides. Note sur le décret de Pergame en l'honneur du roi Attale III (OGIS 332), *Chiron* 34 (2004), 169-185.
- Hansen - Nielsen 2004 M.H. Hansen - T.H. Nielsen, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis: An Investigation Conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation*, Oxford 2004.
- Horster 2013 M. Horster, Priene: Civic Priests and Koinon-priesthoods in the Hellenistic Period, in M. Horster - A. Klöckner (eds.), *Cities and Priests: Cult Personnel in Asia Minor and the Aegean Islands from the Hellenistic to the Imperial Period* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 64), Berlin - Boston 2013, 177-208.
- Iossif 2011 P.P. Iossif, Apollo Toxotes and the Seleukids: Comme un air de famille, in P.P. Iossif - A.S. Chankowski - C.C. Lorber (eds.), *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 - Paris - Walpole (MA) 2011, 229-291.
- Jim 2011 T.S.F. Jim, The Vocabulary of ἀπάρχεσθαι, ἀπαρχή and Related Terms in Archaic and Classical Greece, *Kernos* 24 (2011), 39-58.
- Jim 2014 T.S.F. Jim, On Greek Dedicatory Practices: The Problem of «hyper», *GRBS* 54 (2014), 616-637.
- Jim 2015 T.S.F. Jim, Can Soteira Be Named? The Problem of the Bare Trans-divine Epithet, *ZPE* 195 (2015), 63-74.
- Jones 1993 C.P. Jones, The Decree of Ilion in Honor of a King Antiochus, *GRBS* 34 (1993), 73-92.
- Kotsidu 2000 H. Kotsidu, *TIMH KAI ΔΟΞΑ. Ebrungen für Hellenistische Herrscher im Griechischen Mutterland und in Kleinasien un-*

- ter besonderer Berücksichtigung der archäologischen Denkmäler, Berlin 2000.
- Lebreton 2013 S. Lebreton, *Surnommer Zeus. Contribution à l'étude des structures et des dynamiques du polythéisme attique à travers ses épiclèses, de l'époque archaïque au Haut-Empire*, Thèse de doctorat, Université Rennes 2, 2013.
- Ma 1999 J. Ma, Autour du décret d'Ilion en l'honneur d'un roi Antiochos (OGI 219/I.Ilion 32), *ZPE* 124 (1999), 81-88.
- Malay 1983 H. Malay, A Royal Document from Aigai in Aiolis, *GRBS* 24 (1983), 349-353.
- Malay 1999 H. Malay, *Researches in Lydia, Mysia and Aiolis* (Denkschriften der Philosophisch-Historischen Klasse 279; Ergänzungsbände zu den Tituli Asiae Minoris 23), Wien 1999.
- Malay - Ricl 2009 H. Malay - M. Ricl, Two New Hellenistic Decrees from Aigai in Aiolis, *EA* 42 (2009), 39-60.
- Mikalson 1998 J.D. Mikalson, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*, Berkeley - Los Angeles - London 1998.
- Muccioli 2013 F. Muccioli, *Gli epiteti ufficiali dei re ellenistici* (Historia Einzelschriften 224), Stuttgart 2013.
- Nock 1930 A.D. Nock, ΣΥΝΝΑΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ, *HSCP* 41 (1930), 1-62.
- Paul 2013 S. Paul, Manifestation du divin et reconfiguration des panthéons à la période hellénistique. L'exemple des Artémis d'Asie Mineure, in Ph. Borgeaud - D. Fabiano (éd.), *Perceptions et constructions du divin dans l'Antiquité*, Genève (Recherches et Rencontres 31), 237-259.
- Paul 2016 S. Paul, «Pallas étend ses mains sur notre cité». Réflexion sur le paysage épiclétique autour de l'Athéna «poliade», *Pallas* 100 (2016), 119-138.
- Perrin-Saminadayar 2009 E. Perrin-Saminadayar, La préparation des entrées royales et impériales dans les cités de l'Orient hellénophone, d'Alexandre le Grand aux Sévères, in A. Béranger - E. Perrin-Saminadayar (éd.), *Les entrées royales et impériales. Histoire, représentation et diffusion d'une cérémonie publique, de l'Orient ancien à Byzance*, Paris 2009.
- Piejko 1991 F. Piejko, Antiochus III and Ilium, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 37 (1991), 9-50.
- Robert 1966 L. Robert, Sur un décret d'Ilion et sur un papyrus concernant des cultes royaux, in A. Samuel (ed.), *American Studies in Papyrology I: Essays in Honor of C. Bradford Welles*, New Haven 1966, 175-211.
- Robert 1984 L. Robert, Documents d'Asie Mineure XXXIV-XXXV, *BCH* 108 (1984), 457-532.
- Robert 1985 L. Robert, Documents d'Asie Mineure XXXIV-XXXV, *BCH* 109 (1985), 467-484.