PRIVATE PARTICIPATION IN RULER CULTS:
DEDICATIONS TO PHILIP SOTER AND OTHER HELLENISTIC KINGS

Hellenistic ruler cult has generated much scholarly interest and an enormous bibliography;\(^1\) yet existing studies have tended to focus on the communal character of the phenomenon, whereas the role of private individuals (if any) in ruler worship has attracted little attention. This article seeks to redress this neglect. The starting point of the present study is an inscription \(\Delta \iota \iota \kappa \iota \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \iota \varphi \iota \pi \omega \iota \Sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho \iota\) on a rectangular marble plaque from Maroneia in Thrace.\(^2\) Since the text was published in 1991, it has been disputed whether the king in question is Philip II or Philip V of Macedon. The identity of the king is a matter of great historical significance: if Philip II is meant, not only would this impinge on the question of his divinity, he would also be the first king called Soter, thus providing the earliest attestation of a cult epithet spreading from the traditional gods to monarchs. The first part of this article will re-examine the king’s identity by studying the text from Maroneia in connection with other dedications similarly addressed to a ‘king Philip’ and apparently set up by private individuals. The second will move beyond Macedonia: it will draw on


potential parallels from the Attalid, Seleucid and Ptolemaic kingdoms and explore the possible contexts in which individuals set up similar objects. It will be demonstrated that, while there is evidence from other Hellenistic kingdoms of seemingly ‘private’ dedications set up according to civic or royal commands, in Macedonia the piecemeal and isolated nature of the evidence does not permit a conclusive answer. But whether set up spontaneously or by civic command, these objects provide important evidence for the interaction between the public and private aspects of ruler worship.

DEDICATIONS TO ‘KING PHILIP SOTER’

Found in secondary use in the sanctuary of Dionysus at Maroneia during the excavation in 1986, the marble plaque is inscribed in three lines with letters of 0.020-0.025 metres high. Its date is difficult to determine from the letter forms; Veligianni in the editio princeps argues that the lettering points to Philip V, whereas Hatzopoulos argues for an earlier date and identifies the king with Philip II.3 Even if the stone was inscribed during the time of Philip V, he maintains, it could have honoured Philip II posthumously, whose cult might have been renewed under the reign of his homonym and admirer Philip V.4 Similar problems of identification have been presented by several other inscriptions mentioning a ‘king Philip’, with or without the epithet Soter, which I list below:


Amphipolis, late 3rd or early 2nd century B.C.: Ἀλκαῖος | Ἡρακλείδου | Σαράπιδι, ἴσιδι, | βασιλεῖ Φιλίππων.⁵

Berga, 2nd century B.C.: Δι | καὶ βασιλεῖ | Φιλίππω.⁶

Maroneia, date unclear: Δι | καὶ βασιλεῖ | Φιλίππων Σωτήρ.⁷

Nikiti, late 3rd to early 2nd century B.C.: Βασιλέως | Φιλίππου | Σωτῆρος | καὶ Κτίστου.⁸

Thasos, before 196 B.C.: Βασιλεῖ | Φιλίππω[ι] | Σωτῆρ[ι].⁹

---

⁵ Amphipolis: P. Perdrizet, ‘Voyage dans la Macédoine première’, BCH 18 (1894), 416-45, at 416-19, no. 1; SIRIS 113; M.B. Hatzopoulos, Macedonian Institutions Under the Kings (Athens, 1996) 2.91-2 no. 75; RICIS 113/0902.

⁶ Berga: Z. Bonias (1992), ArchDelt 47, 479, with pl. 132a; Hatzopoulos (n. 5), 2.92 no. 76; SEG XLVII 917; BE (1998), 279. The stone was discovered in the village Neos Skopos, which has been identified with the site of ancient Berga in the Strymon valley: see BE (2000), 479, BE (2001), 302.

⁷ Maroneia: see n. 2 and 3.


The character of these objects is not always clear: while the ones from Nikiti (judging from the genitive) and possibly Thasos are small altars, identification of the others is hindered by the often insufficient information in existing publications. As dedications in the Greek world could take many different forms (such as statues, altars, herms, vases), and as the distinction between altars and (other) dedications is not important for the purpose here, I have referred to them collectively as ‘dedications’ to king Philip. Dedications for Hellenistic kings were mostly set up on their behalf (ὑπέρ followed by the genitive case) or in their honour (accusative). What is relatively rare is the use of the dative case, which was traditionally reserved for the gods and which now recognized implicitly the monarchs’ divinity. Setting aside the text from Maroneia, these dedicatory inscriptions have been more or less securely dated to the

10 Thasos: J. Ma, *Statues and Cities* (Oxford, 2013), at 20 n. 22, thinks that this ‘might be an altar from a private context’. Altars and statue bases can be difficult to distinguish when objects are in a fragmentary state: e.g. A. Benjamin and A.E. Raubitschek, ‘Arae Augusti’, *Hesperia* 28 (1959), 65-85, at 65, noted that other scholars have misidentified altars as statue bases; yet some of their own identifications of altars seem equally uncertain to me.

late third or the second century B.C. on palaeographical grounds;\(^\text{12}\) in the case of the one from Amphipolis, this is confirmed by internal evidence from the text.\(^\text{13}\) To reconcile the chronological gap between the date of the stone and the identity of the king he prefers, Hatzopoulos repeatedly applies his argument — that an inscription

\(^{12}\) (1) Amphipolis: Perdrizet (n. 5): ‘D’après le caractère de l’écriture, le roi est certainement Philippe V’; \textit{SIRIS} 113, ‘Rex est haud dubie Philippus V’; cf. Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulou (n. 9), 47: ‘une dédicace d’Amphipolis...à ne pas douter Philippe II’ (2) Berga: Bonias (n. 6), ‘Προφανώς πρόκειται για τον Φίλιππο Ε’, ὡς φαίνεται από τη χρονολόγηση των γραμμάτων. Αλλώστε η λατρεία του Φιλίππου Ε’ μας είναι γνωστή και από άλλες πηγές’; Hatzopoulos in \textit{BE} (1998), 279: ‘quoique le monument date indubitablement du II\(^\text{e}\) siècle a.C., l’identité du «roi Philippe» n’est pa assurée’. (3) Nikiti: Hatzopoulos (n. 5), 2.92-3 no. 78: ‘Although, judging from the letter forms, the inscription belongs to \textit{ca} 200, the King Philip... is probably Philip II’; Papangelos (n. 8): ‘erected under Perseus for Philip V or (more likely) under Philip V for Philip II’. (4) Thasos: Dunant and Pouilloux (n. 9), 230 no. 405, categorize this under inscriptions before 196 B.C. and think that ‘le roi en question est sans aucun doute Philippe V de Macédoine’, though they concede that one can hardly determine its date from the letters, which are inscribed irregularly and not very deeply; cf. Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulou (n. 9), 47 n. 5: ‘quoique l’écriture de ces deux documents soit peu soignée et irrégulière, on pourrait suggérer une datation aux environs du milieu du III\(^\text{e}\) siècle av. J.-C. et, de toute façon, avant la prise de Thasos par Philippe V en 202’.

\(^{13}\) The cult of Isis and Sarapis did not spread to Greece until the Hellenistic period. The association between Sarapis and Philip V is attested also in \textit{RICIS} 113/0503.
from the reign of Philip V can still refer to Philip II — to almost all of them. Hatzopoulos’ preference for Philip II in all these cases seems to have been influenced by known attestations of divine honours for Philip II on the one hand, and the supposed lack of such cults of Philip V on the other.

The deification of Philip II has been a subject of long-standing debate. Divine honours were possibly bestowed on him by various communities. The people of Amphipolis, according to Aelius Aristides, sacrificed to him as a god (ἐθυον ὡς θεῷ) in his lifetime; Clement of Alexandria tells us that the Athenians voted to prostrate themselves (προσκυνεῖν) before Philip at Cynosarges, implying perhaps a decision to set up a statue of the king in the shrine. We also hear of altars of Zeus

14 See Hatzopoulos (n. 5), 2.91-3 nos. 75 (Amphipolis), 78 (Nikiti); BE (1998), 279 (Berga); BE (1996), 239 (Maroneia).

15 This is expressed most clearly in BE (2002), 284 (Nikiti). See also his comments in Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulou (n. 9), 47 n. 3, on attestations of the cult of Philip II in Amphipolis: ‘la valeur de ces témoignages a été contestée, à notre avis sans raison’.

Philippios in Eresos, two *temene* of Philip in Philippoi, and a tribe named Philippeis in Philippopolis.¹⁷ Yet it is unclear if these pieces of evidence necessarily imply cult; they are slight and contentious, and some of the attestations are of disputed reliability. The state of the sources does not permit us any definitive conclusion. Precisely because the evidence is indecisive, there is a danger that one can argue for or against the validity of these sources on the divinity of Philip II (or the lack thereof), depending on one’s larger arguments and assumptions about when ruler cults came into being. I therefore prefer to collect them in a footnote and let readers decide for themselves. Regardless, even if Philip II did receive divine honours in certain communities outside Macedonia, whether in his lifetime or after death, they have little to do with our immediate concern here, as none of them uses any cult epithet: Philip II was simply referred to as ‘Philip’ in these sources, not Philip Soter or with any other title. The only available piece of evidence which describes Philip II as a ‘saviour’ is Demosthenes’ *de Corona* in 330 B.C., in which Demosthenes claims that ‘those vile Thessalians and the ill-conditioned Thebans regarded Philip as their friend, benefactor and saviour’ (οἱ μὲν κατάπτυστοι Θετταλοὶ καὶ ἀναίσθητοι Θηβαῖοι φίλον,

Yet euergetes and soter do not function here as cult titles in the same way that they did for some later Hellenistic kings, and the passage must not be taken as evidence of a cult of ‘Philip Soter’ or ‘Philip Euergetes’ in Thessaly or Thebes in the fourth century.

The dedicatory inscriptions listed above bear some striking resemblances to each other. All of them qualify the king’s name with βασιλεύς, which apparently was not used by the Macedonian kings of themselves before Alexander the Great. Yet even if βασιλεύς was not a regular part of Macedonian royal titulature under Philip II, this would not have prevented others from referring to him as such, whether during his


lifetime or in a later period when the title became official or typical of the Macedonian kings. The occurrence of βασιλεύς, though seemingly pointing to Philip V, is therefore not a decisive factor when considered alone in itself. When used, however, in Hellenistic inscriptions of a late third or early second century date as in the present instances, the word would weigh in favour of Philip V. One would expect some other form of qualification, such as the use of his patronymic, if Philip II was referred to at the time of another, reigning king of the same name. Otherwise it is unclear how contemporary readers could rightly identify the deceased homonym. The fact that the honorand is simply called ‘king Philip’ without further qualification (sometimes with the addition of ‘Soter’) would suggest that his identity must have been obvious to the viewers at the time the dedications were set up, that is, they are likely to have understood it as their present king Philip V, even if it might cause confusion to us.

20 The word βασιλεύς was already used of the early Macedonian kings by Greek historians of the Classical period: e.g. Hdt. 8.137-8, 9.44 (Alexander I), Thuc. 2.99 (Perdicas II). Isoc. *Paneg.* 126, *Archidamus* 46, uses Μακεδόνων βασιλεύς of Amyntas. Demosthenes uses Μακεδόνων βασιλείς or Μακεδονίας βασιλείς when referring to Macedonian kings in general (to whom he compares Philip II), e.g. in Dem. 1.9, 2.15, 6.20, 7.11. The documents cited in Dem. *De cor.*, in which Philip II supposedly uses the phrase Βασιλεύς Μακεδόνων Φιλίππος of himself, are apparently forgeries.

21 Also noted by Mari (n. 16, 2007), at 380.
The association between Philip and Zeus, made in the inscriptions from Maroneia and Berga, is another favourable but not determining factor in identifying the king as Philip V. Though most abundantly documented in the case of Philip V,\textsuperscript{22} association with Zeus is attested also for other Macedonian kings, including Philip II.\textsuperscript{23} The remaining element in the onomastic formulae, namely the title Soter (‘Saviour’) in the texts from Maroneia, Nikiti and Thasos, requires more detailed discussion. The cult epithet Soter could apply to multiple gods in the Greek pantheon;\textsuperscript{24} it focuses attention on the gods’ power to ‘save’, if in different ways and

\textsuperscript{22} Philip V and Zeus: Hatzopoulos (n. 5), 2.48-9 no. 28 (Philip’s dedication to Zeus Meilichios at Pella); \textit{Anth. Pal.} 16.6 (an epigram comparing Philip to Zeus), Polyb.7.12.1 (sacrifice to Zeus on Mt Ithome); Livy 27.30.9 (Philip was elected the agonothetes of the Nemean Games in honour of Zeus), 40.22.7 (sacrifice to Zeus on Mt Haemus); Plut. \textit{Arat.} 50 (sacrifice to Zeus on Mt Ithome); \textit{BCH} (1904) 354-6 no. 1 (dedications to Zeus at Panamar in Caria).


\textsuperscript{24} E.g. Hdt. 7.192 (Poseidon), \textit{SEG} XX 707 (Apollo in Cyrene), Paus. 2.31.5 (Dionysos in Trozen), \textit{BMC Thrace}, 222-4, nos. 67-89 (Heracles in Thasos), \textit{Syll.} 398 (Zeus Soter in Cos), \textit{I. Histriai} 11 (the Dioscuri in Histria), Aristid. XLVII (\textit{Hieroi Logoi I}) 1, 66 (Asclepius), \textit{I.Kanais} no. 43 (Pan in El-Kanais). Other instances
modes of action. In the Hellenistic period the epithet spread from the traditional gods to the kings: it could be accorded by cities and used in specific localities, or it could be assumed by the royal authorities and used more widely across a kingdom. The earliest secure attestation concerns Antigonus I and Demetrius I, who received cult in Athens as Soteres on account of their ‘liberating’ the city from Cassander in 307 B.C. To characterize a king with the epithet Soter was to recognize his performance of functions similar to those by the ‘saviour’ gods. These were usually (supposedly) major deeds which profoundly affected the survival, freedom, and welfare of the community concerned.

Strategically located on the coast of Thrace, Maroneia was constantly contested between different powers. It is unclear when precisely Maroneia fell under Philip II’s control, though at the latest he must have possessed the city after the battle of Chaeronea in 338 B.C. Philip V, on the other hand, is known to have twice taken


26 See n. 37 below.

27 Dem. 12.17 mentions the Athenians forcing Thasos and Maroneia to submit their dispute over Stryme to arbitration; this leads N.G.L. Hammond and F.W. Walbank, *A History of Macedonia* (Oxford, 1972-88), 2.266, 379, to think that Maroneia was still
the city, in 200 and 187/6 B.C. Maroneia was under Ptolemaic possession when Philip V captured and held it under garrison in 200 B.C.;

it was then freed by L. Stertinius in 196 B.C., only to fall under Seleucus III’s control from 194 to 189. In the treaty of Apamea between Rome and Antiochus III in 188, Eumenes II was made master of the Seleucid possessions in the Thracian Chersonese; Maroneia was excluded from Macedonian territory and assigned to no one. Nevertheless, Philip V took Maroneia again in 187/6. When required by the Roman commissioners to withdraw his garrison in 184, the king, in his anger, had his opponents in Maroneia massacred. He was finally forced to evacuate in 183.

Our sources make no mention of Philip V’s ‘saving’ actions or benefactions (if any) to the Maroneians in either period of Macedonian occupation. Nonetheless, by analogy with other kings honoured as Soter an Athenian ally in 340 B.C. (when Philip II’s letter in Dem. 12 was supposedly written), and that it probably did not come under Philip’s control until 338. The date 338 is also adopted by Hatzopoulos in BE (1991), 377. However, Veligianni (n. 3), at 191, points out that Maroneia’s dispute with Thasos actually dates to 361/0, not 340, and it is possible that Philip took the city (precise date unknown) earlier than 338.

28 Conquest in 200 B.C.: Livy 31.16.4; Walbank, Philip V (Cambridge, 1940), 133, 142 n. 2, 180, 315.

29 Polyb. 21.46.9; Livy 38.39.14, 39.27.10. Walbank (n. 28), 216, 218.

30 Philip’s second period of occupation: Polyb. 22.6, 22.13-14, 23.1.4, 23.8.1-2; Livy 39.24.6-14 (expanded version of Polyb. 22.6), 39.27.2-29.2, 39.34.1-10, 39.46.9, 39.53.10-11. Walbank (n. 28), 223-7, 232-5, 237, 240-1, 260; Hammond and Walbank (n. 27), 3.454-7, 468.
when they took over a city from another power,\textsuperscript{31} Philip V could probably have claimed to have ‘liberated’ Maroneia from Ptolemy V in 200 B.C. If cult epithets, along with other cultic honours, formed part of the process by which a community came to terms with a new power,\textsuperscript{32} Philip V is more likely to have been honoured as Soter when he first captured the city in 200, rather than upon his return in 187/6.\textsuperscript{33} In the absence of further contextual details, however, this should remain hypothetical.

Off the Macedonian coast and not far from Maroneia, Thasos was taken by Philip II probably in 340/339 B.C. with the help of Thasian supporters, and was a member of the League of Corinth in 338.\textsuperscript{34} What happened in the third century is poorly documented,\textsuperscript{35} but we know that Thasos was independent when taken by Philip V in 202 B.C. Polybius tells how, when the king put in at Thasos, the Thasians agreed to surrender the city if he would let them remain ungarrisoned, exempt from tribute, without soldiers quartered on them, and governed by their own laws (ἀφρουρητους,...

\textsuperscript{31} E.g. Demetrius I’s ‘liberation’ of Athens from Cassander in 307 B.C. (Plut. Dem. 9ff.); Seleucus I and Antiochus I’s takeover of Aigai from Lysimachus in 281 B.C. (SEG LIX 1406 A).

\textsuperscript{32} Price, Rituals and Power (n. 1), esp. ch. 2.

\textsuperscript{33} Cf. Veligianni (n. 2), who thinks that the second period of Philip V’s occupation is concerned.


\textsuperscript{35} See J. Pouilloux (n. 34), 434-7.
When Philip acceded to these requests, everyone present applauded what was said with a loud cry and ceremonially led Philip into the city (ἐπισημηναμένων δὲ μετὰ κρανγῆς πάντων τὰ ρηθέντα παρήγαγον τὸν Φίλιππον εἰς τὴν πόλιν). The king’s promises and the inhabitants’ reaction are strikingly similar to the popular reception documented for Demetrius I at Athens about a century earlier. On sailing into the harbours in 307, Demetrius announced his intention to set Athens free, to expel Cassander’s garrison, and to restore their laws and ancestral constitution to the Athenians. ‘Most of the people at once threw their shields down in front of them, and with clapping of hands and loud cries urged Demetrius to land, hailing him as their benefactor and saviour (ἀνεκρότησαν καὶ βοώντες ἐκέλευσαν ἀποβαίνειν τὸν Δημήτριον, ἐνεργέτην καὶ σωτῆρα προσαγορεύοντες). The Thasian

36 Polyb. 15.24.1-3; F.W. Walbank (n. 28), 115-17; Hammond and Walbank (n. 27), 2.413.

inscription Βασιλεῖ | Φιλίππῳ | Σωτῆρι might have been related to the events of 202: Philip’s promise to respect the city’s liberty (Polyb. 15.24.4: ἔλευθερία) might have earned him the title of Soter. If it is correct to contextualize the dedication in the events of 202, this would be an interesting example of a Hellenistic king honoured as Soter, not on account of any ‘saving’ performed, but because of his promises to maintain the present liberty of an independent city. Despite his promises, however, after gaining entry Philip seized the city, enslaved the population and held it with a garrison. This led Polybius to reflect on the fact that perhaps all kings, despite their initial talks of ἔλευθερία, would quickly mistreat those who trust them. If erected after the city had fallen, this inscription might have been an attempt to propitiate the king or to show the citizen’s allegiance. Alternatively one may suppose some royal intervention or concession not documented during his period of control. After Philip’s defeat by Rome in 196 B.C., Thasos was freed from Macedonian domination. It may not be a coincidence that, in the following decade, coins bearing the legends ΗΡΑΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ΘΑΣΙΩΝ were minted in Thasos, and contemporary with them were coins inscribed ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΥ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ clapping of hands, welcomed them as saviours and benefactors (μετὰ κρότου καὶ βοῆς ἐξανέστη, δεχομένων τοὺς ἄνδρας ὡς ἐνεργέτας καὶ σωτήρας).

38 Dunant and Pouilloux (n. 9), 230 no. 405, categorize this under inscriptions before 196 B.C., that is, before the city’s liberation by the Romans.

39 Polyb. 15.24.4-6.

40 Polyb. 18.44; Livy, 33.30.3; F.W. Walbank (n. 28), 179; Hammond and Walbank (n. 27), 3.446.
MAPΩΝΙΤΩΝ in Maroneia. Scholars have seen in the very similar coin types commercial or some other sort of ties between the two cities. Might the coins have been minted to celebrate their liberation from Philip V Soter?

The modern village of Nikiti in the Sithonia peninsula, where the altar ‘of King Philip Saviour and Founder’ (Βασιλέως | Φιλίππου | Σωτήρος | και Κτίστου) was found, is situated a few kilometres north of the ancient city of Gale, also known as Galepsus. During the reign of Philip II the Chalcidic League was

---


42 Dunant and Pouilloux (n. 9), 6 n. 1: ‘cette analogie paraît bien avoir été déterminée par des nécessités commerciales’; G. Le Rider (n. 41), 190 n. 1: ‘les dieux monnayages ont été inaugurés à la suite d’un même événement qui intéressait les deux cités’; Grandjean and Salviat (n. 41), 311: ‘il faut sans doute y voir l’effet d’une alliance monétaire’.

43 I owe this observation to Veligianni (n. 2), 143-4, but she does not link the Maroneian material to Philip V’s dealings with Thasos and the Thasian dedication to him.

44 P. Flensted- Jensen, ‘Gale(psos)’, in Hansen and Nielsen (n. 34), no. 571. This is not to be confused with the Thasian colony Galepsus near the Strymon, which was
broken up, and many cities of the Chalcidice fell under Macedonian control; nevertheless much remains uncertain about the status of these cities, the treatment they received, and their relations to Macedonia thereafter, which doubtless varied from one case to another.\textsuperscript{45} Since we do not know of a city founded by Philip II or Philip V in this region,\textsuperscript{46} Hatzopoulos and Papangelos prefer to relate ‘Saviour’ and ‘Founder’ to the foundation of the entire Macedonian kingdom by Philip II, who, according to Justin, formed one kingdom and one people from large numbers of different clans and tribes.\textsuperscript{47} Assuming that no cult of a living king is attested in Macedonia, Papangelos further suggests that the stone was erected under Perseus for

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{46} The nearest new Hellenistic settlements in the region were Cassandreia and Antigoneia, the former of which was located in an extensive territory including estates previously granted by Philip II and Alexander the Great (\textit{Syll.3} 332): see G.M. Cohen, \textit{The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor} (Berkeley, Oxford, 1995), 91-2, 95-9.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{47} Justin 8.6.2; Hatzopoulos (n. 5), 1.179, 2.92-3 no. 78, probably followed by Papangelos (n. 8).
\end{flushleft}
Philip V or, more probably in his view, under Philip V for Philip II.\(^{48}\) As Mari rightly points out, however, the word ‘founder’ might have been used figuratively, that is, it need not refer to any specific acts of foundation by the king concerned. We can think of Brasidas, who was honoured posthumously as ‘founder’ (οἰκιστής) and ‘saviour’ (σωτήρ) of Amphipolis in 422. The Amphipolitans were transferring the existing cult honours of Hagnon (the Athenian who founded the city in 437 B.C.) to Brasidas, though Brasidas had not in fact founded the city.\(^{49}\) Similarly Aratus, who liberated Sicyon from Nicocles’ tyranny in 251 B.C., was buried inside the city as its ‘founder’ and ‘saviour’ (ἀσπερ οἰκιστὴν καὶ σωτήρα τῆς πόλεως ἐκήδευσαν) in 213.\(^{50}\) In both cases an individual was called soter and oikistes in recognition of his liberating the city, a great contribution which was put on a par with, but did not actually involve, city foundation. The word oἰκιστής was used much more frequently in the Classical period than κτίστης, which is attested occasionally from the fourth century onwards.

\(^{48}\) Recently Mari (n. 16, 2008) (262-3 on this inscription) has argued against the view that no ruler cult, at least as far as living kings are concerned, ever existed in Classical or Hellenistic Macedonia.


\(^{50}\) Plut. Arat. 53; see also Paus. 2.9.4; A. Griffin (1982), Sikyon (Oxford), 79-81. For Hellenistic kings called Soter and Ktistes, see e.g. OGIS 301 (Eumenes II); I.Estremo Oriente 103 (Antiochus IV).
and became extremely common in the Roman period.\footnote{See W. Leschhorn, \textit{Gründer des Stadt} (Stuttgart, 1984); M. Casevitz, \textit{Le vocabulaire de la colonisation en grec ancien} (Paris, 1985), esp. 69-70; F. Muccioli, \textit{Gli epiteti ufficiali dei re ellenistici} (Stuugart, 2013), 201-2. In the Roman period numerous altars were set up to Hadrian as \textit{soter} and \textit{ktistes}: see n. 66.} Even if \kappa\tau\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma\ does not necessarily refer to actual ‘founding’, it nevertheless remains difficult to relate Philip’s epithets to other deeds (if any) since little is known about either Philip’s dealings with Gale(psus) or its nearby areas.

We have seen the possible contexts in which Philip V could have been honoured as Soter in various communities, yet in the later Hellenistic period a specific context is not strictly necessary. When used of Alexander’s early successors (as in the cases of Demetrius I, Ptolemy I, Seleucus I and Antiochus I), Soter invariably referred to specific deeds of the kings: it was not kingly status \textit{per se} which made a king ‘Soter’, but his performance of ‘saving’ functions for the \textit{soteria} or \textit{eleutheria} of the community. We would therefore expect some exceptional ‘saving’ act from Philip II if he was indeed the earliest Soter. By the late third and early second century B.C., however, the epithet Soter had become increasingly routine: communities probably felt compelled to use a title which had become fairly common if not standard in the treatment of Hellenistic monarchs. Instead of responding to a particular ‘saving’ act performed, a king might be honoured under this title because of his potential to do good (and harm). Among the Antigonids alone, Antigonus I Monophthalmus, Demetrius I Poliorketes, Antigonus II Gonatas and Antigonus III Doson are known to
have received the title Soter.\textsuperscript{52} By the time Philip V came to power, this had become a fairly standard way of showing respect for a king, and the very fact of his ruling over Maroneia and the Chalcidice might have been a sufficient reason for honouring him as such. Although much remains unclear about the precise context in which these dedications were set up, taken together, the Hellenistic date of almost all of these inscriptions, the use of βασιλεὺς Φιλίππος without further qualification, the well-documented association between Philip V and Zeus, and the prevalence and routinization of Soter as a royal epithet by the late third century B.C. all weigh in favour of Philip V as the ‘King Philip Soter’ in the texts from Maroneia, Nikiti and Thasos.

After the defeat of Philip V in the Second Macedonian War, the Roman general Flamininus famously proclaimed the freedom of the Greeks in the Isthmian Games of 196 B.C. In the flurry of public excitement, everyone sprang forward to hail him as the saviour and champion of Greece (προσειπείν τὸν σωτῆρα τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ πρόμαχον).\textsuperscript{53} At more or less the same time in Thessaly, where much of the

\textsuperscript{52} Antigonus I and Demetrius I: Plut. Dem. 10.3, Diod. Sic. 20.46.2, \textit{SEG} XXX 69. Antigonus II Gonatas: V.C. Petrakos, Δῆμος τοῦ Ραμνοῦντος (Athens, 1999), no. 7, and possibly \textit{IG} XII Supp. 168. Antigonus III Doson: Polyb. 5.9.10, 9.36.5, \textit{IG} V.2 229, \textit{IG} V.1 1122, and possibly \textit{SEG} XLVIII 812 (Gonatas has also been suggested as the king in question).

\textsuperscript{53} Plut. Flam. 10.5; see similarly Polyb. 18.46.12, with Walbank’s commentary ad loc. He was also honoured as Soter in Chalcis (Plut. Flam. 16.4), Gytheum (\textit{Syll.}\textsuperscript{3} 592) and Acrocorinth (Livy 34.50.9).
campaigning (including the decisive battle at Cynoscephalae) took place, a penteteric festival called the *Eleutheria* was established in Larisa in honour of Zeus Eleutherios, the very god with whom Philip identified himself. If it is correct to think that Philip V was formerly Soter in various communities, to call Flamininus Soter and to honour Zeus Eleutherios as a symbol of collective Greek freedom might have been a deliberate insult to Philip and a negation of the *soteria* he supposedly provided.

‘PRIVATE’ DEDICATIONS TO HELLENISTIC KINGS: CONTEXTS AND MOTIVATIONS

The dedications to Philip Soter raise important questions of the identity of their dedicators and their possible motivations. Of the inscriptions cited earlier, only the one from Amphipolis indicates the dedicator’s name; yet the size and limited scale of all these objects and, in the Thasian case, the quality of the craftsmanship and the error of the stonecutter, suggest that they are very likely to have been brought by


55 Amphipolis: see n. 5.
private individuals. These dedications have received far less discussion than public
cults and civic monuments set up by cities, and, given their simple and often
anonymous nature, can easily escape our attention.

The phenomenon is, however, not unique to Philip V. Similar dedications are
documented for other Hellenistic kings, such as Attalus I and Eumenes II:

_I.Pergamon_ 43, small altar, Pergamum: βασιλεί | Ἀττάλων | σωτήρι | Ἀπολλόδωρ[ος].


_I.Pergamon_ 45, small altar, Pergamum: βασιλέως | Ἀττάλον | σωτήρος.

_I.Pergamon_ 59, small altar (and statue?), Pergamum: βασιλέα [Ἀτταλον(??)] | θεόν
σωτήρα καὶ | τὸν βαμών [ὁ δείνα].

_MDAI(A) _ 33, 403-4, no. 32, altar-shaped base, Pergamum: βασιλεῖ Ἀττάλει |
Σωτήρι Μητρεις ή | ιέρεια.

_RPhil_ 23 (1899), 283 no. 5, honorific statue, Heraclea near Latmus: βασιλέα |
Ἀτταλον | Σωτήρα.

---

56 Size of dedications: Amphipolis: 0.20 x 0.22 m; Berga: 0.30 x 0.26 – 0.33 x 0.09 m;
Maroneia: 0.36 x 0.35 x 0.13 m; Nikiti: 0.61 x 0.32 x 0.28 m; Thasos: 0.137 x 0.19 x
0.165 m.

57 Private dedications to the Ptolemies (in the dative) are also attested, and are often
more elaborate in formulae: e.g. _OGIS_ 24, 62-3, 82, 102-03, 106, 111, 732; _SB_ 1.1104,
3993; _SEG_ II 867, XX 509, XXIV 1174, XLIV 1507; see also P.M. Fraser, _Ptolemaic
OGIS 289, small altar, Heraclea near Latmus: [Βασίλεως | [Ἀττά]λου | Σωτήρος.

MDAI(A) 27, 95 no. 86, altar, Pergamum: βασιλεῖ Εὐμένει θε[ω] | σωτήρι καὶ εὐεργε[τη] οἱ βάκχοι τοῦ εὐαστοῦ θ[εοῦ].

MDAI(A) 27, 95 no. 87, altar, Pergamum: βασιλέως | Εὐμένους | σωτήρος.

Formulated so similarly to each other and to the ones for Philip Soter, these altars and statue bases are interesting but also frustratingly unrevealing. All that is stated — mostly in the dative case, occasionally in genitive or accusative — are the king’s name, his title basileus, his epithet Soter, and, in a few cases, the dedicator’s identity.

We find a priestess called Metreis and a group of Dionysiac associates in Pergamum.  

58 Although none of the inscriptions indicates the occasion when it was set up, contextual evidence suggests that they were erected after Attalus I and Eumenes II defeated the Gauls in the 230s and 180s respectively: 59 they earned the title Soter as a result of their successful defence and protection of their subjects. Epigraphic and

58 LGPN Va, s.v. Metreis (6).

literary sources describe the savage and violent nature of the Celtic invaders: how they desecrated temples and shrines, set fire to farms and houses, killed women and children alike, and took many inhabitants prisoners.60 A marble *stele* found in Thyateira, firmly dated to 276/5, shows a father giving thanks to Apollo Pityaenos for the release and safe return (*soteria*) of his son, who had been captured by the Galatians.61 The threat posed by the Gauls in Asia Minor was therefore dire and real, and these dedications were responses to deliverance from a real crisis. Did individuals, otherwise helpless to defend themselves, offer dedications to their kings as a token of their respect and recognition in return for protection received? Unfortunately they have left no explicit statement of thanks and hope addressed to the monarchs, and their motivations remain difficult to pin down.

That the dedications for Attalus I and Eumenes II concentrate in Pergamum may itself be significant. We would like to know whether they were originally set up in the same area62 and on the same occasion — such as some celebration in the capital upon the kings’ triumphant return or a ceremony during which Attalus I was

60 See e.g. *I.Priene* 17 = *I.Priene*2 28 (Priene’s honorific decree for Sotas); *I.Laodikeia* no. 1 (decree from Laodicea honouring Achaeus and his agents for services during the Gallic war); Paus. 10.22.3-4. See also S. Mitchell, *Anatolia: Man, Land and Gods in Asia Minor* (Oxford, 1993), 1.17.

61 *TAM* V.2 no. 881.

62 Of the five altars in Pergamum for Attalus I, four came from the acropolis, but each had a different find-spot (the agora, the theatre, the sanctuary of Demeter, the sanctuary of Athena), and the fifth came from the sanctuary of Aspordene in the mountain round Pergamum.
acclaimed ‘king’ and ‘saviour’.\(^{63}\) Our literary sources do not document the rituals (if any) on the kings’ return after defeating the Gauls. But an analogy may be drawn with Attalus I’s reception in Athens in 200 B.C. Polybius tells us that, in response to an Athenian request for help against Philip V, Attalus I arrived at Athens and was met not only by magistrates and cavalrymen but by all the citizens with their wives and children, which demonstrated the *philanthropia* of the populace. All the temples were thrown open, victims were placed ready at all the altars, and the king was asked to offer sacrifice.\(^{64}\) Could it be that Attalus I and Eumenes II, upon returning to Pergamum, were greeted by citizens who had set up altars in their honour and upon which sacrifice would be performed as an expression of their goodwill and *philanthropia*? Similar receptions are documented for Ptolemy III in the Gourob papyrus. In 246 B.C., at the beginning of the Third Syrian War, when Ptolemy III and his company arrived at Seleukia, they were greeted by priests, magistrates, soldiers and other citizens wearing garlands. According to Holleaux’s supplements, private citizens asked them to sacrifice victims on the altars they had built by their houses (col. III 3-5: [ἐπεὶ δὲ] εἰς τὴν πόλιν [εἰσήμεν, ἥξιον ἡμὰς τὰ παρασταθέντα]).

\(^{63}\) Attalus I was given the title ‘king’ after his Gallic victory: Polyb. 18.41.7 (= Livy 33.21.3); Livy 38.16.14; Strabo 13.4.2, 624. It is sometimes thought that the *Basileia* mentioned in *OGIS* 268 were games instituted to celebrate Attalus I’s assumption of the title of king (e.g. W. Dittenberger in *OGIS*; Wilcken, *RE* s.v. Attalos I, 2159; E. Meyer, *Die Grenzen der Hellenistischen Staaten in Kleinasiien* (Zurich, 1925), 98); but L. Robert, ‘Inscriptions grecques inédites au Musée du Louvre’, *RA* 2 (1933), 121-47, at 136, and L. Robert, *Villes d’Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1962), 36 n. 6, showed that the festival was held in honour of Zeus Basileus; cf. R.E. Allen (n. 59), 105 n. 120.

\(^{64}\) Polyb. 16.25, Livy 31.14.12.
θύματα [οί ιδιωταί θόσαι ἐπὶ τοῖς βωμοῖς τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτῶν κατασκευασθέοι παρὰ τὰς οἰκίας].

We can further think of the numerous altars in different parts of the Greek world for Hadrian as Soter and Ktistes in the second century A.D.: these are generally interpreted as a Greek response to the emperor’s appearance in person on his travels. Although similar receptions are not documented for the Attalids after their Galatian victories, the parallels offered by Attalus I, Ptolemy III and Hadrian in Greece make it probable that the kings’ physical presence or *epidemia* might have prompted these objects.

---

65 W.Chr. no. 1, esp. col. II 23-5, col. III 3-5 (reception at Seleukia), 19-25 (similar reception at Antioch), with supplements and discussion in M. Holleaux, *Études d’épigraphie et d’histoire grecques* III (Paris, 1942), 281-310 (308-9 on the reception of kings). The lines quoted were supplemented by Holleaux on the analogy of *I.Magnesia* 100 = *LSAM* 33, according to which sacrifices should be made to Artemis Leucophryene by each of the inhabitants before the door, according to the means of the households, on altars constructed by them (A. lines 7-10: ; see also 87-8). On altars in or outside private houses, see also C.G. Yavis, *Greek Altars* (St. Louis, 1949), 175-6; A. Pelletier, ‘Note sur les mots διατριβή, ἰερόν, διάθεσις’, *Recherches de Papyrologie* IV (1967), 175-86, at 180-4.

66 Altars for Hadrian: W. Weber, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus* (Leipzig, 1907), 134, 188, 205; A.S. Benjamin, ‘The Altars of Hadrian in Athens and Hadrian’s Panhellenic Program’, *Hesperia* 32 (1963), 57-86; Price (n. 1), at 69. Numerous (private?) altars are similarly documented for Pompey, Augustus and Trajan. All of them are small in scale, usually anonymous, and formulated similarly. On altars for Augustus, see Benjamin and Raubitschek (n. 10).
Despite these dedications’ seemingly private character, it is far from clear whether they were set up on individuals’ own initiative or following civic or royal commands. Evidence from the Seleucid and Ptolemaic kingdoms suggests that members of citizen bodies might be required to set up domestic altars. According to a decree from Teos concerning the local cult of Antiochus III and Laodice III, each of the symmorai (civic subdivisions) had to build an altar of the royal couple, and all others who live in the city (presumably meaning foreign residents) had to sacrifice and celebrate the festival in their own houses according to their means.67 Here the initiative came from the subject city, but similar commands could also be issued by the king himself. When recounting the Jewish struggle for religious and political independence from 175 to 135 B.C., the first book of the Maccabees records Antiochus IV Epiphanes’ decree to his whole kingdom ordering, inter alia, the construction of altars for sacrifice (οἰκοδομήσαι βωμοὺς καὶ τεμένη καὶ εἰδώλια καὶ θεεῖν ὅεια καὶ κτήνη κοινά). Not only were altars constructed in the cities of Judah all around, local inhabitants also offered sacrifice at the doors of the houses and in the streets (καὶ ἐπὶ θυρῶν τῶν οἰκίων καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἐθύμιον).68 Ma has argued that the obligatory building of altars in front of houses, along with compulsory participation in civic festivals, does not constitute religious ‘persecution’

67 SEG XLI 1003, II.9-13, 24-5; J. Ma, Antiochos III and the Cities of Asia Minor (Oxford, 1999), 311-17, no. 18, with discussion in A. Chaniotis, ‘La divinité mortelle d’Antiochos III à Téos’, Kernos 20 92007), 153-71. The date is disputed: Ma prefers c. 203 B.C. to 197/6 B.C.

68 I.Macc. 1.47, 1.55.
of the Jews but a standard administrative measure for integrating the subject community into the Seleucid city of Antiocheia, a phenomenon also attested in the decrees of various Hellenistic poleis. Here we are not told if the sacrifices were offered to Antiochus or the Greek gods, but an Alexandrian decree concerning the cult of Arsinoe II Philadelphus attests to the construction of household altars for private sacrifices to the queen. It stipulates that ‘those who wish to sacrifice to Arsinoe Philadelphus are to sacrifice in front of their shrines (?) or on the [housetops?] in the street along which the canephorus passes’ ([οι δὲ] βουλόμενοι θυεῖν Αρσιν[όη Φιλαδέ]λφωι θυνέτωσαν πρὸ τῶν ἱδ[ρυματ]ῶν ἡ ἐπὶ τῶν [ . ]. μάτων ἦ κα[τὰ τὴν] ὁδὸν ἦν ἢ καὶ[η]φόρος βαδίζ[ημ].) ‘all are to build altars of sand. But if any have ready-built altars of brick, they are to strew sand on them’ (το[ὺς] δὲ βωμοὺς ποιεῖτωσαν πάντες ἐξ ἀμ[μ]οῦν. ἐὰν δὲ τ[ὴν]ινες [οἱ]κοδομητοὺς πλυνθίνους ἧχ[ως]άν ποιητός θυεῖν ἐπάνω ἄμμον). Louis Robert brilliantly associated this decree with a series of stone plaques, most of which were simply inscribed Αρσινόης Φιλαδέλφου in the genitive, from various parts of the Greek world. These plaques, he suggested, once formed part of the household altars


70 P.Oxy. 2465 fr. 2, col. I (tran. P.Oxy.).
referred to in the decree, which allowed private households to offer sacrifice to the queen.\footnote{Robert (n. 68), esp. 192-4 (on the decree), 202-4 (on archaeological evidence). On dedications to Arsinoe Philadelphus, see recently \textit{SEG} XLI 856; T. Schreiber, ‘’Ἀρσινόης θεᾶς φιλαδέλφου’’ - Ein Miniaturlaltar der Arsinoë II. im Archäologischen Museum der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität Münster’, \textit{Boreas} 34 (2011), 187-201 (\textit{SEG} LXI 1538). Also related to the cult of Arsinoe might have been a series of crudely made Ptolemaic \textit{oinochoai} decorated with relief showing a female figure pouring libation beside an altar: these might have been used by private households for libations when celebrating the cult. See D.B. Thompson, \textit{Ptolemaic Oinochoai and Portraits in faience} (Oxford, 1973), esp. 71-5, 117-22.}

The cases of the Seleucids and Ptolemies attest not only to the role of the royal house behind the seemingly spontaneous dedications, but also the use of house altars as a means of private participation in the public cults of rulers. As far as the Attalids are concerned, scholars generally agree that there is little or no evidence of a dynastic cult,\footnote{On the cults of the Attalids, see e.g. Hansen (n. 59), 453-70; D. Fishwick, \textit{The Imperial Cult in the Latin West} (Leiden, 1987-), I.1, 17-8; cf. Allen (n. 59), 145-58, who thinks that a royal cult was probably founded in the year 188 when the Attalid kingdom expanded in power and territory following the treaty of Apamea.} but the strikingly similar series of altars and statue bases for Attalus I Soter and Eumenes II Soter, and their concentration in the state capital, may point to some royal decree proclaiming the kings’ epithet as official and requiring their worship with altars and sacrifice under that title. Some state organization was probably involved,
though how precisely it was regulated — as for instance by some royal decree, which has not survived — can only be speculated upon.

Are we to suppose, then, that the dedications to Philip Soter follow a similar pattern, namely that they were also prescribed by a public command? Compared to the striking series of dedications to the Attalids, however, those for Philip V Soter are attested in an isolated matter and scattered in different locations, and, as we have seen, not all of them can be shown to be altars. The piecemeal state of the evidence makes it much more difficult to determine if they were set up on an ad hoc basis as expressions of loyalty, allegiance or private devotion to Philip, or whether they were prescribed by some civic decree in relation to a public cult. We do not know, and perhaps need not suppose, that all the dedications for Philip fulfilled the same function and arose from one single context.

CONCLUSION

As with dedications to the gods, the possible reasons for dedicating to kings were many. Although much remains uncertain about the reasons and contexts in which these objects were set up, they remind us, significantly, of the possible role of individuals in ruler cults: far from being a matter between the king and the civic community, ruler worship might also involve the participation of anonymous individuals whose role can easily elude us. Given the isolated nature of these dedications and the absence of corroborating evidence, however, we do not know whether the dedications to Philip V Soter concern a private or public cult, that is, whether individuals were honouring the king on their own initiative, or whether they were participating in a public cult in accordance with some civic or royal decree (as
may be the case suggested for the Attalids). Individuals’ cult practices and use of royal epithets are likely to have followed civic practices. Nevertheless, we cannot rule out the possibility that in some cases private practices might operate independently of, or even affect, public ones.\(^3\) Public and private worship of monarchs could therefore influence, reinforce and interact with each other.

The dedications from Maroneia and elsewhere not only raise questions of private participation in ruler cults, but also challenge us to reassess some of the widely-held assumptions about the Macedonian kings, who are often thought to be less prominent in receiving cult than their Ptolemaic, Seleucid and Attalid counterparts. Long ago it was assumed that Antigonus II Gonatas did not receive cult, but subsequently one instance in Rhamnus, and possibly another in Ios, have come to light.\(^4\) If the various dedications in Maroneia, Thasos and Nikiti are correctly

\(^3\) See e.g. \textit{OGIS} 19 and O. Rubensohn, ‘Neue Inschriften aus Ägypten’, \textit{Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete} 5 (1909), 156-8, no. 1, both of which are dedications set up by individuals in honour of (accusative) Ptolemy I Soter during his life-time. That Ptolemy I is called Soter in these two life-time dedications is significant, as other epigraphic attestations of his title all date to the period after his death. It seems possible that some individuals were already calling him Soter independently of, and prior to, the official adoption and promotion of that cult title by the Ptolemaic royal house, which happened only after his death during the reign of his son Ptolemy II. I will discuss this phenomenon in greater detail in a later study.

\(^4\) Petrakos (n. 52), no. 7 (262-240/239 B.C.) = \textit{SEG} XLI 75 (before 236/5 B.C.); \textit{IG} XII Supp. 168. Discussed in C. Habicht (n. 14), 65-73, 81, 256-7; C. Habicht, ‘Divine
identified as belonging to Philip V, it would be another example of a Hellenistic king called Soter, and another instance where modern preconceptions about a Macedonian king’s divinity (or the lack thereof) need to be reconsidered.
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