

SELEUKID STUDY DAY VI
Reception, Response, and Resistance:
Reactions to Seleukid Claims to Territorial Rule or Hegemony

Nipissing University, North Bay ON
1–3 September 2017

List of 19 Paper Abstracts & CVs

1) Eran Almagor (Jerusalem, Israel):
Two Possible Ways of Jewish Response to the Seleukids
Email: [eranalmagor at gmail.com](mailto:eranalmagor@gmail.com)

Abstract:

This paper addresses two possible ways in which Jews responded to Seleukid rule and claims to authority, as seen in Jewish sources. One mode of response is that of acceptance and the other is defiance up to the level of open revolt. Whereas the latter one is visible in the *Books of Maccabees* and the Jewish tradition, the former may be gleaned from several passages in Jewish literature, i.e., Josephus, and the *Book of Esther*.

While probably conveying a popular tradition that goes back to Persian times, and presumably echoing a vague memory of a brief and turbulent time of the Jews or of Judaea under Xerxes (cf. *Ezra* 4.6), *Esther* is late. It stands to reason that the book was composed during the Seleukid period (Fox 1991, 139–140) and reflects a Jewish exilic existence, rather than one centered in Judaea. Its message is one of approval of a foreign rule, of recognition that power and position could be gained only through the royal court, and its ultimate goal seems to be the enjoyment of religious autonomy of Jews in a separate physical presence among the gentiles (cf. Jos. *BJ* 7:43–45 on the Jews of Antioch). The only acts of violence mentioned in *Esther* are not against the sovereign, but rather sanctioned by it (*Est* 8.11–13, 9.1–16). The participation of Jews in these violent acts may evoke their part in the Seleukid army (*2Macc* 8.20, against the Galatians), perhaps as mercenaries (cf. Jos. *AJ* 12.147–153, if authentic). The loyalist impression of *Esther* is further attested in that no higher authority above the Great King is present, since God is not even mentioned in the story.

The other reaction to Seleukid rule is the famous violent resistance of the Hasmonaean revolt. The demands of the rebels for political independence (alongside religious autonomy) can be seen in *2Macc* (e.g., 2.17, 2.22, 9.14–15, 15.22), a condensed version of a five-book history written by Jason of Cyrene (2.23) and probably of a diasporan venue itself (Schwartz 2008, 45; 52); it is thus of a presentation comparable to contemporary claims for political autonomy. It is significant that this book ends with a victory over the Seleukid general Nikanor at the Battle of Adasa, before the ensuing setbacks in the Jewish struggle (*1Macc* 9).

The two responses may seem to be reactions to two different claims voiced by the Seleukid ruler: one as overarching king, like the Persian monarch (Ma 1999, 272–276; Tuplin 2008, 119), and the other as a local king, identifiable with the Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar (cf. Borsippa Cylinder, Sachs and Hunger 1989, 187A rev.11; *1Macc* 1.24b). The two Jewish responses were probably seen as competitive by the Jews themselves, and of note is the proximity of the festive ‘Day of Nikanor’ on the 13th of Adar and ‘Purim’ (or ‘Day of Mordechai’: *2Macc* 15.36) on the

14th or 15th of Adar. Gradually (till the modern era), Purim grew in prominence at the expense of the commemoration of the political aspects of the Hasmonean revolt.

References

- Fox, M.V. 1991. *Character and Ideology in the Book of Esther*, Grand Rapids MI.
- Ma, J. 1999. *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford.
- Sachs, A.J. & H. Hunger 1989. *Astronomical Diaries and Related Texts from Babylonia*, vol. 2, Vienna.
- Schwartz, D.R. 2008. *2 Maccabees. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature*, Berlin.
- Tuplin, C.J. 2008. 'The Seleucids and Their Achaemenid Predecessors: A Persian Inheritance?' in S. Mohammad Reza Darbandi & A. Zournatzi (eds.), *Ancient Greece and Ancient Iran: Cross-Cultural Encounters. 1st International Conference (Athens, 11–13 November 2006)*, Athens, 109–136.

Short CV:

After serving as a Visiting Scholar at Oxford University (2006–2007), Dr. Almagor earned his PhD at Hebrew University (2007). Subsequently, Dr. Almagor was a Postdoctoral Fellow of the Max Weber Kolleg, Erfurt (2011), a recipient of the Minerva Stiftung, Max Planck Gesellschaft (2009–2011), and a British Academy Visiting Fellow (2009) before becoming a Lecturer at Ben Gurion University (2011–2014). He is currently an independent scholar. Dr. Almagor has published extensively on Hellenistic history and his contributions to Seleukid scholarship include: 'Seleukid Love and Power: Stratonike I' in A. Coşkun & A. McAuley (eds.), *Seleukid Royal Women. Creation, Representation and Distortion of Hellenistic Queenship in the Seleukid Empire*, Stuttgart 2016, 67–86. Other notable publications include: (with J. Skinner) (eds.), *Ancient Ethnography: New Approaches*, London 2013, and 'The political and the divine in Achaemenid royal inscriptions' in T. Howe et al. (eds.), *Ancient Historiography on War and Empire*, Oxford 2017, 26–54.

2) Altay Coşkun (University Waterloo ON):

Historical and Ideological Implications of Eras in the Orbit of the Seleukid Empire

Email: acoskun@uwaterloo.ca

Abstract:

The counting of time according to the years of an individual monarch ('regnal years') can be traced back to the Bronze age. In contrast, Antiochos I was the first Hellenistic ruler to establish a count for his whole dynasty. This started with the foundational campaign of his father Seleukos I in 312/311 BCE. With minor regional variation, it became the chronological point of reference throughout the kingdom for centuries to come or, in other words, the beginning of the 'Seleukid Era'. Gradually, however, several minor kingdoms or cities in the former territory either replaced the Seleukid Era by introducing their own regnal year counts or dynastic or civic eras respectively, occasionally even side by side with the Seleukid Era. It is crucial for the interpretation of the ideological implications of using or rejecting Hellenistic eras to identify not only their start years, but also the time when those counts were effectively introduced, modified, abandoned, rejected, or even resumed; likewise, it may be relevant to specify the audience that was being addressed. Case studies that draw on the (1) Arsakids of Parthia, (2) Maccabees of

Judaea and (3) Mithradatids of Pontos and the Bosporos will illustrate the complexity of the problem as well as the potential of shedding light on ideological choices made in the orbit of the Seleukid Empire.

(1) The beginning of the **Arsakid era** is the 1st Nisan 247 BCE. While this has often been seen as the date of the decisive or at least first major defection from the Seleukids, the late attestation (beginning with the coinage of Phraates IV, 37/32 BCE) recommends some caution. This is all the more in place since there is sufficient evidence for continued loyalty until the 160s despite some temporary upheavals. The start date rather seems to mark the appointment of Arsakes as the *karanos* (satrap) by Antiochos II, probably as a reward for helping defeat the usurper Andragoras.

(2) The **First Book of Maccabees** is a conundrum: while the tone is largely hostile towards the Seleukids and proudly documents Judaeian independence under Maccabaeian (or Simonid) leadership, no other extant Greek text includes as many Seleukid era years (namely 25). Previous scholarship pointed either towards Seleukid or Babylonian chronicles as sources, or simply to the convenience of this rational time count. While this cannot be excluded, it deserves to be pointed out that the bulk of the text seems to have been written or edited before 129 BCE, when John Hyrkanos II finally gained independence for good. Accordingly, much of the text is still quite friendly to the Seleukids, in how they proudly heralded the royal letters that conceded privileges, and thus neither hesitated to draw on the Seleukid era. It is only the final revision that changed the tone and focused on the full independence of the high priest by denouncing the treacherous character of the Seleukid kings and praising the Romans as guarantors of their freedom (129/28 BCE). One may add that the Maccabees / Hasmonaeans never introduced a dynastic era, but the earliest year count for a high priest is attested in the year 140 BCE (besides the Seleukid Era: *IMacc* 14.27) and in 128 BCE (without era date: *Jos. Ant. Jud.* 14.8.5 [148]).

(3) The **Pontic-Mithradatic era** begins with 298/97 BCE, but is not attested before the time of Mithradates VI Eupator (120–63 BCE). While arguments from silence are always difficult, we can at least point to the alliance between Pharnakes I and Chersonesos (*IOSPE* 402) of ca. 179 BCE: this seems to prove that Pharnakes no longer used the Seleukid era on the one hand, but that he had not yet established his own dynastic era on the other (Avram 2016 argues for the era of Sinope). The dynastic era was continued in the Bosporan Kingdom by the offspring of Eupator. The usurpator Asandros (48/47–18 BCE), however, rejected it and dated his coins with regnal years. His wife Dynamis, the granddaughter of Eupator, re-introduced the Mithradatic era when she was appointed co-ruling queen in 21/20 BCE, so that for a short time the two alternative year counts are attested side by side.

References:

- Avram, A. 2016. 'On the Date of the Treaty between Pharnaces and Tauric Chersonese', in J.-Ch. Couvenhes (ed.), *La symmachia comme pratique du droit international dans le monde grec*, Besançon, 213–237.
- Coşkun, A. 2016. 'Laodike I, Berenike Phernophoros, Dynastic Murders, and the Outbreak of the Third Syrian War (253–246 BC)', in A. Coşkun & A. McAuley (eds.), *Seleukid Royal Women*, Stuttgart, 107–134.
- Coşkun, A. ca. 2017. 'The Bosporan Kings in-between the Mithradatic Tradition and Friendship with Rome: the Usurpation of Asandros Revisited', forthcoming in *Archaia Pontou*.
- Ehling, K., *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der späten Seleukiden (164–63 v.Chr.)*, Stuttgart 2008.

- Hannestad, L. & V. Stolba (eds.) 2009. *Chronologies of the Black Sea Area in the Period c. 400–100 B.C.*, Aarhus, 137–147.
- Kosmin, P. 2014. *The Land of the Elephant Kings. Space, Territory, and Ideology in the Seleucid Empire*, Cambridge MA, 100-103.
- Leschhorn, W. 1993. *Antike Ären. Zeitrechnung, Politik und Geschichte im Schwarzmeerraum und in Kleinasien nördlich des Tauros*, Stuttgart.
- Luther, A. 1999. 'Überlegungen zur *defectio* der östlichen Satrapien vom Seleukidenreich', *GFA* 2, 5–15.
- Nodet, É. 2005. *La crise maccabéenne: Historiographie juive et traditions bibliques*, Paris.
- Plischke, S. 2014. *Die Seleukiden und Iran. Die seleukidische Herrschaftspolitik in den östlichen Satrapien*, Wiesbaden 2014.
- Strootman, R. 2015. Art. 'Seleucid Era', in E. Yarshater (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Iranica (Online)* Winona Lake.
- Tilly, M. 2015. *1 Makkabäer*, Freiburg i.B.

Short CV:

Dr. Altay Coşkun initiated international collaboration on the Seleucid Empire in 2009 in Exeter, UK, and (co-) hosted several Seleucid conference panels since 2010 as well as *Seleucid Study Days* 1–5 (2011–2015), in Canada and various European countries. His most relevant publication is the co-edited volume (with A. McAuley): *Seleucid Royal Women. Creation, Representation and Distortion of Hellenistic Queenship in the Seleucid Empire* (Historia Einzelschrift 240), Stuttgart 2016; the proceedings of the previous Seleucid Study Day, 'Rome and the Seleucid East' will soon be published in *Collection Latomus*, Brussels (co-ed. with David Engels). His full CV (altaycoskun.com) lists over 220 scholarly publications and over 30 conferences, workshops or panels which he has (co-) organized since 2003.

3) Gunnar Dumke (University of Halle-Wittenberg, Germany):

The Hellenistic Kings of Bactria and India as Successors to the Seleukids

Email: [gunnar.dumke at altertum.uni-halle.de](mailto:gunnar.dumke@altertum.uni-halle.de)

Abstract:

The Bactrian kingdom, a former satrapy of the Seleucid Kingdom, achieved autonomy sometime in the third quarter of the third century BCE. The exact date is highly debated, with some scholars advocating a high (~250 BCE) and others a low (~239 BCE) chronology (cf. Holt 1999: 60–66); most recently, Wenghofer (ca. 2017) has even claimed that Bactria remained loyal to the Seleukids down to the time of Eukratides I in the early-2nd century BCE. The written evidence is too patchy to be conclusive. It needs to be complemented by the enormous number of coins minted under the different kings ruling in the Hellenistic Far East. Owing to the fact that coins are official documents and are, as such, sanctioned by the government, it is possible to extract parts of the king's official self-representation from them.

In my paper I aim to pursue a twofold strategy. On the one hand, I will analyze whether these images are modified when the political circumstances of the issuing king change. Normally alterations in the iconography of royal coin issues are explained by changing political circumstances. I intend to analyze it the other way around: is the coin iconography indeed modified in times that underwent change according to the non-numismatic evidence? And if it

does, in which ways? On the other hand, I will ask if the depiction of loyal and rebel kings respectively differed. Are there ways of communicating political agendas through aspects of the portrait and other elements, such as deities, arrangement of legends, epithets etc.? And is conformity with Seleukid models to be regarded as a sign of loyalty or merely evidence for a shared cultural and political heritage?

The analysis will start with two Baktrian kings. Of particular interest will be Diodotos II, in the first place, who changed the politics of his father and coalesced with the neighboring Parthian Kingdom (Justin 41.4.1–20; Wenghofer ca. 2017), and, in the second, Euthydemos I with his long-standing fight against Antiochos III during the latter's anabasis (Polybios 10.49 and 11.34; Plischke 2014). In both cases, we will be able to confront coin imagery with a sufficiently detailed literary tradition. The results of this investigation will be compared with the self-representation of more certain usurper kings such as Achaios and Molon, whose insurrection and accompanying self-representations are securely dated (cf. Fleischer 1991; Houghton & Lorber 2002). In this way, it should be possible to identify specific aspects of a usurper iconography (if only such a thing really exists), or at least to describe a range of options a disloyal king had at his disposal to herald his political agenda.

It is to be hoped that, against this background, the official Seleukid imagery and designs as well as their reception by loyal neighboring kings will also be better understood.

References:

- Fleischer, R. 1991. *Studien zur seleukidischen Kunst*, Band 1: *Herrscherporträts*, Mainz.
- Holt, F. 1999. *Thundering Zeus. The Making of Hellenistic Bactria*, London.
- Houghton, A. & C. Lorber 2002/8. *Seleucid Coins: A Comprehensive Catalogue*, New York, Parts I & II (with O. Hoover).
- Plischke, S. 2014. *Die Seleukiden und Iran. Die seleukidische Herrschaftspolitik in den östlichen Satrapien*, Wiesbaden.
- Wenghofer, R. ca. 2017. 'Rethinking the Relationship between Hellenistic Baktria and the Seleukid Empire', forthcoming in K. Erickson (ed.): *War within the Family – the First Century of Seleucid Rule. Proceedings of Seleucid Study Day III = Panel at the VIIth Celtic Conference of Classics, Bordeaux Sept. 2012*, Swansea.

Short CV:

Gunnar Dumke is research assistant at the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology and associate lecturer at the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg. He is currently working on his Ph.D. *Alexander's heirs in India. Graeco-Macedonian Rule in Pakistan and North-Western India after Menander I Soter*. His publications include: 'Diadem = Königsherrschaft? Der Fall des Diodotos I. von Baktrien', in A. Lichtenberg et al. (eds.), *Das Diadem der hellenistischen Herrscher. Übernahme, Transformation oder Neuschöpfung eines Herrschaftszeichens?*, Bonn 2013, 385–393; 'Nicht nur im Auge des Betrachters – Zu visuellen und haptischen Unterschieden baktrischer Münzen als Ausdruck unterschiedlicher Kommunikationsstrategien', in A. Lichtenberg et al. (eds.), *BildWert – Nominalspezifische Kommunikationsstrukturen in der Münzprägung hellenistischer Herrscher*, Bonn 2014, 79–106; "'Weil sie sich nach griechischer Erziehung und Lebensweise zurücksehnten...'" Probleme und Auswirkungen der Ansiedlung griechischer Soldaten im hellenistischen Baktrien', in Ch. Rass (ed.), *Krieg, Militär und Mobilität*, Paderborn 2015, 31–40.

4) David Engels (UL Brussels, Belgium):

Hellenisation vs. Sinicisation and Arabisation. Some Remarks on Assimilation in the Seleukid Empire from a World-Historical Perspective

Email: [dengels at ulb.ac.be](mailto:dengels@ulb.ac.be)

Abstract:

'Hellenisation' has been, for decades now, a central term in the endeavor to understand the impact of the Greco-Macedonian conquest of most parts of the former Achaemenid Empire. Sometimes it has been overrated as a real colonisatory mass-movement seeking to impose Greek culture on 'Barbarian' natives, sometimes it has been down-played as a mere attempt of securing the newly-won territories through a limited number of garrisons and economic centers of essentially multicultural nature. At any rate, 'Hellenisation' still remains a fundamental notion of contemporary research in the post-Alexandrian Near East in general and of the Seleukid Empire in particular. As the discussion has reached a certain dead-end due to the material limits of our sources, it seems high time to find a new approach. We will therefore consciously disconnect 'Hellenisation' from its portentous and cumbersome associations with the nature and importance of 'Hellenicity' and rather attempt at opening it up to wholly new fields of comparison. In other words: previously, the 'Hellenisation' of the East in continuity (or not) was contextualized within previous phases of Greek or Achaemenid cultural and ethnic expansion; instead, we will rather try to propose a critical comparison between 'Hellenisation' on the one hand and the endeavors of two other major societies at assuring their dominance over their often far-reaching territories by furthering the presence of the hegemonic ethnos outside of their homeland and/or by promoting their cultural impact on the dominated people. We will thus look at structural parallels and differences of the policies, first, of the Qin Kingdom during the 'Warring-States' period of early Chinese history and, second, of the early Muslim rule over the Levant, in order to place colonisation in the Seleukid Empire into a larger historical and morphological context. We will sketch some major trends such as infrastructural assimilation, political integration, religious proselytism and the feeling of cultural superiority. We will try to show how, despite the huge differences between these three societies, they seem to have followed analogous strategies.

References:

- Berlejung, A. 2012. 'The Assyrians in the West: Assyrianization, Colonialism, Indifference, or Development Policy?', in M. Nissinen (ed.), *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*, Leiden, 21–59.
- Engels, D. 2017. 'Construction de normes et morphologie culturelle. Empire romain, chinois, sasanide et fatimide – une comparaison historique', in T. Itgenshorst & Ph. LeDoze (eds.), *La norme sous la République romaine et le Haut Empire. Élaboration, diffusion et contournements*, Bordeaux, 53–73.
- Engels, D. ca. 2017. *Rulers, Kings, Benefactors. Studies on the Seleukid Empire between East and West*, Leuven, forthcoming 2017.
- Higginbotham, C.R. 2000. *Egyptianization and Elite Emulation in Ramesside Palestine: Governance and Accommodation on the Imperial Periphery*, Boston/Cologne.
- Kennet, D. 2007. 'The Decline of Eastern Arabia in the Sasanian Period', in *Arabian Archaeology and Epigraphy* 18, 86–122.
- Török, L. 1998. *The Kingdom of Kush: Handbook of the Napatan-Meriotic Civilization*, Leiden.

Short CV:

Dr. David Engels studied History, Philosophy and Political Economy (MA 2002) and Ancient History (PhD 2005) at the University of Aachen, Germany. In 2008, he was appointed assistant professor of Roman History at the Université libre de Bruxelles (tenured in 2012). From 2012 to 2017, he was editor-in-chief of “*Latomus. Revue et Collection d’Études Latines*”. His monographs include: *Das römische Vorzeichenwesen*, Stuttgart, 2007; *Le déclin. La crise de l’Union européenne et la chute de la République romaine*, Paris, 2013; *Studies on the Seleukid Empire between East and West*, Leuven, Leuven 2017. He has (co-)edited 6 conference volumes and published nearly a hundred papers on global history, including: ‘Middle Eastern “Feudalism” and Seleucid Dissolution’, in K. Erickson & G. Ramsay (eds.), *Seleucid Dissolution*, Wiesbaden 2011, 19–36; ‘A New Frataraka Chronology’, *Latomus* 72, 2013, 28–82. He is among the most prolific ancient historians, whose work has solicited hundreds of reviews and interviews.

5) Kyle Erickson (UWTSD Lampeter, Wales):

Tokens of Authority: Coinage as Ideology in the Seleukid Empire

Email: [k.erickson at uwtsd.ac.uk](mailto:k.erickson@uwtsd.ac.uk)

Abstract:

This paper will argue that the coinage produced in the name of the Seleukid kings functioned as a media tool to propagate political messages that resonated with regional and local elites. As explored by Strootman (2014), regional and local elites had an important role in the imperial court, but responses to their concerns are difficult to discern in the historical record (beyond local events). I have argued elsewhere that the Seleukid kings developed a royal image that both created a uniform appearance of ‘Greekness’ while also having local resonances. What has not always been agreed on is the extent to which ancient coinage played an ideological role in the development of the dynasty’s image. Nor has a concerted effort been made to consider how local minting authorities responded to the imperial court’s ideological agenda.

This paper will argue that, while we cannot provide evidence for the individual workings of mints nor the mechanisms in which the court implemented its ideology on them, we can map adherence to or variation from a single theme. This allows us to extrapolate how central imagery could have been understood at a local level. Furthermore, the establishment of a ‘Seleukid image’ provided an iconographic unifier for the empire. Accordingly, various groups that have been considered defiant or outright insurgent could express their relationship to the Seleukids through the adoption, rejection, or manipulation of this image. Too often regional identities are studied in isolation (Iossif 2004, Erickson 2011, Wright 2009, Erickson and Wright 2011), or the resistance of individual states to the Seleukids is studied in their own contexts (Engels 2013, Chrubasik 2016, Wenghofer forthcoming, Strootman forthcoming). Each of these studies (and several others) makes an assumption about the expression of a unified Seleukid ideology applicable to local and imperial ambitions that has not yet been fully argued.

This paper aims to develop an explanation of how the underlying Seleukid iconographic expression reflected an imperial image that needed to be taken into account when resisting Seleukid authority. I will argue that the Seleukid empire was held together largely through the efforts of a Weberian charismatic king (and court) that had to constantly assert the image of Seleukid power. As such, the image of Seleukid authority was not an appeal to a new

Macedonian homeland, but an appeal to ‘Seleukidness’ which could vary from region to region, so long as loyalty to the court was maintained. I argue that the maintenance of Seleukid power was derived from the successful creation of a Seleukid identity which was neither territorially delimited nor culturally exclusive, but was rather tied into conceptions of the Seleukid king’s right to rule. This authority ultimately derived from Seleukos’ conquests, but was supplemented by the (iconographic) reiteration of divine support for the monarch. This paper will focus on exploring the Seleukid court’s recognition of the need to develop an ideology and to disseminate it broadly across the empire.

References:

- Chrubasik, B. 2016. *Kings and Usurpers in the Seleukid Empire: The Men Who Would Be King*. Oxford 2016.
- Iossif, P. 2004. ‘Les Monnaies de Suse Frappées Par Séleucos Ier : Une Nouvelle Approche’. *Numismatica E Antichità Classiche* 33, 249–271.
- Engels, D. 2013. ‘A New Frataraka Chronology’, *Latomus* 72, 29–80 with pls. I–II.
- Erickson, K. 2011: ‘Apollo-Nabû: the Babylonian Policy of Antiochus I’, in K. Erickson & G. Ramsey (eds.), *Seleucid Dissolution: Fragmentation and Transformation of Empire (Exeter, July 2008)*, Wiesbaden, 51–66.
- Erickson, K. & N.L. Wright 2011. ‘The ‘Royal Archer’ and Apollo in the East: Greco-Persian Iconography in the Seleukid Empire’, in N. Holmes (ed.), *Proceedings of the XIV International Numismatic Congress*. Glasgow, 163–168.
- Strootman, R. 2014. *After the Achaemenids: Courts and Elites in the Hellenistic Empires, c. 330–64 BCE*, Edinburgh.
- Strootman, R. ca. 2017. ‘The Coming of the Parthians: Crisis and Resilience in the Reign of Seleukos II’, forthcoming in K. Erickson (ed.): *War within the Family – the First Century of Seleucid Rule. Proceedings of Seleucid Study Day III = Panel at the VIIth Celtic Conference of Classics, Bordeaux Sept. 2012*, Swansea.
- Wenghofer, R. ca. 2017. ‘Rethinking the Relationship between Hellenistic Baktria and the Seleukid Empire’, forthcoming in K. Erickson (ed.): *War within the Family – the First Century of Seleucid Rule. Proceedings of Seleucid Study Day III = Panel at the VIIth Celtic Conference of Classics, Bordeaux Sept. 2012*, Swansea.
- Wright, N.L. 2009. ‘Non-Greek Religious Iconography on the Coinage of Seleucid Syria’, *Mediterranean Archaeology* 22/23 (October), 193–206.

Short CV:

After taking his BA in History, Greek and Latin (2005) at UCLA and his MA in Hellenistic History and Culture (2007) at Exeter, Dr. Kyle Erickson received his PhD in Classics and Ancient History (2010) at the University of Exeter. He became Head of the School of Classics at the University of Wales, Trinity St. David, Lampeter in 2013 and Assistant Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Performing Arts in 2015. His PhD thesis examined the iconography of early Seleukid coinage, which is the basis for a monograph in preparation. Erickson is the (co-) editor of three Hellenistic conference volumes (*The Sinking of the Anchor*, Wiesbaden 2011, with G. Ramsey; *The Alexander Romance in Persia and the East*, Barkhuis Publishing 2012, with I. Netton & R. Stoneman; *War within the Family – the First Century of Seleucid Rule. Proceedings of Seleucid Study Day III*, Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, ca. 2017).

6) Chris Fleming (UWTSD Lampeter, Wales):

Freedom, Rebellion and Loyalty: Smyrna and the End of Seleukid Asia

Email: Christopher.fleming@uwtsd.ac.uk

Abstract:

Seleukid influence over the cities in western Asia Minor fluctuated under pressure from both internal and external threats throughout the latter half of the 3rd century BCE. These pressures ranged from attacks by competing Hellenistic dynasts to rebellions led by Seleukid generals, and even members of the royal family, such as Antiochos Hierax. The entry of Rome further complicated this theatre. This investigation considers the framework of Seleukid hegemony and the position of an individual *polis* in light of these changes. In an attempt to bridge these two topics, several studies have explored the position of the *polis* in the Seleukid space (see esp. Ma 1999). However, one aspect that has not been fully explored is the concept of resistance to and rebellion from Seleukid authority by individual *poleis*.

This paper will present a case study on Smyrna. As a *polis* on the west coast of Asia Minor it was on the periphery of the Seleukid Empire, yet it played an important role in the region, both politically and economically. The construction of a complete narrative of Smyrna is, however, inhibited through the sparseness of the epigraphical record and the fact that the literary accounts focus primarily on Roman expansion.

Central to narratives of Romano-Seleukid conflict was Flamininus' decree granting *eleutheria* to the cities of Asia Minor which remained under Seleukid control. For this reason, understanding how individual cities understood this decree helps us assess the structures of Seleukid hegemony. As explored by Dmitriev (2011), this term had come to define the basis of good relations between a *polis* and a hegemonic power which had officially granted it. In this context, Smyrna, along with Lampsakos and (possibly) Alexandria Troas, utilised the rise in Romano-Seleukid tensions and the proclamations of freedom to declare themselves free from Seleukid authority. This act undermined the intricate network of relationships the Seleukids had created in Asia Minor. As such, Smyrna stands as a useful regional case study to examine these broader issues, as not only can we explore the interplay between a *polis* and other actors under the umbrella of 'freedom' in the 190s BCE, but we can also trace this concept back to the mid-3rd century BCE and the origins of Seleukid hegemony.

In studying this conflict, scholars have tended to focus on the development of *eleutheria* as a tool of hegemonic powers, while downplaying the individualisation of the reactions of individual *poleis* (e.g., Dmitriev 2011, esp. 196–197). This paper will argue against this trend by asking questions such as: if Smyrna was indeed independent, why was it necessary to state this publicly? How did self-declared 'freedom' differ from the 'freedom' previously offered by the Seleukids?

To answer these questions, this paper will first offer a brief discussion of *eleutheria* as a working model in Asia Minor. Here the analysis will consider not only Ma (1999), but more recent contributions which discuss 'freedom' as a diplomatic tool from Dmitriev (2011) and Bugh (2014), exploring how Smyrna stands as an anomaly with regard to typical *polis* behaviour. In an attempt to understand how Smyrna fits within these networks, my study will continue the discussion begun by Eckstein (2006 and 2008) and Burton (2011), who have applied Neorealist and Constructivist models respectively to the Graeco-Roman world. By focusing on the semantics of the relationship between Smyrna and the Seleukids, I will further develop Burton's

Constructivist approach. However, this approach is not without its drawbacks as will become apparent in some practical applications of this branch of political science. One such issue is the Cold War mentality that has influenced Burton's theoretical framework, which causes problems when one attempts to use it on a regional level (Burton 2011, 9–15). I shall address this issue by introducing new theories while retaining Smyrna as a case study in order to find a more holistic paradigm in which to understand these specific interstate relations.

References:

- Bugh, G.R. 2014. 'Mithridates the Great and the Freedom of the Greeks', in V. Cojocaru, A. Coşkun & M. Dana (eds), *Interconnectivity in the Mediterranean and Pontic World during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Cluj-Napoca, 383–395.
- Burton, P.J. 2011. *Friendship and Empire: Roman Diplomacy and Imperialism in the Middle Republic (353–146 BC)*, Cambridge.
- Coşkun, A. 2016. 'Ptolemaioi as Commanders in 3rd-Century Asia Minor and Some Glimpses on Ephesos and Mylasa during the Second and Third Syrian Wars', in B. Takmer et al. (eds.), *Vir doctus anaticus. Studies in Memory of Sencer Sahin*, Istanbul, 257–279.
- Dmitriev, S. 2011. *The Greek Slogan of Freedom and Early Roman Politics in Greece*, Oxford.
- Eckstein, A.M. 2006. *Mediterranean Anarchy, Interstate War, and the Rise of Rome*, Berkeley CA.
- Eckstein, A.M. 2008. *Rome Enters the Greek East; From Anarchy to Hierarchy in the Hellenistic Mediterranean*, Oxford.
- Ma, J. 1999. *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford.

Short CV:

Chris Fleming gained his BA in Ancient History and Latin at the University of Wales, Trinity St. David, Lampeter in 2013 and his MLitt in Classics at the University of Glasgow in 2014. He is currently a PhD student at Lampeter investigating the ideology of the free *polis* in the Seleukid Kingdom. He is the recipient of various scholarships and awards, including an Erasmus scholarship that allowed him to study a semester at the University of Bologna, Italy, in 2012/13. He is also a founding member of the Postgraduate Research Group at Lampeter.

7) Sylvie Honigman (University of Tel Aviv, Israel):

Responses to Seleukid Claims to Hegemony: Cross-Perspectives from Judaea

Email: [honigman at post.tau.ac.il](mailto:honigman@post.tau.ac.il); [sylvie.honigman1 at gmail.com](mailto:sylvie.honigman1@gmail.com)

Abstract:

Judaea offers a good case study for the investigation of responses to Seleukid claims to hegemony. Firstly, the Seleukid dynasty did not take over directly from Persian rule, but after a century of Ptolemaic domination (301–198 BCE); and secondly, the evidence allows us to discern divergent responses from different elite groups, a trend that may be traced throughout the two periods. My approach will be diachronic. I will contend that responses were first and foremost determined by the perception of whether or not royal policy was attuned to the group's or individual's interest in a context of competition between various elite groups. Moreover, critical voices from within local elites prioritized attacks against local rivals over denunciation of the imperial king.

1) The documentary and literary evidence shows that the Ptolemies installed an unprecedentedly dense administrative network in the region, entailing the emergence of new elites. Josephus' *Romance of Joseph the Tobiad* (*Ant. Jud.* 12.154–236) depicts the career of Joseph: he took over the farming of the provincial taxes, thereby depriving the high priest of Jerusalem of this function, which he, in turn, had acquired during the troubled days of the Diadochi. The narrative refers to the Alexandrian court in very favourable terms, while depicting the high priest negatively. The prophetic book of Zechariah 11–14, especially as analysed by Hervé Gonzalez, offers a contrast foil, for this displays the temple elites' negative response to the royal administration, its local agents and possibly also the introduction of bronze coinage. These conflicting reactions show how domestic tensions were entangled with relations to empire. In subsequent times, the memory of the Ptolemies was altogether erased from priestly literature.

2) Antiochos III's decree for Jerusalem (*Jos. Ant. Jud.* 12.138–144) restored prestige and (some) power to the temple elites. In 175 BCE, the creation of a *polis* in Jerusalem by a certain Jason, who usurped the high priesthood, entailed new tensions. The new *politai* dubbed themselves as *Hellenes*—a qualification which may be read as an endorsement of the royal ideology, and which was subsequently turned against them by their opponents (*2Macc* 4). Moreover, the creation of the *polis* entailed a redistribution of the fiscal burden. Strikingly, to strengthen his denunciation of the social and economic bearings of Jason's creation of the polis, the author of *2Macc* charges him with cancelling the fiscal exemptions that had been granted by Antiochos III (*2Macc* 4.6–15). Thus, whereas the *politai* stated their loyalty to the ruling king (Antiochos IV), the attack of the new settlement in *2Macc* did not only draw on arguments referring to the Judaeian cultural and political tradition, but also on the memory of another Seleukid king (Antiochos III).

3) With the rise of the Hasmonaeans, not only Antiochos IV, but also Jason and his successor Menelaos were transformed into utmost villains by the court historians who composed *1* and *2Macc* respectively. At the same time, Antiochos III's decree served as a model for fabricating 'Persian' decrees in favour of the Jerusalem temple in the *Book of Ezra* and in Septuagint's *1Esdras*. In this way, the benefactions were eventually dissociated from its original benefactor. A clear-cut contrast was thus created: whereas the ruling Seleukid dynasty was vilified, the memory of the Persian dynasty under which the Jerusalem temple was rebuilt was enhanced.

References:

- Chrubasik, B. forthcoming. 'Sanctuaries, Priest-Dynasts and the Seleukid Empire', forthcoming in S. Honigman, O. Lipschitz & C. Nihan (eds.), *Judaea in the Long Third Century BCE. The Transition between the Persian and Hellenistic Periods*, Winona Lake IN.
- Gonzalez, H. forthcoming. 'Zacharie 9–14 et le temple de Jérusalem. Observations sur le milieu de production d'un texte prophétique tardif', forthcoming in *Judaïsme ancien / Ancient Judaism* 4.
- Gorre, G. & S. Honigman 2014. 'La politique d'Antiochos IV à Jérusalem à la lumière des relations entre rois et temples aux époques perse et hellénistique (Babylonie, Judée et Égypte)', in Ch. Feyel & L. Graslin-Thomé (eds.), *Le projet politique d'Antiochos IV*, Nancy, 301–338.
- Honigman, S. 2014. *Tales of High Priests and Taxes: The Books of the Maccabees and the Judean Rebellion against Antiochus IV*, Berkeley CA.

Short CV:

Dr. Sylvie Honigman is Professor of Ancient History at Tel Aviv University, Israel. She gained her PhD in Ancient History at the University of Paris-I-Sorbonne in 1995. Her research is dedicated to the history and literary production in Hellenistic Judaea in a comparative perspective, and to the history and literary production of Jews in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt. Her monographs (*The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: Study in the Narrative of the 'Letter of Aristeas'*, London 2003, and *Tales of High Priests and Taxes: The Books of the Maccabees and the Judean Rebellion against Antiochus IV*, Berkeley CA 2014) are landmarks in the field. She is also the author of several articles, including 'La politique d'Antiochos IV à Jérusalem à la lumière des relations entre rois et temples aux époques perse et hellénistique (Babylonie, Judée et Égypte)', Ch. Feyerl & Graslin-Thomé 2014.

8) Paul Kosmin (Harvard University, Cambridge MA):

Weighing Time: From the Seleucid Empire to the End of the World

Email: [pjkosmin at fas.harvard.edu](mailto:pjkosmin@fas.harvard.edu)

Abstract:

This paper will explore the relationship between the temporal structures projected by the Seleucid empire and the indigenous temporalities that responded to, resisted, and ultimately undermined these. After a theoretical reflection on the historical examination of temporality, I will focus on one case study – the use of the Seleucid Era on the standardized mechanisms of market trade – to explore the sociopolitical effects of this imperial chronography's regular duration and temporal irreversibility. It will be argued that the Era's use as a 'faceless commitment', to borrow Giddens's phrase, made it a site of reliability, credence, and political predictability.

We will see, in turn, a contemporary engagement with the time of the Seleucid agora in the work of apocalyptic eschatology. A close reading of two chapters in the book of Daniel will demonstrate the co-option of these imperial objects and the relocation to heaven of the authority they represent. I hope that the case study will demonstrate the close dialectical relationship between Seleucid imperial ideology and religious innovation among the subjected populations.

References:

- Appadurai, A. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis.
- Bickerman, E. 1944. 'Notes on Seleucid and Parthian Chronology', *Berytus* 8, 73–83.
- Edensor, T. 2006. 'Reconsidering National Temporalities: Institutional Times, Everyday Routines, Serial Spaces and Synchronicities', *European Journal of Social Theory* 9, 525–545.
- Savalli-Lestrade, I. 2010. 'Les rois hellénistiques, maîtres du temps', in I. Savalli-Lestrade & I. Cogitore (eds.), *Des Rois au Prince: Pratiques du pouvoir monarchique dans l'Orient hellénistique et romain*, Grenoble, 55–83.

Short CV:

Dr. Paul Kosmin is the John L. Loeb Associate Professor of the Humanities in the Department of Classics at Harvard University. After taking his BA from Oxford University (Balliol College) in 2005, he went on to complete his PhD at Harvard University, during which time he was also a Thomas Seymour Fellow at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (2009/10). While at Harvard, he completed his dissertation entitled *Seleucid Space: The Ideology and*

Practice of Territory in the Seleucid Empire. His most recent monograph, *The Land of the Elephant Kings: Space, Territory, and Ideology in the Seleucid Empire* (2014) is a significant contribution to our understanding of the ideological strategies of Seleukid hegemony. Soon forthcoming is *The Maccabean Moment. Resistances to Hellenistic Empires* (co-ed. with I. Moyer).

9) Catharine Lorber (American Numismatic Society, New York):

Honouring the King in the Ptolemaic and Seleukid Empires: a Comparative Approach

Email: catharinelorber@hotmail.com

Abstract:

Honors offered to rulers by their subjects express loyalty. This paper will compare data for the Seleukid and Ptolemaic kingdoms to bring out the particular qualities of the Seleukid record. It will consider geographic distribution, chronological patterns, where the honors fell on a public to private spectrum, and the occupations and ethnicities of the subjects who offered them.

(1) **Asia Minor and the islands.** The civic honors offered to the Seleukids and the Ptolemies are similar in kind and quantity, though honors to the Ptolemies could also be offered by *theôroi* dispatched to Alexandria for festivals of royal cult (*SEG* 1.366; *SEG* 36.1218). The frequency of civic honors correlates with the power of the kings: Antiochos III received the most honors of any Seleukid while Ptolemy II and III were the most honored of their dynasty. This pattern is consistent with the view that honors were part of the negotiation of civic status (Ma 1999), but we cannot overlook the role of these particular kings in encouraging honors for themselves by establishing cults for other members of their respective dynasties. Private dedications follow the same chronological pattern and were usually offered by elite officials, who thus modeled the devotion the kings hoped to receive from all their subjects.

(2) **(Koile) Syria and Phoenicia.** Honors were rarely offered to the Ptolemies in this region. They are concentrated in Tyre and its territory (Bonnet 2015, 276–290, 383 n.44). Most were private dedications inspired by the victory at Raphia, offered by officials and soldiers. After the Seleukid conquest Antiochos III was honored by an agonistic victor in the gymnasium at Tyre (Rey-Coquais 2006, no. 1). A statue of King Antiochos was erected at Tyre by a priest of the king (Rey-Coquais 2006, no. 19), and the sanctuary of Eshmun at Sidon yielded a dedication to a Seleukid triad (Stucky 2005, Gr4). Other private dedications were offered to traditional gods on behalf of Demetrios I, probably at Sidon (Gatier 2004, 139–144), and on behalf of Antiochos VII at Ptolemais on the eve of his Parthian campaign, by a military scribe (*SEG* 19.904). These private dedications to Seleukid rulers are more diverse geographically and chronologically than those offered to the Ptolemies, but no more numerous. Seleukid dynastic cults are attested at Scythopolis and Sebaste-Samaria under Demetrios I (*SEG* 8.33, 8.96) but it is clear that they were imposed from above and related to the state cult attested at Seleukeia in Pieria under Seleukos IV (*OGIS* 245).

(3) **Babylonia and the Upper Satrapies.** There is very little evidence for honors to the rulers in the east, apart from the practice of dedicating manumitted slaves to a deity for the well-being of the king, attested at Gurgan in Hyrcania under Antiochos I (*IK EstOr* 280) and at Susa in the second century. Kings may have shared in the sacrifices at Esagila on certain occasions (*BCHP* 12 I; Del Monte 1997, AD 2, no. 204) and there is a single private dedication to Antiochos IV at Babylon (*OGIS* 253).

The extreme contrast with Egypt suggests a cultural explanation: the centrality of pharaoh in Egyptian religion helped the Ptolemies to promote an enthusiastic royalism based in cult, whereas different religious traditions made the Levant and the east unreceptive to Seleukid efforts to develop royal cult.

References:

Bonnet, C. 2015. *Les enfants de Cadmos: Le paysage religieux de la Phénicie hellénistique*. Paris.

Del Monte, G. F. 1997. *Testi dalla Babilonia Ellenistica, Vol. I, Testi Cronografici*, Pisa.

Gatier, P.-L. 2004. 'Inscriptions grecques et latines du Proche-Orient: Questions de provenance', *ZPE* 147, 139–144.

Rey-Coquais, J.-P. 2006. *Inscriptions grecques et latines de Tyr, BAAL III, h.s.*, Beirut.

Stucky, R. 2005. *Das Eschmun-Heiligtum von Sidon: Architektur und Inschriften*, Basle.

Finkel, I., & R. J. van der Spek, forthcoming. *Babylonian Chronicles of the Hellenistic Period* [=BCHP]. Preliminary publication (2004/17):

<http://www.livius.org/sources/about/mesopotamian-chronicles/>

Short CV:

Catharine Lorber holds a BA in ancient Greek from UCLA. Now retired, she spent her career in commercial numismatics as a cataloguer of ancient Greek, Roman, and Byzantine coins. She has published over 70 articles and book chapters on numismatic topics including: *Amphipolis: The Civic Coinage in Silver and Gold* (1990); with Arthur Houghton and Oliver Hoover, *Seleucid Coins: A Comprehensive Catalogue* (Part I, 2002; Part II, 2008); with Thomas Faucher and Andrew Meadows (eds), of *Egyptian Hoards I: The Ptolemies* (2017). She is currently working on a comprehensive catalogue of Ptolemaic coinage, and a monograph on the provincial silver coinage of Judah with Jean-Philippe Fontantille and Haim Gitler. Lorber is a Fellow of the American Numismatic Society and of the Royal Numismatic Society, and a member of the Royal Hellenistic Coinages project, which aims to create an online database of royal Hellenistic coins in the major public collections.

10) Paul Monaghan (University of Nipissing, North Bay ON):

Greek Theatre(s) and the Seleukid Empire

Email: paulmo@nipissingu.ca

Abstract:

In the notion of (Hellenistic) “Greekness,” or “Macedonian-Greekness” – to the extent that such a more or less definable notion existed as a unifying characteristic in the Hellenistic World as a whole – Greek language, literature (including tragedy and comedy), and athletics played an important role. The centrality of theatre to the notion of “Greekness” may have been overemphasized (Fredericksen 2002, 65–66; Potts 2011, 249), but Alexander’s political use of *agones musikoi*, including theatre, during his Eastern conquests is well-attested (Le Guen 2014), and the number of new Hellenistic theatres in Asia Minor (over 50) and in Greece, Macedonia and to the West bear witness to the ongoing importance of Greek theatre in these areas. The prevalence and reception of Greek theatre in Europe and the New World, from the Roman Republic to contemporary times, has been extensively researched. Until recently, however, the

impact of the Greek theatre on the Hellenistic East has been given little attention. Plutarch claimed that “[w]hen Alexander civilised Asia, Homer became common reading, and the sons of the Persians, Susians, and Gedrosians learned to intone the tragedies of Sophocles and Euripides” (Plutarch, *On the Fortune of Alexander* 328). The role of theatre and theatres (in which far more than performances of tragedy and comedy took place) in the Seleukid Empire, then, is a fertile area for further research.

Le Guen (2014) claims that for Alexander’s successors, Greek theatre “became a vehicle for highlighting or emphasising some of the main elements of royal ideology...” (271). But in the core areas of the Seleukid Empire – Babylonia, Media, Susiana, Persis, and Baktria – very few theatres have been discovered to date. Hellenistic theatres have been discovered at Babylon (probably built either during Alexander’s lifetime or soon afterwards), Daphne, Laodikeia-on-the-Sea, Seleukeia-on-the-Tigris (founded by Seleukos between 312–307 BCE), Sardis, and Ai Khanoum (the theatre was probably built around 200 BCE: Hendricksen 2000, 169). Strootman (2014) suggests that the common site for theatres was “on the slope of the acropolis at the divide of royal and civic space” (74). Plutarch (*Alexander* 67.8 and 72) mentions theatrical activity by Alexander at Gedrosia-Karmania and Ecbatana during his conquests, but no remains of theatres seem to exist in these locations.

Le Guen (1995) posits dramatic competitions in “Babylon, Armenia, Central Asia, and probably also Syria” (367). Evidence for performances in the theatre at Babylon is fairly secure (Van der Spek 2001; Potts 2011), and numerous figurines of performers (especially musicians, dancers) and terracotta masks (mainly of the leading slave of New Comedy) have been found in houses at Babylon, Uruk, and Seleukeia-on-Tigris (Ristvet 2014, 5–6). There may even have been some Hellenistic-Jewish playwrights (Kotlinska-Toma 2016, 199). A water-spout in the shape of a comic slave mask was found at Ai Khanoum. But ascertaining the extent to which Seleukid (and other Eastern Hellenistic) theatres were used for theatrical performances is difficult, since there is a general lack of evidence for dramatic festivals and for the existence of *hoi peri ton Dionyson technitae* (actors’ guilds) in Seleukid territories. Moreover, Hellenistic theatres are known to have also been used for public meetings, the reading of decrees and bestowing of civic honors, the display of power and wealth, and potentially for riots (Ceccarelli 2010; Fredericksen 2002; van der Spek 2001, 447; Le Guen 1995, 72–73). Even more elusive is the evidence for theatrical performances outside of theatres for private and public readings of Greek plays and their use in educational settings (Nervegna 2014, 387).

Beginning with some brief comments on the engagement with Greek theatre by Philip II and Alexander the Great, and the prevalence of theatres in Asia Minor and the West, this presentation will examine the sparse evidence for Greek theatres and theatrical activity within the shifting boundaries of the Seleukid Empire. It will also examine the degree to which the “theatrical mentality” (Chaniotis 1997, 221, citing Pollitt) that seems to have pervaded many aspects of Hellenistic life characterized public and especially court life in the Seleukid Empire (for example, “political” performance in Babylon: Ristvet 2014; the procession of Antiochos IV at Daphne: Strootman 2007, 309–313). Monarchs and tyrants may not have been “fond of drama and theatres,” as Fredrickson (2002, 91) suggests, but the scanty evidence for theatre and theatres in the Seleukid Empire suggests a degree of resistance to Greek/Macedonian rule. An explanation for this resistance needs to be sought not only in the Seleukid period itself, but also in the culture and religion of the earlier Achaimenid Empire, in, for example, the region’s apparent disdain for telling lies (Herodotus 1.139, supported by epigraphic evidence) and the

general nature of Zoroastrianism and its lack of images of the gods (Herodotus 1.131) until well after this period.

References:

- Ceccarelli, P. 2010. 'Changing Contexts: Tragedy and the Civic and Cultural Life of Hellenistic City-States', in I. Gildenhard & M. Revermann (eds.), *Beyond the Fifth Century: Interactions with Greek Tragedy from the Fourth Century BCE to the Middle Ages*, Berlin, 99–150.
- Chanotis, A. 1997. 'Theatricality beyond the Theatre. Staging Public Life in the Hellenistic World', in B. Le Guen (ed.), *De la scène aux gradins. Théâtre et représentations dramatiques après Alexandre le Grand dans les cités hellénistiques. Actes du colloque, Toulouse, 1997 (Pallas 41)*, Toulouse, 219–259.
- Frederiksen, R. 2000. 'Typology of the Greek Theatre Building in Late Classical and Hellenistic Times', in S. Isager & I. Nielsen (eds.), *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens III*, Athens 135–175.
- Frederiksen, R. 2002. 'The Greek Theatre. A Typical Building in the Urban Centre of the Polis?', in Th. Heine Nielsen (ed.), *Even More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, Stuttgart, 65–124.
- Kotlinska-Toma, A. 2015. *Hellenistic Tragedy: Texts, Translations, and a Critical Survey*. London.
- Le Guen, B. 1995. 'Theatres et Cités à l'époque hellénistique', *Revue des Études Grecques* 108 59–90.
- Le Guen, B. 2014. 'Theatre, Religion, and Politics at Alexander's Travelling Royal Court', in E. Csapo et al. (eds.), *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century*, Berlin, 249–274.
- Nervegna, S. 2014. 'Contexts of Reception in Antiquity', in M. Revermann (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Greek Comedy*, Cambridge, 387–403.
- Potts, D.T. 2011. 'The *Politai* and the *Bit Tamartu*: The Seleucid and Parthian Theatres of the Greek Citizens of Babylon', in E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, M. Margarete Van Ess & J. Marzahn (eds.), *Babylon: Wissenskultur in Orient und Okzident*, Berlin, 239–252.
- Ristvet, L. 2014. 'Between Ritual and Theatre: Political Performance in Seleucid Babylonia', *World Archaeology*, DOI: 10.1080/00438243.2014.883939.
- van der Spek, R. J. 2001. 'The Theater of Babylon in Cuneiform', in *Studies Presented to Klaas R. Veenhof on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, Leiden 445–456.
- Strootman, R. 2007. *The Hellenistic Royal Courts: Court Culture, Ceremonial and Ideology in Greece, Egypt, and the Near East, 336–30 BCE*. PhD Dissertation, University of Utrecht.
- Strootman, R. 2014. *Courts and Elites in the Hellenistic Empires: The Near East After the Achaemenids, c. 330 to 30 BCE*. Edinburgh.

Short CV:

Dr. Paul Monaghan took his PhD in Theatre Studies/Classical Studies (University of Melbourne, 2011). Formerly a tenured professor at the University of Melbourne and Victorian College of the Arts (Australia), and Head of Postgraduate Studies and Research (Theatre), Paul now teaches in Classical Studies and History at Nipissing University and in the Theatre Department at the University of Ottawa. His research focuses on the nature and performance of ancient drama, its influence and reception in antiquity and the modern world, twentieth- and twenty-first-century theatre history, contemporary theatrical practice and dramaturgy, and teaching Greek and Latin as 'spoken' languages. Recent publications have included chapters on Greek tragedy in

contemporary performance, a history of Greek drama in Australia, and the importance of the Roman playwright Plautus for the development of Italian Renaissance comedy. Current research projects include the reception of Greek drama and the spread of Greek theatres in the Seleukid Empire.

11) Germain Payen (Rouen, France):

Le royaume artaxiade dans l'Empire séleucide : de dominé à dominant

(The Artaxiad Kingdom and Seleukid Empire: from Ruled to Rulers)

Email: [germain.payen at gmail.com](mailto:germain.payen@gmail.com)

French Abstract:

Après la défaite séleucide infligée par les légions romaines à Magnésie (190 a.C.), l'Arménie obtint son indépendance et fut divisée en deux royaumes, l'Arménie Majeure artaxiade et la Sophène orontide. Cette prise d'indépendance fut un premier acte de résistance pour Artaxias, gouverneur régional nommé quelques années auparavant par Antiochos III, acte dont les implications quant aux clauses du traité d'Apamée méritent un nouvel examen. Lors des décennies suivantes, les relations entretenues par les rois artaxiades avec le trône séleucide oscillèrent entre une hostilité plus ou moins ouverte et un rapport de domination à l'avantage des Séleucides. Le règne de Séleucos IV fut l'occasion d'un retour de l'Arménie Majeure sous le contrôle direct du roi séleucide, suivi par un conflit ouvert entre Artaxias, roi d'Arménie Majeure, et le successeur de Séleucos, tandis qu'un nouveau pouvoir autonome prenait forme dans la région, celui du royaume de Commagène, rendant la situation régionale plus complexe qu'elle ne l'était déjà. L'État artaxiade occupait une place mal établie par les sources anciennes dans la scène géopolitique asiatique, à la périphérie de l'empire séleucide mais partiellement intégrée à l'espace anatolien. Cette situation se refléta dans les sphères culturelle et idéologique aussi bien que politique en ce qui concerne les dynastes en question. Divers épisodes et projets politiques –tels que l'appel à Hannibal lors de la fondation de la capitale royale Artaxata, la conservation du dialecte araméen dans les inscriptions royales, la participation des rois artaxiades dans différentes guerres auxquelles les Séleucides ne participèrent pas, ou encore la reprise du titre de Roi des Rois par Tigrane à une date indéterminée– pourront apporter des lumières quant aux relations entre l'Arménie et le pouvoir séleucide, ainsi que sur leur évolution. Dans la seconde partie du deuxième siècle, à mesure que l'influence séleucide s'étiolait, le statut de l'Arménie Majeure évolua au contact des puissances romaine, arsacide et pontique. Après une rapide unification de l'Arménie, Tigrane II d'Arménie Majeure en vint à retourner une situation séculaire en conquérant Antioche. Ce tournant géopolitique fut accompagné d'un décalage du centre politique proche-oriental d'Antioche à Tigranocerte, le temps d'un épisode court mais qui impacta fortement sur l'équilibre des pouvoirs autour de la Méditerranée. Il prépara la division des anciennes possessions séleucides entre Romains et Parthes, tandis que l'Arménie était à nouveau réduite au statut d'État périphérique bloqué entre deux grandes puissances.

English Abstract:

In the aftermath of the Seleukid defeat against the Roman legions at Magnesia (190 BCE), Armenia became an independent region, divided between two kingdoms, Artaxiad Greater Armenia and Orontid Sophene. In the subsequent decades, the relations between the Artaxiad kings and the Seleukid throne fluctuated between dormant hostility and ruler-to-ruled

domination. The reign of Antiochos IV saw a brief return of Greater Armenia to the Seleukid control, immediately followed by an open conflict between Artaxias, king of Greater Armenia, and Seleukos' successor, as well as by the creation of a new autonomous power in Armenia, the kingdom of Commagene, creating an even more complex political situation. The Artaxiad state took a rather unclear place in the Asian geopolitical order, in the periphery of the Seleukid Empire but partly integrated into the Anatolian scene. This situation was reflected in the cultural background and ideological politics of the kingdom, as well as in the political choices made by its dynasts. In the second half of the second century, as Seleukid influence declined, the status of the king of Greater Armenia evolved through contact with Rome, the Arsakids and Pontos. After a quick political unification of Armenia, Tigranes II of Greater Armenia managed to completely turn the tides by taking control of Antioch. This political shift saw the transfer of the Near-Eastern political centre from Antioch to Tigranokerta, which, although for a brief period, severely impacted the Mediterranean balance of powers. At the same time, it prepared the division of former Seleukid central regions between the Romans and the Parthians, while a united Armenia fell back to a status of peripheral state between two greater powers.

References:

- Arnaud, P. 1987. 'Les guerres des Parthes et de l'Arménie dans la première moitié du premier siècle av. n.è.: Problèmes de chronologie et d'extension territoriale (95 BC–70 BC)', *Mesopotamia*, 22, 129–145.
- Engels, D. 2011. 'Middle Eastern "Feudalism" and Seleucid Dissolution', in K. Erickson & G. Ramsey (eds.), *Seleucid Dissolution: Fragmentation and Transformation of Empire (Exeter, July 2008)*, Wiesbaden, 19–36.
- Engels, D. 2014. 'Je veux être calife à la place du calife'? Überlegungen zur Funktion der Titel 'Großkönig' und 'König der Könige' vom 3. zum 1. Jh. v. Chr.', in V. Cojocar, A. Coşkun & M. Dana (eds.), *Interconnectivity in the Mediterranean and Pontic World during the Hellenistic and the Roman Periods*, Cluj-Napoca, 333–362.
- Facella, M. 2006. *La dinastia degli Orontidi nella Commagena ellenistico-romana*. Pisa.
- Hewsen, R.H. 1985. 'Introduction to Armenian Historical Geography IV: the boundaries of Artaxiad Armenia', *REArm*, 19, 55–84.
- Invernizzi, A. (ed.) 1998. *Ai piedi dell' Ararat. Artaxata e l'Armenia ellenistico-romana*, Florence.
- Khatchadourian, L. 2007. 'Unforgettable Landscapes. Attachments to the Past in Hellenistic Armenia', in N. Yoffee (ed.), *Negotiating the Past in the Past. Identity, Memory and Landscape in Archaeological Research*, Tucson, 43–75.
- Payen, G. ca. 2017. 'L'influence séleucide sur les dynasties anatoliennes après le traité d'Apamée', forthcoming in A. Coşkun & D. Engels (eds.), *Rome and the Seleucid East. Select Papers from Seleucid Study Day V, Université libre de Bruxelles, 21–23 Aug. 2015, Collection Latomus*.
- Shayegan, M.R. 2011. *Arsacids and Sasanians. Political Ideology in Post-Hellenistic and Late Antique Persia*, Cambridge.
- Traina, G. 1999/2000. 'Épisodes de la rencontre avec Rome (IIe siècle av. J.-C. – IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)', *Iran & Caucasus*, 3/4, 59–78.

Short CV:

Après une Licence en Histoire menée à l'Université de Rouen (France), entre 2004 et 2007, Dr. Germain Payen a suivi un cursus d'Histoire ancienne, en commençant par un Master de recherche, dans la même université de Rouen, entre 2007 et 2009. Le sujet du mémoire associé était « la défense du royaume attalide (188–133 a.C.) » et les directeurs de recherche Prof. Patrice Hamon et Prof. Giusto Traina. De 2011 à 2016, il étudia en cotutelle internationale de thèse aux universités Laval (Québec) et Paris-Sorbonne (Paris), sous la direction conjointe de Prof. Patrick Baker (Québec) et de Prof. Giusto Traina (Paris). La thèse s'intitulait « les conséquences géopolitiques du traité d'Apamée en Asie Mineure ». Actuellement chercheur indépendant, il s'intéresse surtout à la géopolitique de la mer Noire et des régions caucasienne et arménienne dans les deux derniers siècles avant notre ère.

12) Gillian Ramsey (University of Regina, Saskatchewan):

Rebel Poleis: the Politics of Anti-Seleukid Violence

Email: [Gillian.Ramsey at uregina.ca](mailto:Gillian.Ramsey@uregina.ca)

Abstract:

Polities within the Seleukid Empire were a conglomeration of colonial ventures, reconstituted city-states, and myriad villages controlled by adherents to the royal court, all of them shaped by experiences of multicultural encounters, warfare driven by high politics of the empire, and shifting economic fortunes. The evidence for violent resistance to Seleukid authority spans all these groups and the motives for it stemmed from economic, geopolitical, and cultural concerns. The latter two are most evident in the Seleukids' own rhetoric and iconography of imperial rule, while the former can be inferred from the circumstances surrounding Seleukid subjects' interactions with their kings. This paper will consider the cases of violent resistance to the Seleukids, defined by the willingness of subjects to throw support behind a violent agitator or take up arms themselves. It will argue that most episodes of resistance, although folded into the histories of great men's quests for usurpation and personal glory (e.g. Apollonitans with Molon, Antiochenes with Tryphon), were rooted in, and extended only so far as, local concerns.

Inasmuch as the Alexandrian model of masculine kingship encouraged the ambitious to aim at independent rulership, the old Greek *polis* model of autonomy and self-governance also retained its force through the centuries of Seleukid colonial occupation. Many resistance movements had at their core a collective desire for local political self-determination. In the vast majority of documented encounters between the Seleukids and their subjects, we are told how the dynasty leveraged this *polis* desire for its own gain, acquiescence to Seleukid domination, and performances of loyalty in exchange for promised freedoms. Enough examples survive in the record, however, to show that this exchange broke down given the right combination of latent grievances and concatenating circumstances. For many cities and towns, we could characterize their euergetic exchanges with the dynasty as agreements to defer dealing with serious problems to a later date.

This paper will focus on how the politics-driving outbreaks of anti-Seleukid violence show a consistent concern with economics and local character, two areas of community life, which also lay at the heart of Greek *polis* civilization. The same transplanted vibrancy of city life, which nourished a power base for the Seleukids, also posed a serious hindrance to their ongoing domination.

References:

- Chrubasik, B. 2016. *Kings and Usurpers in the Seleukis Empire: The Men who would be King*, Oxford.
- Cohen, G.M. 2006. *The Hellenistic Settlements in Syria, the Red Sea Basin, and North Africa*, Berkeley CA.
- Cohen, G.M. 2013. *The Hellenistic Settlements in the East from Armenia and Mesopotamia to Bactria and India*. Berkeley CA.
- Eddy, S.K. 1961. *The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern resistance to Hellenism, 334–31 B.C.* Lincoln.
- Evans, R.J. 2010. ‘The Family as a Target for Revenge in Greek and Roman History’, *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 21/2, 63–73.
- Howe, T. & Lee L. Brice (eds.) 2016. *Brill’s Companion to Insurgency and Terrorism in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Leiden.
- McGing, B.C. 1997. ‘Revolt Egyptian Style. Internal Opposition to Ptolemaic Rule’, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und Verwandte Gebiete* 43/2, 273–314.
- Ma, J. 1999 (repr. 2000). *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford.
- Mackil, E. 2004. ‘Wandering Cities: Alternatives to Catastrophe in the Greek Polis’, *AJA* 108/4, 493–516.
- Ramsey, G. forthcoming. “‘The Four Generals in the Land’”: Late Seleukid Administration in Babylonia,’ forthcoming in A. Coşkun & D. Engels (eds.), *Rome and the Seleukid East. Select Papers from Seleukid Study Day V, Université libre de Bruxelles, 21–23 Aug. 2015, Collection Latomus*.
- Rigsby, K.J. 1997. *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley CA.
- Taylor, M.J. 2014. ‘Sacred Plunder and the Seleucid Near East’, *Greece & Rome* 61/2, 222–241.

Short CV:

Dr. Gillian Ramsey is Assistant Professor of Classics at Campion College, University of Regina. She had previously held an Assistant Professorship at the University of Toronto and Lecturerships at the Universities of Leicester and Exeter, UK. She was awarded her PhD in Classics at the University of Exeter (2009), after gaining her MA in Greek and Roman Studies at the University of Victoria (2005) and her BA Hons in History (with a minor in Classical Studies) at the University of Regina (2003). Her research concentrates on the administration of the Seleukid Empire and female agency in the Hellenistic world. Recent publications include ‘The Diplomacy of Seleukid Women: Apama and Stratonike,’ in A. Coskun & A. McAuley 2016, 87–104; ‘Generals and Cities in late Seleukid and early Parthian Babylonia’, forthcoming in A. Coskun & D. Engels (eds.), *Rome and the Seleukid East* (Collection Latomus), Brussels ca. 2017.

13) Rabbi Ben Scolnic (Southern Connecticut State University, New Haven)

Judaean Responses to Seleukid Rule in the Second Century BCE

Email: [rabbiscolnic at gmail.com](mailto:rabbiscolnic@gmail.com)

Abstract:

The famous Judaean revolt against the Seleukid king Antiochos IV Epiphanes in the 160’s BCE should be seen in historical context. The Ptolemies ruled Judaea until Antiochos III’s victory at

the Battle of Panion in 200 and so Seleukid rule was a relatively recent development. As they had under Ptolemaic rule, the Judaeans lived in peace and with religious autonomy under Antiochos III (cf. the Wisdom of Ben Sira, written c. 180). Things may have begun to change during the time of Antiochos III's son Seleukos IV. Recent scholarship on the roles of ministers at the Seleukid court has pointed to an interesting case in the assassination of Seleukos IV by a group of courtiers led by Heliodorus who objected to his fiscal policies concerning temples in his reign. After they installed the boy Antiochos, son of Seleukos IV, as king, however, their efforts were thwarted by the usurpation of the throne by Antiochos IV, who then made even more dramatic moves against Judaeans worship. The actions of Antiochos IV caused a violent revolt, but that famous rebellion notwithstanding, the Judaeans remained subjects of the Seleukid throne for decades afterwards.

Three texts have come down to us from the time of the revolt and the era that followed it, *Daniel* 7–12, *1Maccabees*, and *2Maccabees*, all produced while the Seleukids still ruled over Judaea, vary in their attitudes to Seleukid rule. The different ideologies expressed in *Dan* 7–12 show how the monotheism of the Judaeans affected their understanding of historical reality, as they grappled with the meaning of centuries of foreign rule. In particular, *Dan* 11's reconstruction of Hellenistic history is quite explicit and detailed in its negative assessment of Seleukid rule, culminating in its attack on the legitimacy of Antiochos IV. *Dan* 11 may be based on an anti-Seleukid, Ptolemaic historical account, following Hellenistic rules, with a Jewish theological context provided by *Dan* 10 and 12. If one distinguishes between political legitimacy in Hellenistic and Jewish terms, does *Dan* 11 try to harmonize the two streams? *1Macc* is defiant in its evaluation of the Seleukid kings and in celebrating those heroes who fought for religious freedom. The letter that is found in *2Macc* 1, dated to 143 BCE, however, is quite surprising in its deference to the legitimacy of the crown in its summary of the revolt. The issue of religious autonomy is central to this discussion, and this issue is intertwined with Seleukid economic policies and with the question of centralization of power in a kingdom that was so far-flung and heterogeneous. The Judaeans in the centuries after the Babylonian exile were almost always loyal subjects of the various kingdoms that ruled them, and only an extreme provocation could have led to armed revolt. The fact that the Judaeans returned to loyal vassalage after the revolt demonstrates this non-confrontational ideology.

References:

- Gera, D. 2013. 'Onias III and the Legitimacy of Judas Maccabaeus', in *XIV Congress of the IOSCS*, Atlanta, 105–26, esp. 107, n. 7.
- Lebram, J.-Ch. H. 1975. 'Perspektiven der gegenwärtigen Danielforschung', *JSJ* 5, 1–33.
- Lebram, J.-Ch. H. 1975. 'König Antiochus im Buch Daniel', *VT* 25, 737–772.
- Lebram, J.-Ch. H. 1983. 'The Piety of the Jewish Apocalypticists', in D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979*, 171–210.
- Lebram, J.-Ch. H. 1984. *Das Buch Daniel*, Zurich.
- Portier-Young, A.E. 2011. *Apocalypse against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids MI, 80.
- Schwartz, D.R. 2008. *2 Maccabees*, Berlin, 38–44.
- Scolnic, B. 2014. 'Is Dan 11:1-19 Based on a Ptolemaic Narrative?', *JSJ* 2014, 157–184.

Short CV:

Rabbi Dr. Benjamin Scolnic took his PhD from the Jewish Theological Seminary after taking a BA (English) and MA (Comparative English Literature) from Columbia University. Currently Rabbi Scolnic is the spiritual leader of Temple Beth Shalom in Hamden, Connecticut and is also Adjunct Professor at Connecticut State University. Rabbi Scolnic has authored numerous books and articles in the areas of Seleukid and Maccabean history, among other areas of a vast and diverse scholarship. Dr. Scolnic was the Daniel Jeremy Silver Fellow at Harvard (1997/98) and was the recipient of other fellowships and awards, including the Rabbi Jacob Agus Prize, presented to "the pulpit rabbi who best exemplifies the ideal of the rabbi-scholar." His several book publications include *Judaism Defined: Mattathias and the Destiny of His People*, 2010; *Thy Brother's Blood: The Maccabees and the Morality of Kinship*, 2007; *Alcimus, Enemy of the Maccabees*, 2004.

14) Nicholas Sekunda (University of Gdańsk, Poland):

The Oxyartid Dynasty of the Paropamisadai

Email: sekunda@ug.edu.pl

Abstract:

The Alexander Historians unanimously state that Oxyartes was Baktrian. The name Oxyartes is seemingly derived from the Oxos River and its protecting deity. Following the Greek historians the name Oxyartes was borne by rulers of Bactria in pre-Achaimenid times (eg. Diod. 2.6.2). It is thus possible that Oxyartes was a local throne name.

The historical Oxyartes, who had been one of Bessos' last adherents (Arr. *An.* 3.28.10), probably joined in the general revolt of 329 BCE, but was later reconciled with Alexander, who married his daughter Roxane. In 323 BCE Perdikkas gave the satrapy of Paropamisadai to Oxyartes (Diod. 18.3.3). We last hear of Oxyartes in 316 BCE (Diod. 19.48.9) when Antigonos permitted him to retain the satrapy 'as before, for he too could not be removed without a long campaign and a strong army'. After that, we hear nothing further directly of him. In 304 BCE, after reasserting his rule over Bactria, Seleukos must have traversed the Hindu Kush, passing through the Paropamisadai. He had a strong army – did he remove him from the satrapy? It is the practically unanimous opinion of moderns, with the notable exception of Tarn (1951, 100), that Seleukos I ceded Paropamisadai to Chandragupta, but they cite Strabo 15.2.9, whose testimony is ambiguous.

Coins, stylistically belonging to the Hellenistic period, bearing the same name Oxyartes in Aramaic letters (*VaHšUVaR*) have been found. In 1962, Bellinger listed three different coins, all thought to have come from the Oxos Treasure. One of the coins bears the head of Athena, below which appear two letters which W. Tomashek interpreted as ΠΓ standing for a date of 83 years, which could be 253 or 250 BCE if running from an Alexandrian era beginning in 336 or 333; 244 or 245 BCE if running from 327 or 328 when Oxyartes became a dynast; or 229 BCE if running from the beginning of the Seleukid era in 312 BCE.

It is impossible to decide which dynastic system was in use, but it is hard to avoid the conclusion that some descendant of the historical Oxyartes enjoyed 'semi-independent politico-military status' (Sidkey 2000, 109), at some time between 253 and 229 BCE. This would coincide with a statue-base dedicated to or by one Oxyartes at Delos, which Baslez dates to around 235 BCE (*JG XI* (4) 1209; Baslez 1985, 142 n. 33).

A gold ring was also found in the Oxos Treasure engraved with an inscription in Aramaic letters, which has been interpreted as the name Oxyartes (Dalton ¹1905, no. 105, pp. 103–105, pl. 15; ²1926, no. 105, p. 28, pl. 16; ³1963, no. 105, p. 28, pl. 15). Dalton dated the ring to the fifth or fourth centuries, and so to the historical Oxyartes or one of his ancestors. This is unlikely, but the form of the ring cannot be as late as the second century. It has a flat oval bezel engraved in intaglio with a winged human-headed bull, crowned and standing to the left. In the field above is an inscription in Aramaic letters, and before the animal's breast is a sign. The sign is identical with the old astronomical symbol for Taurus, and was frequently used in the East about the time of Alexander. It also occurs in the punch marks of Persian *sigloi* dating from the early fourth century. I will suggest that the ring dates, like the coin and the statue base from Delos, to the third century BCE.

This paper will draw all these pieces of disparate evidence together. Emphasis will be given to establishing a plausible date for the end of the rule of the Oxyartid Dynasty. Did it survive long enough to witness the *Anabasis* of Antiochos III? In light of recent work stressing the devolved nature of Seleukid Kingship (Chrubasik 2013), this paper will seek to determine what level of independence the Oxyartid Dynasty enjoyed in the Paropamisadai. At first it was evidently under Seleucid suzerainty, but did it resist Seleucid claims to territorial hegemony with the break-up of Seleukid power in Central Asia in the middle of the third century BCE?

References:

- Baslez, M.-F. 1985. 'Présence et Traditions iraniennes dans les Citées de l'Égée', *RÉA* 87.1–2, 137–155.
- Bellinger, A.R. 1962. 'Coins from the Treasure of the Oxus', *American Numismatic Society. Museum Notes* 10, 51–67.
- Chrubasik, B. 2013. 'The Attalids and the Seleucid Kings, 281–175 BC', in P. Thonemann (ed.), *Attalid Asia Minor: Money, International Relations, and the State*, Oxford, 83–119.
- Dalton, O.M. ¹1905; ²1926; ³1963. *The Treasure of the Oxus*, London.
- Sidky, H. 2000. *The Greek Kingdom of Bactria. From Alexander to Eucratides the Great*, Lanham.
- Tarn, W.W. 1951. *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, Cambridge.

Short CV:

Dr. Nicholas Sekunda took his PhD from Manchester University (1981) and is now Head of Department of Mediterranean Archaeology at Gdańsk University. He was awarded post-doctoral research fellowships at Monash University (1986–1988) and Australian National University (1988/89). He served as Assistant Editor on the Lexicon of Greek Personal Names at Oxford (1989–1992) and was a Temporary Lecturer at the University of Manchester (1993/94). Since 1994 he has lived in Poland, working at first in English Language Teaching, principally at the Military Academy for the teaching of foreign languages, Łódź. He returned to archaeology in 1999, first teaching in the Nicholas Copernicus University, Torun, and from 2006 for Gdańsk University. He is currently Head of Department of Mediterranean Archaeology at Gdańsk University, and co-Director of Excavations at Negotino, and also participates in Greek excavations at Antikythera. In 2015, he was awarded the title of Professor by the President of Poland.

15) Svyatoslav Smirnov (Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow):

Between Seleukids and Parthia: The Coinage of Seleukeia-on-the-Tigris of 140-130 BC and the Iconography of a Transition Period

Email: [smirnovsv3 at ya.ru](mailto:smirnovsv3@ya.ru)

Abstract:

When the young king Demetrios II rose to power, the struggle between Seleukids and Parthian king Mithradates I entered its final phase. As more and more of the Seleukid eastern possessions irreversibly passed under the control of Parthia, Demetrios ran the risk of losing his power over territories east of the Euphrates. Under these circumstances, Seleukeia on the Tigris became the last Seleukid outpost in the East. For Demetrios this city was of a great importance not only because of its resources and strategic location but also its ideological significance. It had been founded as a rich and resourceful trade center by Seleukos Nikator, and was ever since considered to be the cradle of their power. Seleukeia should thus have been the last hope for young Demetrios in his war against the usurper Diodotos. The present paper centers on the iconography of the coins issued by the mint of Seleukeia in the course of the transition from Seleukid to Parthian rule. Sudden changes of iconography can be observed during the first reign of Demetrios, which could reflect the transformation of the king's ideology in the face of his Parthian campaign and struggle against Diodotos. Thus, instead of the dominant Seleukid type 'Apollo on omphalos', which served as a reverse type for the first silver series of Demetrios, two new coin types 'Tyche holding cornucopiae' and 'Zeus Aitophoros' were introduced. In addition, a new series of bronze coins appealed to the motif of the eastern campaign, displaying a variety of royal portraits: with helmet, elephant headdress, lion skin or diadem. This way, Demetrios made a firm attempt to associate his power with that of both his father Demetrios I and his ancestor Seleukos I. These two had been successful in their eastern campaigns, whereas Demetrios II ultimately failed and ended in captivity. Seleukeia was thus lost to the Parthians. Its new ruler Mithradates I, however, did not stop depicting the same iconographic motifs on his coins as his Seleukid predecessor. Thus, the 'Zeus Aitophoros' type was adopted for silver coins by Mithradates, but it is hardly possible he intended to reference the aforementioned Seleukid rulers. In this context, local iconographic traditions of Seleukeia deserve a particular attention, too. The municipal bronze issues and seals initiated under Mithradates present 'Zeus Aitophoros' and 'Tyche' types as rather local imagery. It thus seems likely that, by drawing on local iconography, the two opponents Demetrios and Mithradates tried to advertise the support (or only attempted to gain the support) of the population of Seleukeia-on-the-Tigris, which remained for both Seleukids and Parthians the all-important city in the East.

Short CV:

Dr. Svyatoslav Smirnov is postdoctoral researcher at the Institute of World History, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow. His research focusses on the ideological history and coin iconography of the Hellenistic world. Currently, he is working on two coin catalogues, *Seleukid Coins from the Collection of the State Historical Museum (Moscow)* (with Zakharov E.V.), and *Hellenistic coins from the Collection of the Saratov Museum of Local History* (Morzherin K.Yu.). His publications include 'The First Experience of Co-Regency in Seleukid Kingdom' (in Russian), *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii*, 4. 2009, 159–168; 'The Elephant Chariots at Daphne: an Aspect of Antiochus' IV Ideological Policy', in O. Gabelko. & A. Mehl (eds.), *Ruthenia*

Classica, Stuttgart 2013, 117–121; '[Arist.] Oec. II. 1345b. 21–28 and the interpretation of τὰ γῆ (in Russian), in *Aristeas* 8, 2013, 110–120.

16) Gaius Stern (University of California, Berkeley, Los Angeles):

Antiochos III the Eleutherotes Want-to-Be and His Short-Lived Warm Reception in Greece (192 BCE)

Email: [gaius at berkeley.edu](mailto:gaius@berkeley.edu)

Abstract:

After having fought with the Romans against the Macedonians in the Second Macedonian War, the Aetolian League felt insufficiently rewarded in terms of territory and loot. The Aetolians now turned with the hopes of future compensation to Antiochos III: he had recently returned from a substantial Eastern campaign, retracing the footsteps of and reconquering much of the Empire of Alexander the Great, for which Antiochos now styled himself Antiochos the Great. Although the Aetolians assured Antiochos the other Greeks would welcome him into Greece with far more enthusiasm than the new local umpire, the semi-barbaric Romans, they either were ill-informed or deliberately misinformed Antiochos both about the Romans and about his popularity in order to benefit from his forces in the coming diplomatic and probably military struggle with Rome. The Aetolians believed Antiochos' propaganda about his glorious Eastern campaigns and that the man and the time had come through which they could avenge themselves upon Rome, an error several other powers also made with usually grim consequences, most famously Carthage.

Believing his new allies (whom Polybius repeatedly condemns as untrustworthy and even as pirates), Antiochos III invaded Europe and soon declared himself the liberator of the Greeks (Polyb. 20.8.1), in spite of T. Quinctius Flaminius's proclamation at the Isthmian Games in 196. In a few places, he was welcomed in with fanfare and adulation, namely by the Aetolians and the Boeotians, but more of Greece had no need of his liberation, since no state in Greece had a garrison or paid tribute to the Romans or suffered under a harsh treaty (Liv. 35.46.10). Thus, Antiochos' dream of reuniting this additional portion of Alexander's former empire with his own was founded on a series of wrong assumptions, starting with the premise that he would be welcomed into Greece, that the Aetolians had accurately summed up hatred of the Romans, and that both Sparta and Macedon would ally with him to avenge their disgraceful treatment at the hands of them. Furthermore, Antiochos was wholly unprepared to tangle with the Romans, who were unlike any opponent he had ever faced before.

What Antiochos probably took to be a safe bet by trusting his Aetolian allies, actually turned out to be a complete gamble. Nor did he benefit from the assistance and genuine good advice from Hannibal, who was a much better commander than anyone the Aetolians could offer, because all of the Greeks distrusted the Carthaginian as a foreigner, while Hannibal's very presence intensified Roman resolve to defeat Antiochos as the host of the enemy Hannibal. But a bigger problem overshadowed all, namely, that Antiochos believed in his own propaganda and invincibility, completely unaware that the Romans had defeated Philip V for precisely the same reasons they would defeat him: their military machine was better than his and the majority of Greeks whom he was 'liberating' with absolute monarchy – whose cooperation was essential – preferred the freedoms they had newly regained at Roman hands to a 125-year-old version of 'freedom' that Cassander, Demetrius Poliorcetes, and others had offered them that was really more autocracy than autonomy.

References:

- Badian, E. 1959. 'Rome and Antiochus the Great: A Study in Cold War', *CP* 54, 81–99.
- Dmitriev, S. 2011. *The Greek Slogan of Freedom and Early Roman Politics in Greece*, Oxford.
- Eckstein, A.M. 2006. *Rome Enters the Greek East: From Anarchy to Hierarchy in the Hellenistic Greek East*, Berkeley CA.
- Eckstein, A.M. 2006. *Mediterranean Anarchy, Interstate War, and the Rise of Rome*, Berkeley CA.
- Georges, P. 1994. *Barbarian Asia and the Greek Experience*, Baltimore.
- Gruen, E. 1984 (pb 1986). *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*, Berkeley CA.
- Harris, W. 1979 (repr. 1985). *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome, 327–70 B.C.*, Oxford.
- Holleaux, M. 1935. *Rome, la Grèce et les monarchies hellénistiques au III^e siècle avant J.-C. 273–205*, Paris.
- Jones, K. 2011. 'The Conflict of East and West as Propaganda during the Antiochene War', CAMWS 2011.
- Mastrocinque, A. 1983. *Manipolazione della storia in età ellenistica: i Seleucidi e Roma*, Rome.
- Newell, E.Th. 1938. *Coinage of the Eastern Seleucid Mints from Seleucus I to Antiochus III*, New York.
- Warrior, V.M. 1996. 'Evidence in Livy on Roman Policy Prior to War with Antiochus the Great', in R.W. Wallace & E.M. Harris (eds.), *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360–146 B.C. in Honour of E. Badian*, Norman OK, 356–375.

Short CV:

Dr. Gaius Stern teaches History at San Jose State University and Classics at UC Berkeley Extension. He took a PhD in Ancient History from UC Berkeley after writing a thesis on the politics of the Augustan Age in 13 BCE, using the Ara Pacis Augustae as contemporary evidence to indicate the 'official version' of the power dynamic in Rome in 13 BCE. Much of his research looks at the Ara Pacis as it should be understood, as a Roman monument that does not proclaim monarchy to an audience of Romans of 13 BCE, unaware of who would later rule Rome. Other topics of research include POWs, Classical Greece, and archaic Rome to the Punic Wars. He has organized a series of Punic War panels at CAMWS and other conferences in the past few years.

17) Rolf Strootman (University of Utrecht, Netherlands):

Dismember, Behead, Impale! Ritual Mutilation and the Concept of Treason against the King in the Macedonian Near East, c. 338–190 BCE

Email: [R.Strootman at uu.nl](mailto:R.Strootman@uu.nl)

Abstract:

In ancient monarchies, rebel leaders were not merely executed when caught; they typically were also often 'dehumanized' by the mutilation of their bodies and the denial of proper burial. The Seleukid Empire was no exception. When the rebel king Achaios was delivered into the hands of the imperial sovereign, Antiochos III, the Royal Council after ample discussion decided 'that his extremities should be cut off, his head severed from his body and sewn up in the skin of an ass, and his body impaled' (Polybios 8.21.3).

Other examples from Hellenistic contexts include Alexander's execution of Artaxerxes V Bessos in 329 BCE (Curtius 7.5.36–43) and the impalement of Molon's corpse in 221 BCE (Polybios 5.54.3). Ptolemaic court poetry has given us the nasty details of Jason's treatment of the corpse of Apsyrtos (Apollonius, *Argonautica* 4.477–479), while the best known literary example from the Hellenistic World remains the execution of the villain Haman in the *Book of Ester* (7.10). And of course, examples from the Achaemenid Empire, too, have amply survived in Greek sources, not to mention the positive depiction of cruelty against enemies on Assyrian palace reliefs and in Biblical texts (Zimmermann 2013; Lemos 2006). All these acts of mutilation typically are of a theatrical, public nature. In most cases, treason or rebellion is somehow associated with it.

What was the purpose of inflicting such severe retribution, particularly on (alleged) traitors? Various interpretations of (*post mortem*) mutilation rituals have been suggested by Ancient Historians and Classicists: they have been explained as rituals to avert the vengeance of a murdered soul (Ceulemans 2007); as the humiliation of defeated enemies or simply as a typical imperial form of violence (Lincoln 2007; Zimmermann 2013); as Zoroastrian burial practice (Jacobs 1992); and as a literary trope, *viz.* as orientalist stereotyping (Rollinger 2010; Colburn 2011).

Believing that the wide attestation of the theatrical dismemberment of significant enemies is based on historical fact, I argue that it was not so much a punishment inflicted *upon* traitors, but a performative act by which treason, or rebellion, was constructed as a category of social conduct. Ritual mutilation and the denial of burial was a means to present the elimination of internal opponents as a legitimate act while at the same time denying legitimacy to the executed 'rebel'. This, in turn, begs the question how the mutilated bodies were displayed or reported, and how such punishments were received by others.

References:

- Colburn, H.P. 2011. 'Orientalism, Postcolonialism, and the Achaemenid Empire: Meditations on Bruce Lincoln's *Religion, Empire, and Torture*', *BICS* 54.2, 87–103.
- Ceulemans, R. 2007. 'Ritual Mutilation in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*: A contextual analysis of IV, 477–479 in search of the motive of the *μασχαλισμός*', *Kernos* 20, 97–112.
- Jacobs, B. 1992. 'Der Tod des Bessos – Ein Beitrag zur Frage des Verhältnisses der Achämeniden zur Lehre des Zoroastres', *Acta Praehistorica et Archaeologica* 24, 177–186.
- Jacobs, B. 2009. 'Grausame Hinrichtungen – friedliche Bilder. Zum Verhältnis der politischen Realität zu den Darstellungsszenarien der achämenidischen Kunst', in M. Zimmermann (ed.), *Extreme Formen von Gewalt in Bild und Text des Altertums*, Munich, 121–153.
- Lemos, T.M. 2006. 'Shame and Mutilation of Enemies in the Hebrew Bible', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125.2, 225–241.
- Lincoln, B. 2007. *Religion, Empire, and Torture: The Case of Achaemenian Persia. With a Postscript on Aby Ghraib*, Chicago.
- Llewellyn-Jones, L. 2013. "'Empire of the Gaze": Despotism and Seraglio Fantasies à la Grecque in Chariton's Callirhoe', in S. Blundell, D. Cairns & N. Rabinowitz (eds.), *Vision and Viewing in Ancient Greece (Helios 40)*, 167–191.
- Rollinger R. 2010. 'Extreme Gewalt und Strafgericht. Ktesias und Herodot als Zeugnisse', in B. Jacobs and R. Rollinger (eds.), *Der Achämenidenhof. Akten des 2. Internationalen Kolloquiums zum Thema "Vorderasien im Spannungsfeld klassischer und altorientalischer*

Überlieferungen", Landgut Castelen bei Basel, 23.-25. Mai 2007 (Classica et orientalia 2), Wiesbaden, 559–666.

Strootman, R. 2005. 'Kings against Celts: Deliverance from Barbarians as a Theme in Hellenistic Royal Propaganda', in K.A.E. Enenkel & I.L. Pfeijffer (eds.), *The Manipulative Mode: Political Propaganda in Antiquity*, Leiden, 101–141.

Zimmermann, M. 2013. *Gewalt. Die dunkle Seite der Antike*, Munich.

Short CV:

Dr. Rolf Strootman graduated in History and Archaeology at Leiden University, and in Cultural Heritage and Museology at the Amsterdam School of the Arts. In 2007, he received his PhD from the University of Utrecht where he studied the social, ritual, and political dimensions of royal courts in the Hellenistic empires. He is currently Associate Professor of History at the University of Utrecht. His areas of research include cultural encounters and globalization in premodern Afro-Eurasia. He is the author of *After the Achaemenids: Courts and Elites in the Hellenistic Empires, c. 330–64 BCE* (2014) and *The Birdcage of the Muses: Patronage of the Arts and Sciences at the Ptolemaic Imperial Court, 305–222 BCE* (2017), and co-editor with M.J. Versluys of the volume *Persianism in Antiquity* (2017). His current research project, 'Royal Roads', examines the role of royal courts in the Achaemenid and Seleukid empires, c. 550–150 BCE.

18) Richard Wenghofer & Mark Wachowiak (Nipissing University, North Bay ON):
Ancient History GeoVisage: A Digital Platform for the Interdisciplinary Study of the Seleukid World

Email: [richardw at nipissingu.ca](mailto:richardw@nipissingu.ca) & [markw at nipissingu.ca](mailto:markw@nipissingu.ca)

Abstract:

Ancient History GeoVisage (AHGV) is a hybridized digital map and data archive utilizing NASA satellite imaging developed at Nipissing University by Richard Wenghofer (Classical Studies) and Mark Wachowiak (Mathematics and Computer Science). The original purpose of the design was to integrate the ever expanding digital resource collections of primary sources (both literary and material culture) for the study of ancient history and culture into a single, coherent database organized geospatially and chronologically, thus organizing historical knowledge in the way events themselves actually unfolded – in space and time. The intended application of AHGV was, initially, purely pedagogical, however, more recently we have come to realize the potential for research applications of this platform as well. We thus now envision AHGV as a vehicle for interdisciplinary scholarship organized on the basis of time and place rather than by discipline, theme, topic etc. (i.e. the traditional scholarly and heuristic paradigms). With respect to Seleukid scholarship in particular, AHGV can work as a venue for bringing together scholars from various Classical Studies disciplines as well as from fields outside of Classical Studies (i.e. Geology, Hydrology, Soil Science, Ecology etc.) in order to study specific regions/periods in a more holistic fashion, thus providing scholars with a much fuller and more integrated picture of historical causation. Research panels thus organized can then publish their peer-reviewed findings directly onto AHGV alongside the collection of relevant literary sources, material culture, and other historically relevant data.

Short CV

Dr. Mark Wachowiak gained his BSc, MSc and PhD in Computer Sciences at the University of Louisville. He is currently Associate Professor in the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science at Nipissing University.

See below for Wenghofer's CV.

19) Richard Wenghofer (Nipissing University, North Bay ON) & Dylan Hall (Western University, London ON)

Acquiescence or Resistance? Reading the Diplomatic Language of the 'Seleukid' Poleis against the Grain

Email: [richardw at nipissingu.ca](mailto:richardw@nipissingu.ca) & [dehall694 at community.nipissingu.ca](mailto:dehall694@community.nipissingu.ca)

Abstract:

To date a number of studies have appeared which examine the ways in which the Seleukid kings attempted to legitimize their reign over a vast and diverse array of polities (most recently see Kosmin 2014). While these studies have been largely successful in uncovering the mechanisms of Seleukid control (i.e. social, political, economic, cultural, and ideological), less attention has been paid to how Seleukid subjects reacted to Seleukid claims of hegemony. Indeed, with the exception of obvious cases of open, armed revolt (i.e. Maccabean Revolt, Timarchos, Molon, Achaios etc.), the prevailing assumption is that Seleukid claims to the exercise of legitimate hegemony were in some sense effective and that the absence of armed revolt somehow suggests acquiescence if not outright support. It is therefore the purpose of this paper to question such assumptions and to explore some of the ways, other than armed revolt, in which resistance to Seleukid hegemony could, and likely did, occur. The starting point for this analysis is that of *realpolitik*. Smaller entities, such as the various poleis dotting the Western fringe of the Seleukid world, existed in the shadow of Seleukid kings who wielded considerably more economic and military might than could be mustered by most poleis. It has of course been rightly argued that Seleukid rule was a negotiated hegemony (see Ma 1999; Ramsay 2011; Strootman 2013), and that the Seleukid kings' preferred *modus operandi* was to exchange a variety of benefactions to a polis for tribute, defense of royal private and public affairs (i.e. *pragmata*), and public expressions of loyalty (i.e. games in honor of kings, royal cult etc.). My study will therefore focus on these public expressions of loyalty, most typically those found in the epigraphic and numismatic data, and will attempt to demonstrate the existence of a diplomatic subtext that often employs a highly moralized rhetoric which, it could be argued, was aimed at curtailing or limiting the exercise of royal power. My contention is that while such public declarations of fealty on the part of the weaker party (i.e. the polis) might at times have been genuine, the performative character of said declarations, and the skillful manipulation of the moral economy articulated therein, can also be viewed as acts of resistance to Seleukid hegemony on the part of the polis.

References:

Capdetrey, L. 2007. *Le pouvoir Séleucide: territoire, administration, et finances d'un royaume hellénistique*, Rennes.

- Chrubasik, B. 2012. 'Tyrants or Kings? The Communication between Cities and Usurpers in the Seleukid Empire', in Ch. Feyel, J. Fournier, L. Graslin & F. Kirbihler (eds.), *Communautés locales et pouvoir central dans l'Orient hellénistique et romain*, Paris, 65–83.
- Grainger, J.D. 2013. *Rome, Parthia, & India: The Violent Emergence of a New World Order, 150–140 BC*, Barnsley.
- Grainger, J.D. 2014. *The Rise of the Seleukid Empire (323–223 BC)*, Barnsley.
- Grainger, J.D. 2015. *The Fall of the Seleukid Empire (187–75 BC)*, Barnsley .
- Kosmin, P.J., 2014. *The Land of the Elephant Kings: Space, Territory, and Ideology in the Seleucid Empire*, Cambridge MA .
- Ma, J. 1999. *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford.
- Nye, J. 2004. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. Cambridge MA.
- Ramsey, G. 'Seleucid Administration – Effectiveness and Dysfunction among Seleucid Officials', in K. Erickson & G. Ramsey (eds.), *Seleucid Dissolution: Fragmentation and Transformation of Empire (Exeter, July 2008)*, Wiesbaden, 37–50.
- Sherwin-White, S. & A. Kuhrt 1993. *From Samarkand to Sardis. A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*, London.
- Strootman, R. 2013. 'Babylonian, Macedonian, King of the World: The Antiochos Cylinder from Borsippa and Seleukid Imperial Integration', in E. Stavrianopoulou (ed.), *Shifting Social Imaginaries in the Hellenistic Period: Narrations, Practices, and Images*, Leiden, 67–97.

Short CVs

Dr. Richard Wenghofer received a BA in Classical Studies (University of Guelph, 1992), an MA in Classics (University of Western Ontario), and another MA in Early Modern History (University of Guelph, 2001), before taking his PhD in Ancient History from York University in 2009. Effective July 2017, he will be Associate Professor of Classical Studies at Nipissing University where he has been lecturing since 2006. Peer-reviewed publications include 'Sexual Promiscuity of Non-Greeks in Herodotus' *Histories*', *Classical World* 107.4, 2014, 515–534; 'Marriage Diplomacy and the Political Role of Royal Women in the Seleukid Far East', in A. Coskun & A. McAuley 2016, 191–207 (with D.J. Houle); 'With Enemies Like This, Who Needs Friends? Roman Intervention in the Hellenistic East and the Preservation of the Seleukid Patrimony', forthcoming in A. Coskun & D. Engels 2017; 'Rethinking the Relationship between Hellenistic Baktria and the Seleukid Empire', forthcoming in K. Erickson (ed.) 2017.

Dylan Hall gained his BA with honours specialization in Classical Studies at Nipissing University in 2017. He has, at time of writing, accepted an offer for Graduate Studies at the University of Western Ontario for 2017–2019 where he will be investigating archaeological techniques that may shed light upon the subaltern classes, especially camp followers, in and around the Vindolanda archaeological site. As part of his interest in subaltern studies, Mr. Hall is interested in examining the life of colonized subjects in imperial contexts. He is currently assisting Dr. Richard Wenghofer in an examination of resistance strategies employed by colonized subjects in the Seleukid Empire.