Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections

Preliminary Observations on Hellenistic Honorific Statuary in Ptolemaic Egypt

Sara E. Cole
J. Paul Getty Museum

In Ptolemaic Egypt, members of the elite classes used art that combined elements from both the Greek and Egyptian traditions in order to negotiate status and identity in a cross-cultural environment.[1] One of the genres through which they did this was statuary, and among the different types of statuary produced in Ptolemaic Egypt were honorific statues. These statues were tied to the Hellenistic concept of *euergetism* (benefaction) toward one's community, an important facet of elite identity in the Hellenistic world.[2] Communities or individuals honored benefactors by setting up statues of them accompanied by Greek inscriptions on their bases and sometimes on stelae erected nearby.

A comprehensive study of this Hellenistic practice in the Ptolemaic context has never been undertaken. P. Van Minnen notes that "[e]uergetism as a phenomenon in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt has never been studied *per se*."[3] Similarly, the major studies of Hellenistic honorific statuary have largely glossed over or entirely omitted Egypt.[4] This is in part because in Ptolemaic Egypt the phenomenon acquired characteristics different from those of the rest of the Hellenistic world, and in part because a limited number of honorific inscriptions are preserved. But it is clear that Hellenistic euergetism impacted the visual culture of Ptolemaic Egypt and that the Hellenistic honorific statue habit (to use J. Ma's phrase) developed in Egypt in ways that resulted in hybridizing displays of civic honor.

Throughout the Hellenistic East the subjects of honorific statues were elite individuals who had the wealth and resources to provide services for their cities, and they often held high-ranking positions in the administration, priesthood, or military. Statues were also dedicated to rulers for their good deeds. Common settings for honorific statues were the agora, shrines and temples, theaters, and gymnasia. Because it was necessary to receive the approval of the city to set up a statue, and because the statues

were often displayed in public or semi-public spaces, honorific statuary and its expression of civic identity was inextricably linked to the control of civic space and how it was organized. A statue or inscription made an individual's identity a public matter, tying private to civic, and allowing the community to claim some degree of ownership over the individual.[5]

Honorific statues tended to adhere to certain conventions. Marble and bronze were the materials used, and the marble bases bore Greek inscriptions that followed established formulas, with the name of the honorand appearing first in the accusative case, followed by the name of the agent awarding the statue in the nominative. The subjects were often shown standing in a contrapposto pose and draped. Statues could be single or pairs/groups of individuals. Their style was largely consistent across Hellenistic sites, and they were typically just over life-size.[6]

Did these same standards for statue material, style, display context, and inscription appear in Ptolemaic Egypt as well, or did the practice acquire new aspects in this setting? How did Egyptian statuary traditions impact the forms that honorific statuary took in Egypt? Did the Hellenistic and Egyptian statuary practices engage in a dialogue with one another? J. Ma frames his study of honorific statuary around the question: "Why say thank you with a statue?" My aim is to expand this question to ask "Why—and, just as importantly, *how*—did one say thank you with a statue in Ptolemaic Egypt?"

Inscribed statue bases and stelae comprise the main body of extant evidence for honorific statues in Ptolemaic Egypt. Numerous statue fragments survive that may have once belonged to honorific statues, but they have been separated from their inscriptions. My intention is to begin by focusing on inscriptions and the evidence that the texts and the statue bases themselves can provide about the individuals being honored, the types of statues being made, and their contexts of display. For a preliminary survey, I have relied on existing publications of Ptolemaic inscriptions.[7] The Corpus of Ptolemaic Inscriptions, a current project to create a full database of Greek, bilingual, and trilingual inscriptions on stone from Ptolemaic Egypt, will be of enormous help once it is published online and in book form.[8] Based on the CPI, there are about 10 honorific statue bases for Ptolemaic rulers, 10 honorific statue bases for private individuals, and about 90 decrees or dedicatory inscriptions on stelae (12 of which come from gymnasia).[9] Of this last category, some decrees dedicate honorific statues while many publicly proclaim dedications of money, buildings, or other resources being made by private individuals, priests, or civic groups. Therefore, some stelae pertain directly to the honorific statue habit while others speak more broadly to the importance of euergetism. Statue bases and stelae come not only from Alexandria and its environs but also cities throughout Egypt; honorific statues were thus not restricted to newly founded Hellenistic cities but also incorporated into existing Egyptian communities and temples.

The honorific statue habit in Egypt took unique forms that integrated characteristics of both Greek and Egyptian statuary customs, as Ptolemaic elites took Hellenistic trends and adapted them to Egyptian contexts in order to appeal to multiple audiences. The agents and honorands, whether Greek or Egyptian, all belonged to similarly privileged groups and occupied the same social space. These individuals chose to use the same type of object, in varying forms, to express a priority common to all Hellenistic elites. Furthermore, Egypt's long-standing practice of erecting statues of priests in temples, accompanied by lengthy biographical inscriptions detailing the individuals' service, provided an inroad for honorific statuary to map on to established Egyptian traditions, thus facilitating its proliferation in Egypt and making the presence of Hellenistic-style statues adjacent to Egyptian ones socially acceptable. As C. Fischer-Bovet argues, "the concept of euergetism, broadly defined as generously using one's own wealth for the welfare of the community, was not exclusively the continuation of a practice found in Greek poleis."[10] Community benefaction was a practice already valued in Egypt, one that had a tradition of being commemorated through statuary. One of my primary research goals will be to explore this intersection further by drawing upon select examples of inscribed Egyptian-style statues of Ptolemaic priests and officials.

Below I briefly overview a statue base dedicated to a Ptolemaic ruler, two statue bases dedicated to private individuals, an Egyptian-style inscribed statue, and a decree that offers honorific statues. These examples provide a representative sampling of the extant evidence. I then articulate a few preliminary hypotheses and questions for further study.

Diodotos, Son of Achaios

As elsewhere in the Hellenistic world, honorific statues in Ptolemaic Egypt were dedicated to members of the ruling dynasty and to private individuals. It seems that Egyptian-style stone statues and Hellenistic-style bronze ones were created.[11] We know this from decrees that offer statues in both stone and bronze (see the Callimachos Decree discussed below), as well as from the surviving surfaces of statue bases. For example, in his study of statues of Ptolemaic rulers, Paul Edmund Stanwick used the following criteria to determine whether the statues were of Greek or Egyptian type:

> Egyptian statue bases have either the remains of feet in Egyptian style, or a rectangular hole cut into the top, where the depth is about twice the size of the width (to accommodate an Egyptian style standing figure). Greek statue bases, in contrast, often have foot-shaped holes cut into the top for affixing bronze statues.[12]

In many instances, only poor-quality black-and white-photographs of the statue bases, or illustrations of them, are available. An examination of the approximately 20 extant statue bases could potentially provide valuable information about the style of the statues and the material from which they were made. Additionally, some of the statue bases appear to have been re-inscribed, raising questions about re-use.

Private individuals could dedicate statues to Ptolemaic rulers. A granite statue base in Alexandria bears an inscription that reads:

(1) ΒΑΣΙΛΕΑ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΝ
ΣΩΤΗΡΑ ΔΙΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΑΧΑΙΟΥ

King Ptolemy,
Savior. Diodotos, son of Achaios.[13]

The two lines of Greek are followed by the same inscription in Demotic, referring to Ptolemy as "pharaoh" (*pr-ʿ3*). In the Greek text, the name of the honorand (Ptolemy) appears in the accusative case, while the name of the agent (Diodotos) is in the nominative. The inscription can thus be understood to say: "(Statue of) King Ptolemy, Savior. Diodotos, son of Achaios (has dedicated)." Because of its rectangular recess, this base would have supported an Egyptian-style stone statue of Ptolemy I. The statue base is carved from granite instead of the marble that was used elsewhere in the Hellenistic East. The Greek text adheres to the standard formula but is paired with a bilingual inscription and an indigenous statuary tradition—in both style and material—for the depiction of rulers. The complete statue + base thus combines a local practice with an imported one to create a hybridizing form.

Apollonios, Son of Theon

Two mid-2nd century BCE red granite statue bases inscribed with the name of Apollonios, son of Theon, were found by Édouard Naville at the entrance to the hypostyle hall in the temple at Bubastis in the Egyptian Delta.[14] These bases date to the reign of Ptolemy V. It is conceivable that this Apollonios is identical with the priest Horpakhepesh represented in an Egyptian granite statue in the Yale Peabody Museum that is likely also from Bubastis.[15] Naville did not describe the appearance of the bases, and he published only transcriptions of the Greek inscriptions, no photographs. One reads:

(1) ΒΑΣΙΛΕΑ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΝ Θ[ΕΟΝ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΗ]
ΚΑΙ ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ[Ν ΕΑΥΤΟΥ
ΑΔΕΛΦΟΝ]
ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΝ ΑΠΟΛΛΩ[ΝΙΟΣ ΘΕΩΝΟΣ]
ΤΩΝ ΦΙΛΩΝ Ο ΔΙΟΙΚΗ[ΤΗΣ ΕΥΝΟΙΑΣ]
(5) ΕΝΕΚΕΝ ΤΗΣ ΕΙΣ ΤΑ [.....]
ΑΥΤΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΤΕΚ[ΝΑ ΑΥΤΩΝ][16]

King Ptolemy, god manifest
and gracious, and his own brother
Ptolemy, Apollonios, son of Theon,
one of the friends (of the king), the finance minister,
on account of their kindness toward the [.....]
him and their children.

The second reads:

(1) ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΝ ΘΕΩΝΟΣ ΤΩΝ ΘΙΛ(ΩΝ)
ΤΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΟΙΚΗΤΗΝ
ΤΟΝ ΕΑΥΤΟΥ ΑΔΕΛΦΟΝ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΣ
ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ ΤΩΝ ΔΙΑΔΟΧΩΝ
(5) ΕΥΝΟΙΑΣ ΕΝΕΚΕΝ ΤΗΣ ΕΙΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΑ
ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΑΝ
ΚΛΕΟΠΑΤΡΑΝ ΘΕΟΥΣ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΕΙΣ ΚΑΙ
ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΟΥΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΤΕΚΝΑ ΑΥΤΩΝ[17]

> Apollonios, son of Theon, one of the friends
> of the king, and the finance minister,
> his own brother, Ptolemy,
> son of Apollonios, one of the diadochoi,
> on account of his kindness toward king
> Ptolemy and queen
> Cleopatra, manifest and gracious
> gods, and to their children.

The first inscription is dedicated by Apollonios, son of Theon, to both king Ptolemy and a second man named Ptolemy, perhaps indicating a pair statue or that two separate statues were created. The second inscription is dedicated by Ptolemy—son of another Apollonios—who calls Apollonios, son of Theon, his brother. This may be a term of fictive kinship meant to emphasize the honorific nature of the dedication. Ptolemy dedicates this second statue to Apollonios, son of Theon, who was a *dioikētēs* (finance minister) and counted himself among the *philoi* (friends) of the king. Ptolemy was a member of the aulic class called the *diadochoi*. The reason given for this statue is Apollonios's kindness toward the king and queen.

These statue bases illustrate the reciprocal character of elite euergetism, in which one man dedicates a statue to his "brother" and that man is obligated to return the favor. In the second inscription, Apollonios is honored for his service not to the community, but to the ruling family. Ptolemy is also honored for his kindness toward a particular person (or people) and their children, but it is difficult to suggest a satisfactory name or word that would fit in the lacuna at the end of line five of that inscription, so it is unclear toward whom Ptolemy has extended benefaction. In any case, the reciprocity demonstrated in these inscriptions would have strengthened the social bonds between the two men and, in consequence, increased their social capital within the elite groups to which they belonged.

Harchebi/Archibos

Alongside these honorific statues, traditional Egyptian statues of priests and high officials continued to populate Egyptian temples, and these two statue types may have occupied the same physical spaces. One example of such statues is that of a man named Harchebi. Harchebi, who also went by the Hellenized form of his name, Archibios, was a *dioikētēs* and priest. A grey granite statue of Harchebi—missing the head, lower legs, and much of the arms—probably comes from Mendes.[18] The torso shows a striding male wearing a smooth Egyptian kilt, with both arms clenched at his sides. The hieroglyphic inscription on the statue's belt provides Harchebi's chief titles and his parentage:

> *ḥm-nṯr sš-nsw.t ỉmy-rꜣ ꜣḫ snty*
> *ḥr-ḫbỉ ḏd.tw n=f ỉrkbys*
> *zꜣ Pꜣ(-n-)Mr-wr*
> *ms tꜣ-šr.t(-n-)Bꜣst.t*
>
> The priest, royal scribe, overseer of fields, *snty/dioikētēs*,
> Harkhebi, who is called Archibios,
> son of Pamnevis,
> born of Senobastis.[19]

Harchebi's parents both bear Egyptian names, though this does not discount the possibility that he had some Greek ancestry. At the top of the statue's trapezoidal back pillar, the top of which is broken away, a scene shows him offering to Harpokrates, the Ram of Mendes, and Hatmehyt.[20] In this scene, Harchebi wears a long tunic with short sleeves and what may be a lotus-bud diadem on his head. The diadem with lotus bud signifies a close relationship to the king and is indicative of the official title *sn-nsw.t/syngenes* ("royal kinsman/companion"), which was used frequently in the later Ptolemaic period.[21]

Two dates have been proposed for Harchebi:[22] the reign of Ptolemy II,[23] and the reign of Ptolemy VIII.[24] If the Kansas City statue dates to the reign of Ptolemy II, Harchebi would be the earliest known native Egyptian to hold the title of *dioikētēs*. There is, however, a documented *dioikētēs* and a *hypodioikētēs* named Archibios,[25] both of whom served under Ptolemy VIII, with whom J. Yoyotte argued that Harchebi can be identified.[26] The title *sn-nsw.t/syngenes*, which was common in the later Ptolemaic period, may also point to the reign of Ptolemy VIII.[27]

The inscription on the statue's back pillar details Harchebi's service through funding renovations to local temples and personally purchasing material for the mummification of sacred rams. He proclaims the use of his own resources to support the temple. It was precisely this kind of benefaction that was also commemorated by Hellenistic honorific statues. But

the basic purpose of this type of statue was different: it extended a priest's personhood, enabling him to reside perpetually within the temple in the presence of the gods. In the Ptolemaic period, both of these statue types were set up within temples, as the Callimachos Decree (below) makes clear.

The Callimachos Decree

The Callimachos Decree from Thebes,[28] inscribed in Greek and Demotic on a re-purposed royal stela that was found in front of the first pylon at the Karnak temple, offers three statues (*eikonas*) of the Theban strategos Callimachos, who served under Cleopatra VII.[29] The three statues are to be set up in the public part of the temple of Amun-Re at Thebes (*en episēmois topois tou ierou tou megistou Theou Amonrasōnthēr*). One statue in hard stone (*sklērou lithou*) is offered by the priests; the other two, one in hard stone and one in bronze (*chalkēn*), are offered by the city. This was a measure to honor Callimachos for his service to the Theban community. These statues do not survive, but the decree reveals three important things: 1) honorific bronze statues of individuals were erected in Egyptian temples under the Ptolemies, 2) the priesthood played an integral role in commissioning these statues, and collaborated with the city council in order to do so, so that a civic body and a religious one worked together in honoring a prominent individual, and 3) the statues were placed in the outer, publicly visible parts of the temple.

The stela does not indicate the style in which the three statues were made, but the two different materials—hard stone and bronze—may correlate with Egyptian and Hellenistic styles, respectively.[30] The priests offer one of the statues in hard stone, which is appropriate given its traditional use for temple statues. The city, on the other hand, dedicates both types of statue: an Egyptian hard stone and a (probably Greek) bronze. In this case, the city and the local priesthood collaborated to bring two statuary traditions together in honoring one man.

The statues of Callimachos mediate between the two different functions that were served by traditional Egyptian statues set up within temples, which were primarily religious in nature, and the civic purpose of Hellenistic honorific statues. And in fact, the content of the inscription ties the statues both to Callimachos' service to Amun-Re and to his public benefaction—he is honored for maintaining the sanctuaries of the Egyptian gods and also for helping the community survive a period of drought and famine. The inscription concludes with a declaration: "Publicly he shall share in the good will of the greatest god, Amun-Re, in order that for all time his benefactions shall exist in everlasting memory." With Callimachos, these two concepts—using statues to honor devotion to the Egyptian gods and to honor public benefaction—became fully intertwined.

It is also noteworthy that all of this information is recorded in a bilingual inscription on a granite stela that was originally inscribed with hieroglyphs during the dynastic period and that shows an Egyptian relief scene in its lunette. The scene, in which Cleopatra VII and her son Ptolemy Caesarion (her son with Julius Caesar) worship Amun-Re and the god Montu, is an unambiguous reference to the importance of temples within the Theban community, and it places the content that follows under their purview. We can see the ways in which the priesthood allows the honorific statue habit to exist within its domain—it will approve Greek-style bronze statues within the temple precinct, but it does not dedicate them, and traditional hard stone statues continue to stand next to them.

Preliminary Conclusions and Future Goals

The research outlined above is still in a nascent state. As the majority of the relevant material is housed in Alexandria's Graeco-Roman Museum, which has been closed since 2005 with its collection inaccessible in storage, further progress is dependent upon the museum's re-opening. Access to the statue bases and stelae themselves will be crucial for understanding not only the inscriptions but also the style and material of the statues the bases supported. In-person examination will also allow for new photographs to be taken so that one need not rely solely on old black and white images or illustrations. The publication of the Corpus of Ptolemaic Inscriptions will also be enormously helpful in compiling relevant inscriptions in a single database.

Specific, documented findspots for many of the statue bases and stelae are lacking, making it difficult to reconstruct where within a city or specific building a statue was located. Nevertheless, a comprehensive assessment of the surviving statue bases and related inscriptions can potentially provide a new picture of the statue landscape of

Ptolemaic cities and the mechanics of this Hellenistic practice in Egypt. This will further enhance our understanding of the honorific statue habit throughout the Hellenistic world, expanding the discussion beyond sites like Athens, Priene, and Delos. To the extent possible, it will also be worthwhile to investigate the identities of the agents and honorands of the statues in order to provide a holistic picture of the practice and the people behind it, particularly how individuals and communities grappled with an increasingly mixed Greco-Egyptian culture and sense of identity, and how this may have changed over time.

A later step in the project will be to compare the use of honorific statues in Ptolemaic Egypt with those from Ptolemaic territories such as Cyprus and Cyrene to explore the intersection between local and imported traditions in those contexts. These statues can also speak to local reactions to Ptolemaic presence. For instance, Ma has suggested that privately dedicated honorific statues from the agora at Thera may reflect "a sense that the Therans were trying to keep control of their public space in spite of occupation by a Ptolemaic garrison" during the time of the Ptolemaic thalassocracy.[31] Honorific statues dedicated to Ptolemaic rulers in Hellenistic cities outside of Egypt can also be compared to representations of the Ptolemies within Egypt.[32]

The few examples presented here highlight that there were several different manifestations of the negotiation that took place between Egyptian communities and the honorific statue habit. Further study of these and other examples will seek to clarify how statues and their inscriptions navigated the distinctions among religious worship, dynastic power, and civic honor. Perhaps the most significant overarching theme, and one that deserves to be parsed more fully, is that the Egyptians often worked in concert rather than conflict with this imported Hellenistic practice in order to perpetuate both traditions simultaneously while also allowing for mutual influence.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Alan Bowman, Kyriakos Savvopoulos, Rachel Mairs, and Charles Crowther of the Corpus of Ptolemaic Inscriptions for sharing unpublished material with me. I would also like to thank Paul Edmund Stanwick for sharing his observations on Ptolemaic statuary.

Abbreviations

OGIS I and *II*	Dittenberger, Wilhelm. 1903–1905. *Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae,* 2 vols. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.
SB	Preisigke, Friedrich (ed.). 1922. *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*, vol. 1, nos. 1–6000. Strassburg: Trübner.
SEG	*Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum*. 1923–. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff.

References

Baines, John. 2004. "Egyptian Elite Self-Presentation in the Context of Ptolemaic Rule." In W. V. Harris and Giovanni Ruffini (eds.), *Ancient Alexandria between Egypt and Greece*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 33–61.

Berman, Lawrence. 1999. *Catalogue of Egyptian Art: The Cleveland Museum of Art*. Cleveland, OH: Cleveland Museum of Art; New York: Distributed by Hudson Hills Press.

Bernand, André. 1969. *Les inscriptions grecques de Philae*, vol. 1. Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique.

———. 1970. *Le delta égyptien d'après les textes grecs 1: Les confins libyques*, 3 vols. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire.

———. 1989. *De Thèbes à Syène*. Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique.

———. 1992. *La prose sur pierre dans l'Égypte hellénistique et romaine*, 2 vols. Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique.

Bernand, Étienne. 1969. *Inscriptions métriques de l'Egypte gréco-romaine. Recherches sur la poésie épigrammatique des Grecs en Egypte.* Paris: Belles lettres.

———. 1975. *Recueil des inscriptions grecques du Fayoum*, I. Leiden: Brill.

———. 1981. *Recueil des inscriptions grecques du Fayoum*, II–III. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire.

———. 1982. *Inscriptions grecques d'Égypte et de Nubie: Répertoire bibliographique des OGIS.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

———. 1992. *Inscriptions grecques d'Égypte et de Nubie au musée du Louvre*. Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique.

———. 1999. *Inscriptions grecques d'Hermoupolis Magna et de sa nécropole*. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.

———. 2001. *Inscriptions grecques d'Alexandrie*

ptolémaïque. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.

Bingen, Jean. 1970. "Les épistratèges de Thébaïde sous les derniers Ptolémées," *Chronique d'Égypte* 45: 369–378.

Blasius, Andreas. 2001. "Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt: A Question of Loyalty," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 47: 81–98.

Bothmer, Bernard V. 1960. *Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period, 700 B.C. to A.D. 100*. Brooklyn: Brooklyn Museum.

Breccia, Evaristo. 1911. *Iscrizioni greche e latine*. CGA 1–568. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.

———. 1914. *Alexandrea ad Aegyptum: guide de la ville ancienne et moderne et du Musée gréco-romain.* Bergamo: Istituto italiano d'arti grafiche.

Burstein, Stanley M. 1985. *The Hellenistic Age from the Battle of Ipsos to the Death of Kleopatra VII*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cole, Sara E. 2019. "Cultural Manoeuvring in the Elite Tombs of Ptolemaic Egypt." In Renee M. Gonek and Carrie L. Sulosky Weaver (eds.), *The Ancient Art of Transformation: Case Studies from Mediterranean Contexts*. 75–106. Oxford and Philadelphia: Oxbow.

Cooney, J. D. 1972. "Art of the Ancient World." *Apollo* 96: 474–485.

Curto, Silvio. 1984. *L'antico Egitto nel Museo Egizio di Torino*. Turin.

Curty, Olivier. 2015. *Gymnasiarchika: recueil et analyse des inscriptions de l'époque hellénistique en l'honneur des gymnasiarques.* Paris: De Boccard.

Daehner, Jens. M. and Kenneth Lapatin (eds.). 2015. *Power and Pathos: Bronze Sculpture of the Hellenistic World*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum.

Daumas, François. 1952. *Les moyens d'expression du grec et de l'égyptien comparés dans les décrets de Canope et de Memphis*. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.

Delorme, Jean. 1960. *Gymnasion: étude sur les monuments consacrés a`l'éducation en Grèce.* Paris: Editions E. De Boccard.

Fischer-Bovet, Christelle. 2014. *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gauthier, Henri. 1916. *Le livre des rois d'Égypte: Recueil de titres et protocoles royaux. Vol. 4, De la XXVe dynastie à la fin des Ptolémées*. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.

Gauthier, Philippe. 1985. *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs.* Athens: Ècole française d'Athnes; Paris: Dépositaire, Diffusion de Boccard.

Gorre, Gilles. 2009. *Les relations du clergé Égyptien et des Lagides d'après les sources privées.* Leuven: Peeters.

Greisbach, Jochen (ed.). 2014. *Polis und Porträt: Standbilder als Medien öffentlicher Repräsentation im hellenistischen Osten*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Hölbl, Günther. 2000. *History of the Ptolemaic Empire*. Trans. T. Saavedra. London: Routledge.

Hutmacher, Rudolf. 1965. *Das Ehrendekret für den Strategen Kallimachos.* Meisenheim am Glan: A. Hain.

Klotz, David. 2009. "The Statue of the Dioikêtês Harchebi/Archibios. Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art 47-12." *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 109: 281–310.

Klotz, David and Marc LeBlanc. 2012. "An Egyptian Priest in the Ptolemaic Court: Yale Peabody Museum 264191." In Christiane Zivie-Coche and Ivan Guermeur (eds.), *"Parcourir l'éternité": hommages à Jean Yoyotte*, vol. 2, 645–698. Turnhout: Brepols.

Ma, John. 2004. "Hellenistic Honorific Statues and their Inscriptions." In Zahra Newby and Ruth Leader-Newby (eds.), *Art and Inscriptions in the Ancient World*, 203–220. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2006. "The Two Cultures: Connoisseurship and Civic Honours." *Art History* 29(2): 325–338.

———. 2012 "Honorific Statues and Hellenistic History." In Christopher Smith and Liv Mariah Yarrow (eds.), *Imperialism, Cultural Politics and Polybius: Essays in Memory of P.S. Derow*, 230–251. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2013a. "The History of Hellenistic Honorific Statues," in Paraskevi Martzavou and Nikolaos Papazarkadas (eds.), *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis: Fourth Century BC to Second Century AD*, 165–179. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2013b. *Statues and Cities*: *Honorific Portraits and Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2014. "Private Statues, Public Spaces." In Jochen Greisbach (ed.), *Polis und Porträt: Standbilder als Medien öffentlicher Repräsentation im hellenistischen Osten*, 87–97. Wiesbaden:

Reichert.
de Meulenaere, Herman and Pierre MacKay. 1976. *Mendes* II. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
Migeotte, Léopold. 1997. "L'évergétisme des citoyens aux périodes classique et hellénistique." In Michel Christol and Olivier Masson (eds.), *Actes du Xe congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine, Nîmes, 4–9 octobre 1992*, 183–196. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.
Mooren, Leon. 1975. *The Aulic Titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt: Introduction and Prosopography*. Brussels: Koninklijke academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België.
Naville, Édouard. 1891. *Bubastis (1887–1889)*. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner.
Peremans, W. 1982. "Sur le bilinguisme dans l'Égypte des Lagides." In Jan Quaegebeur (ed.), *Studia Paulo Naster Oblata II: Orientalia Antiqua*, 143–154. Leuven: Peeters.
Peremans, W. and Van't Dack, E. 1950. *Proposographica Ptolemaica I*. Leuven: Peeters.
——— and ———. 1968. *Prosopographia Ptolemaica VI*. Leuven: Peeters.
———, ———, L. Mooren, and W. Swinnen. 1975. *Prosopographia Ptolemaica VIII: addenda et corrigenda aux volumes I (1950) et II (1952)*. Leuven: Peeters.
Ricketts, L. M. 1982/3. "The Epistrategos Kallimachos and a Koptite Inscription: SB V 8036 Reconsidered." *Ancient Society* 13/14: 161–165.
Schmidt, Inga. 1995. *Hellenistische Statuenbasen*. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang.
Spier, Jeffrey, Tim Potts, and Sara E. Cole (eds.). 2018. *Beyond the Nile: Egypt and the Classical World*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum.
Stanwick, Paul Edmund. 2002. *Portraits of the Ptolemies: Greek Kings as Egyptian Pharaohs*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Stanwick, Paul Edmund. 2009. "New Perspectives on the Brooklyn Black Head." In Sue H. D'Auria (ed.), *Offerings to the Discerning Eye: an Egyptological Medley in Honor of Jack A. Josephson*, 301–311. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
Stoop, Jelle. 2013. *Portraits and Pretense: Honorific Habits in Hellenistic Communities*. PhD dissertation, Yale University.
Thiers, C. 2006. "Égyptiens et Grecs au service des cultues indigenes: un aspect de l'éuergétisme en Égypte lagide." In M. Molin (ed.), *Les regulations sociales dans l'Antiquité*, 275–301. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes.
Thomas, James David. 1975. *The Epistrategos in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt*, I. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
Van Minnen, Peter. 2000. "Euergetism in Graeco-Roman Egypt." In L. Mooren (ed.), *Politics, Administration and Society in the Hellenistic and Roman World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Bertinoro 19–24 July 1997*, 437–470. Leuven and Paris: Peeters.
Veyne, Paul. 1990. *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism*. Trans. Brian Pearce. London: Penguin.
Vleeming, S. P. 2001. *Some Coins of Artaxerxes and Other Short Texts in the Demotic Script Found on Various Objects Gathered from Many Publications*. Leuven: Peeters.
Wallensten, Jenny and Jari Pakkanen. 2009. "A New Inscribed Statue Base from the Sanctuary of Poseidon at Kalaureia." *Opuscula* 2: 155–165.
Ward, Roger and Patricia J. Fidler. 1993. *The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art: A Handbook of the Collection*. New York: Hudson Hills Press in association with the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Lanham, Md.
Yoyotte, Jean. 1989. "Le nom égyptien du 'Ministre de l'économie.'" *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* 133(1): 73–90.
Zanker, Paul. 1995. "Brüche im Bürgerbild? Zur bürgerlichen Selbstdarstellung in den hellenistischen Städten." In Michael Wörrle and Paul Zanker (eds.), *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus: Kolloquium, München, 24. bis 26. Juni 1993*, 251–273. Munich: Beck.

Notes

1 E.g., Spier, Potts, and Cole 2018; Cole 2019.

2 On euergetism in the Greek and Roman world, see, e.g., P. Gauthier 1985; Veyne 1990; Migeotte 1997; Van Minnen 2000.

3 Van Minnen 2000, 443.

4 Gauthier 1985; Ma 2013b; Stoop 2013; Griesbach 2014. See also shorter overviews in Ma 2004; Ma 2012; 2013a; 2014. In his recent study of Hellenistic gymnasiarchs, Curty (2015, 21–22) omits Egypt for its uniqueness:

> Les inscriptions en provenance d'Egypte ne figurent pas non plus dans le corpus. Certains esprits vétilleux s'en offusqueront peut-être. Mais faut-il rappeler ici la spécificité de l'Egypte dans

l'Antiquité, ce pays où la civilization grecque, s'est greffée sur la culture nationale, plus qu'elle ne s'y est impose? C'est pourquoi les textes qui y sont produits contiennent trop de singularités indigènes.

5 See Ma 2006; Ma 2013b.

6 On the standardized types, see, e.g., Zanker 1995; Ma 2013b.

7 Including, but not limited to Breccia 1911; *OGIS I* and *II* (1903–1905); *SEG* (1923–); A. Bernand 1969; 1970; 1989; 1992; É. Bernand 1969; 1975; 1981; 1982; 1992; 1999; 2001. For Ptolemaic period Demotic inscriptions and graffiti, some of which pertain to this topic, see, e.g., Vleeming 2001; Thiers 2006.

8 See the webpage for the Corpus of Ptolemaic Inscriptions Project: < http://cpi.csad.ox.ac.uk >, accessed 26 July 2019.

9 Personal communications with Kyriakos Savvopoulos and Alan Bowman in 2015 and December 2018. For inscriptions from Hellenistic gymnasia (including Egypt), see Delorme 1960.

10 Fischer-Bovet 2014, 332. See also Van Minnen 2000, 437–438, 440.

11 Two life-size bronze heads, likely from Egypt but without secure findspots, are believed to represent Ptolemaic queens and provide a clue to the type of honorific bronzes that were produced: see Lapatin in Daehner and Lapatin 2015, 198–199, cat. 7, and Ghisellini in Daehner and Lapatin 2015, 200–201, cat. 8.

12 Personal communication, April 9, 2015; Stanwick 2002.

13 Alexandria, Graeco-Roman Museum 19. Trismegistos 6368; *OGIS* 50, no. 19; Breccia 1911, 1, no. 1, pl. 1.1; Breccia 1914, 149, no. 1; H. Gauthier 1916, 434, an addition for page 219 n. 3; É. Bernand 1982, 15, no. 19; Peremans 1982, 151–152; Stanwick 2002, 98, no. A2, 157 fig. 1.

14 Naville 1891, 59, pl. 49 E–F.

15 Klotz and LeBlanc 2012.

16 Trismegistos 7013; *SB* I 2637. Naville 1891, 59, Pl. 49 E. This statue base is now lost.

17 Alexandria, Graeco-Roman Museum R. 337, formerly Cairo, Egyptian Museum CG 9262. Trismegistos 6394; *OGIS* 176–177, no. 100; Naville 1891, 59, pl. 49 F.

18 Cooney 1972, 476, 478; Ward and Fidler 1993, 107, 115; Gorre 2009, 390–392, no. 77; Klotz 2009; Cole in Spier, Potts, and Cole 2019, 164–165, cat. 97.

19 Klotz 2009, 284.

20 This is the Mendesian divine triad. See de Meulenaere and MacKay 1976, 178–180.

21 Baines 2004, 43.

22 For the history of debate on the date, see Klotz 2009, 300–304. For a discussion of possible similarities between this statue and one from Mendes of disputed date (Cleveland Museum of Art 1948.141), see Bothmer 1960, 125; Yoyotte 1989, 83; Berman 1999, 460-463, cat. no. 355.

23 Bothmer 1960, 125; Klotz 2009.

24 Yoyotte 1989; Gorre 2009, 392.

25 Peremans and Van't Dack 1950, no. 20 and no. 905, respectively.

26 Yoyotte 1989; followed by Gorre 2009, 390-392.

27 Klotz (2009, 303) notes that the modeling of the pectoral is closer to statues of the mid-Ptolemaic period.

28 Turin, Museo Egizio 1764. *OGIS* 275–279, no. 194; Daumas 1952, 264, 283; Curto 1984, 296–300, 358; A. Bernand 1992, 1.106–109, and 2.109–115, no. 46; Hölbl 2000, 239–240; Blasius 2001; Stanwick 2002, 50; Stanwick 2009, 307; Poole in Spier, Potts, and Cole 2019, 170–171, cat. 102. On the Greek text, see Hutmacher 1965. Burstein (1985, 144–146, no. 111) believes that the original stela dates to the New Kingdom, while Poole (2019, 171) believes that it is Dynasty 25.

29 Callimachos is also attested elsewhere as *strategos*, *epistrategos*, and *strategos* of the Red Sea and Indian Ocean: see Hutmacher 1965; Peremans and Van't Dack 1968, 16273, 17147; Bingen 1970; Mooren 1975, 96; Peremans, Van't Dack, Mooren, and Swinnen 1975, 194; J. D. Thomas 1975, 106–108; Ricketts 1982/83; Hölbl 2000, 239–240.

30 Stanwick (2002, 50) suggests that the bronze statue may have been made in the style of Hellenistic honorific statuary.

31 Ma 2012, 246.

32 Including a statue base for Ptolemy I from Miletos (Ma2013a, 174–176); a base for Philotera,

daughter of Ptolemy I at the temple of Apollo at Didyma (Schmidt 1995, 261–262, no. I.2.6); a base for Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II from the sanctuary of Poseidon at Kalaureia (Wallensten and Pakkanen 2009); a base for Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II at Olympia (Schmidt 1995, 536–537, no. XV.5); and two bases for Ptolemy IX on Delos (Schmidt 1995, 331–332, no. IV.1.62; 386–387, no IV.2.3).