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The present thesis essays to ascertain and research problems that concern the social requirements and the iconography of Hellenistic royal portraiture in glyptics. Throughout I employ a methodology established by H. Kyrieleis and R. Fleischer that defined anew the study of the numismatic evidence, recognizing in the obverse typology programs of a dynastic iconography.

The analysis of the royal iconography is pursued in the second through the fourth chapters, which in their organization take account of the distribution of the material evidence. Leaving aside the late Ptolemaic dynasty, for which the numismatic evidence remains silent, over two-thirds of the portraits surveyed represent the types of the regnal emissions or are associated with them in iconography. For the complement of anonymous portraits the I attempt to establish a relative chronology based on correlations educed in the stylistic properties of the obverse types. Whereas some new attributions are proposed, the arguments are equally directed to an assessment of the stylistic idioms in which the iconography is couched. I submit that if judiciously applied against the numismatic criteria, this approach can at least suggest the probable dynastic affiliation or regional origin of a given portrait.
The first chapter addresses the social requirements of the glyptic portraiture in the courts. Principally, it introduces arguments that stand counter to the scholarly consensus. I mount a case to refute the judgement that portrait cameos may have functioned as the ornamental devices of crowns awarded to the priests attending the eponymous dynastic cults. The weight of the evidence presumes that medallions fulfilled this purpose. Further, I would contend that the extended relationship of the glyptic iconography to the obverse types contradicts the theory that the royal house or its commissioners imposed in the aulic environment an iconography of divinized kingship, ideologically separate from that sanctioned for the official, public representation of the dynasty.
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INTRODUCTION

The function royal portraiture held in the social and political structures of the Hellenistic state is understood now to a greater extent than a quarter century ago. The research of H. Kyrieleis and R.R.R. Smith contributed significantly to this advance. Moreover, their scholarship redefined the approach to the problems of iconography and stylistic content that the statuary monuments continue to pose, specifically in relation to the evidence of the numismatic record. Since the late nineteenth century the criticism of royal portraiture addressed mainly the problem of attributions. Central to the methodology was a comparative analysis of the numismatic iconography, which stands in a relatively solid chronology and is accompanied by inscriptions naming the kings under whose authority the emissions were minted. This approach has led to the positive ascription of some twenty-three major portraits in marble and bronze. The attributions, however, in sum account for less than one quarter of the extant monuments.

This disparity, Smith and R. Fleischer elucidate, must in some measure entail the distorted perspective the material conveys. The surviving portraits are almost exclusively of marble, the traditional material of the agalmata, that is, the statues placed in temples and sacred precincts. Few of the royal monuments, however, presume this function. Inscriptions and the preserved bases for statuary monuments well confirm that bronze was the medium normally reserved for the dominant category of the portraiture: the eikones, or honorific dedications of the royal family, the court and civic bodies, whether internal or external to the realms. The bronzes contracted under the patronage of the ruling elite, and erected in the capitals and the regional dynastic centers where the royal mints operated, quite probably were closer in iconographic content to the typology of the emissions. Albeit that variations may emerge in any given sequence of the dies, in general the portraiture on the obverses adheres to a standard iconography.
phenomenon presupposes the existence of official types that under the jurisdiction of court commissioners would have been transmitted to the mints in the form of die models.  

The literature of the late Republic and the Imperial period affords several important passages, in part directly excerpted from Hellenistic authors, that are of interest concerning the status of the decorative arts under royal patronage. Principally, however, the sources center attention on the gold and silver plate that the kings gave to lavish display on the occasion of public regalements and the symposia of the court. Iconographic analysis, for the present, fails to establish that some articles of these elaborate services may survive; however, a few bronze fulcrum busts and plaster models cast for reproduction in metal presume the use of toreutic portraits in the form of appliqué plaques and emblemata as garnitures for the silver plate. Moreover, textiles, evidently woven to simulate the effect of panel paintings, and ivory furniture appliqués carried this theme. Substantially, however, our acquaintance with the minor arts that originated in the environment of the court remains limited to the gemstones and ring shields engraved with royal portraits, which were awarded to this élite and later, to the high officials of the bureaucracy.

The literature has not adequately addressed the subject of Hellenistic royal glyptics. Indeed, a comprehensive reading of it reveals faults of methodology in the examination of evidence from the numismatic record and interpretations that will not stand, often for having failed to weigh alternative contexts in which certain iconographies might be situated (infra).

The present thesis essays to ascertain and research problems that bear upon the iconology and the social requirements of the glyptic portraiture. New attributions, so far as the evidence would permit, are contributed, and the material is established in chronological sequences. The conclusions result in the submission of a revised corpus comprising ninety-five works, sixty-
two of which the previous scholarship has determined represent the types of the regnal emissions or are associated in iconography with them.

Intaglios fashioned for insertion into the bezels of finger rings comprise the mass of the semi-precious stone and glass gems that carry royal iconography. The typology of form may be set forth here in brief, since it is of diminished significance as a criterion on which to construct a chronology of the material, save on the most general lines. Oval stones with shallow or high convex faces were prevalent throughout the period. This type descends from the form of the comparatively rare ringstones of the fifth to the fourth century and directly from the profiles of the late scaraboids.\textsuperscript{11} The circular stones, level or convexly-faced, adhere to a bezel type introduced for solid metal rings during the later fourth century, and parallel in date the series of oval stones.\textsuperscript{12} From the end of the third century the principal developments were the increasing use of level-faced stones, and by the first century, a preference for small gems of the above types, the convex ones having the device centered in the field.\textsuperscript{13}

Of the chalcedonic varieties of quartz, the dominant material for glyptography during the Classical period, only sard and cornelian remained in extensive use. Before the end of the fourth century, in the wake of Alexander’s \textit{anabasis}, the importation of hard luciferous stones from the East began in response to the demand of an elite, whose taste for luxury articles had been affected by an appreciation of the wealth displayed at the Achaemenid court.\textsuperscript{14} The Indian subcontinent and the regions bordering the Red Sea virtually alone possessed the necessary resources of mineral deposits then available to the West. Importation came via overland and maritime conveyances, which terminated primarily in the emporia of the Seleucid and Ptolemaic realms.\textsuperscript{15} The mineral silicates garnet and peridot, the zirconium silicates hyacinth and beryl, and the quartz amethyst were introduced, although amethyst and pyrope, the dark red variety of garnet, surpassed the others in use.\textsuperscript{16}
The sphragistic use associated with engraved gem stones over the course of millennia ensured the continued dominance of the intaglio technique, despite the fact that by the beginning of the third century, in both the private and official sectors of Hellenic society, the employment of solid metal rings as signets had virtually eclipsed this functional application of the gems. This assertion is corroborated by a wealth of material evidence.17 Sites in the Hellenistic East, the Aegean, Egypt, North Africa and Sicily have yielded hoards of sealing impressions, numbering in the tens of thousands, which form the sole remnant of what were archives of state or public records and private documents of a commercial or legal content. Those recovered in Babylonia, at Edfu on the Upper Nile, and at Nea Paphos on Cyprus, have preserved extensive series of impresses representing the devices of signets of authority, which were issued to the bureaus of the royal administration and the scribes of the public registry offices. The iconography of the Seleucid and Ptolemaic dynasties with a complement of devices that in general reiterate the reverse types of the regnal mintage constitute their thematic repertoire. The agent for this concordance of iconography between the sigillary devices and the die types was the symbolic value ascribed to them as insignia embodying the sanction of the state. Impressed on the sealings of administrative ordinances or on the obverse and reverse of an emission, the insignia thus warranted the integrity of the text or the weight and metallic purity of the planchet.18

Preserved signets of the royal officialdom are rare, and carry only Ptolemaic iconography or hieroglyphic inscriptions.19 The bronze rings probably were employed by functionaries of the chancery or the scribes assigned to the administration of the khora. Leaving aside the silver emblema III 2, worked for insertion into the bezel of a ring, the rest are of gold. The large profiles of the latter descend directly from established Egyptian types: the standard form of the
signet ring, which had been introduced during the period of the XVIII Dynasty, and the related cortouche ring.20

The modern scholarship on the subject commenced with the research A. Furtwängler pursued on the engraved gems of Antiquity. The results, first set forth in a series of articles devoted to engravers’ autographed gems, culminated in the publication in 1900 of a monumental treatise. In this Furtwängler essayed a synthesis of the material, which organized according to chronology and addressing the criteria of period styles, ventured well beyond the interests and approach of the antiquitarians who hitherto had dominated the study of glyptics. His chapter on Hellenistic glyptography embraced an assembly of royal portraits to which he applied, not without success, the criticism of numismatic iconography. This treatise was the foundation for the corpus G.M.A. Richter published in 1968. Although she had at her disposal a greater accumulation of material from the Hellenistic period, the considerable range of her study militated against an in-depth assessment of the portraiture. Her analysis of the iconography barely attained the level of casual argument, and in fact the main value of her endeavor rests with the bibliographic citations and the brief summaries of the literature provided.

Since the publication of Richter’s monograph, research on the holdings of museum cabinets and private collections has revealed neglected gemstones and contributed evaluations of still more inadequately-studied works, the commentaries of M. L. Vollenweider, B. Gerring, O. Neverov, E. Zwierlein-Diehl and D. Plantzos being exceptional in this regard.21 Other inquiries have concentrated on regional finds and material correlated on technical criteria.22 Adversely, however, this scholarship has contributed incalculably to a hypothetical corpus that, I submit, would stand condemned by the very heterogeneity of its contents. There emerges in this literature a nearly consistent failure to consider the problem that the royal portraiture
and especially, the posthumous images of Alexander imparted their own aspects to the iconography of divinities; and that immanent in the royal physiognomy itself are formal elements extracted from the canons of the fourth century for the representation of deities and heroes. Nor was the posthumous iconography of Alexander unaffected by the assimilation of features from contemporary portraiture.

The monographs of H. Kyrieleis and R. Fleischer on the Ptolemaic and Seleucid dynasties selectively treat the glyptics as a mere adjunct to the sculptured portraits and the numismatic types. Accordingly, the authors emphasize iconographies that are not controversial, although both reject as irrelevant many of the glyphs previously ascribed to the royal courts. The standard of their scholarship, moreover, well surpasses that of the periodical literature and the publications of the gem cabinets.

D. Plantzos in his recent monograph on Hellenistic glyptography has met the unenviable task of correlating much of this disparate and essentially undocumented material into stylistic and iconographic classifications that in several instances give reasonable evidence of chronology. The first chapter he devotes to a lengthy conspectus of the royal portraiture. The Seleucid and Ptolemaic works he coordinates into individual studies that, although sound in many of the conclusions reached, would certainly have profited, in general, from a more attentive analysis of the numismatic evidence, and especially from a more critical reading of the literature. The rest of the portraiture he organizes into classes based convincingly, for the most part, on regional and dynastic styles of representation.

Nothing looms so large in the literature on the royal portraits as the problem of attribution. The emphasis of this study is similarly directed. Accordingly, I preface the analyses of the material with commentaries on the numismatic evidence, to address in some detail matters of chronology and examine the portrait types that the glyptographers drew upon. The types so
identified constitute nearly half of the corpus. For the rest, the iconographies separate by degrees in relation to the numismatic portraiture, although comparatively few of them bear no ostensible parallels with the types that the médailleurs employed. In order to ascertain the probable dynastic affiliations of the glyphs, I approach them on indications of the style in which the iconographies are couched. That is, the analysis observes such aspects as the arrangement of the hair, especially of the locks at the forehead and the nape, the presence of certain physiognomic elements that are repeated in the numismatic types over some generations, and the degree to which idealization or verisimilitude informs the countenance. This methodology, long exercised and proven to be efficacious in the research on the Imperial Roman portraiture, was not adopted for the study of Hellenistic royal iconography before H. Kyrieleis and R. Fleischer began investigating the Ptolemaic and Seleucid portraiture. Their arguments, founded on a rigorously systematic, empirical reasoning from the evidence, convincingly explain that the portrait types, in essence, present a synthesis of individual features, stylistic conventions and abstracted forms that is solidly based in programs of a dynastic iconography. The failure to address consistently this aspect of the portraiture, and thereby recognize the currents of influence that passed between the dynastic centers, especially during the late Hellenistic period in western Asia, has led in the past to many unwarranted attributions. A reading of the numismatic evidence further invites commentary on issues raised in the recent literature, especially with respect to the political events that attended the reception of portraiture into the mintage of Macedonia and Pontos, and the initial break Mithradates VI made with the portraiture of his forebears.

The first chapter briefly establishes the social structure of the courts in which this glyptic portraiture functioned. Whereas it is well-accepted that the rings bearing royal iconography were worn to symbolize ties of loyalty, I shall argue that the introduction in the second century
of a hierarchy of ranks for the officialdom, did not entail that the rings became mere insignia of rank. Moreover, I attempt to refute the theory that cameo portraits served as the garnitures for the crowns of the priests who attended the dynastic cult; the evidence clearly presumes a tradition of metalwork.

Because the gemstone portraits are associated exclusively with the patronage of the ruling elite, commentators have sought to interpret the iconography of the gems in light of this fact, and on this point have reached a consensus that alleges a pervasive intention to mediate in the glyptic iconography the divinity of kingship. The extended relationship of this iconography to the numismatic typology, the writer will argue, contradicts this assertion and is of no consequence to the theory that the royal house or its commissioners intervened to impose in the aulic environment an iconography, ideologically separate from that of the public image of the monarchy.
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CHAPTER ONE
THE AULIC TITULATURE AND THE FUNCTION OF
GLYPTIC PORTRAITURE IN THE COURT SOCIETY

*Philos*, as the title designating a member of the court society, is first attested epigraphically from the turn of the fourth to the third century. The Diadokhoi had in their employ individuals of the royal *hetaireia*, the nobility elevated under the Argead house. However, the prominence of the Macedonian element in the military and administrative infrastructures of the empire in Asia and Egypt was well on the decline. Alexander and, before him, Philip II had greatly extended the ranks of this aristocracy through the admission of Greeks and foreigners, the latter chiefly from the neighboring Balkan regions. The dynasts set upon this course in raising the meritocracies that would govern at their behest. City-ethnics and patronymics, recorded mainly in inscriptions, evince that overwhelmingly the adherents of the aulic entourage were Greeks enlisted from among the elite class of the *poleis*. The networks of *xenia*, that is, of ritualized friendship, which the elites maintained, were probably instrumental to the system of recruitment.

The Hellenes from the mainland and Asia Minor received into the court entourage constituted a nobility of merit; perceived or demonstrated ability rather than considerations of lineage or wealth was the principal rationale for appointment. The Ptolemaic realm affords some evidence of hereditary service to the royal house; however, this pertains mainly to individuals who although descended from prominent *philoi* of the third century, themselves held positions in the bureaucracy per se. Admission into the circle depended exclusively upon a demonstration of the king’s will. Self-interests, mutually advantageous to the parties concerned and, ultimately, mutual dependence, bound the sovereign and courtier in this personal relationship. Literary and epigraphical sources bear eloquent witness to the nature of this
affiliation through the repeated use of a formula that records the name of the king into whose service the *philos* had entered. This personal obligation of loyalty to the sovereign alone was the element that cohered the retinue, for which, in the sense of an aggregate, no specific designative term has been advanced in the documentation.

Narrative accounts apprise us that this elite formed a *synedrion*, or council, which the king convened at will to deliberate on matters of state, foreign policy, the conduct of campaigns, and to exercise judiciary proceedings that involved capital offenses. The *philoi*, moreover, were appointed in the capacity of high representatives of the crown, discharging their trusts as ambassadors, governors of provinces, agents of the royal interests abroad, administrators, or as commissions in the armed forces. The Alexandrian court held as its singular domain of authority the administration of the overseas empire of the Ptolemies. After the turn of the third to the second century, with the demise of this hegemony in the Aegean, and the waning of available foreign talent that attended the decline of immigration to Egypt, the preeminence of the *philoi* diminished. The literary sources that are relevant to the period of the ensuing two centuries attest the names of rather fewer individuals so appointed from the royal entourage. The monarchy, by necessity, came increasingly to rely upon a bureaucracy, which since the early third century had developed and functioned as a semi-autonomous agency of the realm.

From the first decade of the second century onwards, inscriptions and, mainly, papyrological records attest the existence of a separate system of aulic titles, purely honorific, and constituting a strict hierarchy of orders or classes that were conferred upon officials of the civil bureaucracy. The preeminent dignity, that of *syngenes*, kinsman, however, was alone bestowed as an individual title, and thus remained apart from the hierarchy proper. The executory appointments held by the functionaries of the internal administration from this time forth were ordinarily, although never absolutely, equated with specific titles of honor.
The Seleucid court witnessed the institution of an analogous system of honorific titles. Nothing is recorded of this titulature prior to the accession of Seleukos IV in 187, and in substance the evidence concerns the period of the late second century. The individuals of the highest standing held the dignity of *syngenes*, although the hierarchy of the orders proper never attained quite the elaborate protocol of the Ptolemaic titulature. The Seleucid protocol itself set the precedent for the hierarchies established at the courts of Asia Minor, and later of the Arsakid court.

The literary tradition preserves in Polybios and Athenaios passing references that render intelligible the symbolic significance the portrait rings involved for the court society. Polybios, in depicting at length the events which led to the demise of Agathokles, relates that in the course of a feast, one Aristomenes, of the royal guards, was the first to have presented the regent with a gold *stephanos*, a homage accorded by custom solely to the king, and that he was the first to wear a ring bearing a portrait of Agathokles. The account in Athenaios, which quotes a passage in Poseidonios of Apameia, concerns the philosopher Athenion, who in 88 headed an Athenian embassy to Mithradates VI. Received at court and admitted into the royal entourage, in manifestation of this dignity he was conferred with a radiant *khlamys* and a gold ring that bore a portrait of the king.

From the brief indications in the accounts of Polybios and Athenaios it can be inferred that such rings were bestowed in sign of royal favor, privileged status, and a delegation of authority. Analogous motives, although oriented to public proclamation, underlay the royal and court dedications of statuary portraiture in the pan-Hellenic sanctuaries and the capital cities of the realms. This reading of the symbolic import ascribed to the portrait rings is not a matter of controversy in the scholarly criticism. What must be readdressed, however, is the premise that with the institution of the titular hierarchy during the second century, this symbolization would
inevitably recede and give precedence to the function of the rings in the capacity of insignia of rank.\textsuperscript{21}

Literary accounts pertaining to the aulic insignia are few and concern virtually alone the court of the late Seleucids. This evidence submits that of the articles, which the demonstration of royal munificence might comprehend, the \textit{porphyra}, worn as a \textit{khlamys}, was the common distinction for the higher echelons of the aulic society, with the \textit{mitra}, the \textit{stephanos}, and a gold clasp for the \textit{khlamys} being the exclusive attributes of the \textit{syngeneis} and \textit{ton proton philon}.\textsuperscript{22} The sources, however, fall silent on the use of finger rings to this effect. To counter weigh this lacuna, W. Völcker-Janssen reasons that it may not be far wrong to assert this development on the presumed survival of a Hellenistic court custom in the distinctions that existed among the \textit{amici Caesaris}. Established by the reign of Claudius (A.D. 41-54), and founded upon the protocol of admission into the emperor's presence, the privilege was first extended to those individuals who were presented with a gold signet ring bearing a portrait of the Princeps.\textsuperscript{23} His suggestion of this parallelism, however, may serve only to mislead the present inquiry, since it is not couched in solid argument. The ceremonial of access to the court and private quarters of the Imperial residence originated in, and was not distinctly separate from, the protocols observed by the elite of the late Republic.\textsuperscript{24} Moreover, nearly two centuries before the foundation of the Principate, the privilege of wearing a gold signet ring as a mark of rank had extended to the higher orders of society.\textsuperscript{25} The Hellenistic state, however, recognized no directly comparable status evaluation of gold signets (infra).

There remains only the physical evidence itself that might justify the stated premise. Set forth in brief by M.L. Vollenweider, the argument proposes that the rings fashioned in precious materials were bestowed upon individuals of the highest standing at court: the \textit{philoi}, commanders of the \textit{stratia}, admirals, and foreign envoys. Leading officials, the subordinates of
the bureaucracy, and the private staff of the palace received rings of silver or bronze. The baser materials, iron and glass, she concludes, were reserved for the soldiery. Vollenweider articulates this thesis on a flawed inference, however. Precisely, she has misconstrued the use and effect of the bronze and iron signet rings, which were symbols of royal authority per se, issued to officials of the chancellery and the bureaux charged with exacting and maintaining in evidence the revenues of the crown. The gold rings, one may be led to reason, were separately insignia of the authority vested in royal envoys and the foreign agents the kings enlisted. Plinius the Elder attests that under the Republic it was long the practice to bestow gold signets on ambassadors, since the articles bore universal acceptance as a manifestation of the highest honor. Further evidence to verify this notice rests in the letter Philip V addressed to the citizenry of the island of Nisyros in Ionia, that, accompanied by a royal signet, he entrusted to one Kallias, a local. Athenaios’ account of the embassy of Athenion to Mithradates VI, previously cited, invites reinterpretation in this context, for upon his return from the Pontic court, Athenion became dictator in Athens at the head of the party that allied itself with Mithradates.

The sources illuminate nothing beyond this, which would lead to the conclusion that the high officials of the internal bureaucracy received gold signets. In the event, however, that this elite held them in witness to the discharge of their appointments, the warrant to issue and seal ordinances in the name of the King would not have attended it. The royal chancelleries alone functioned in this capacity.

The association in iconography of the gold signets with those employed to close and warrant documents transferred to them the denotation of vested authority implicit in the foregoing references. This symbolism, however, may not necessarily have been imparted to the gemstones engraved with royal portraits, at least not in primary intent. Plutarch, in his biography of
Lucullus, records that at the close of his embassy to the court of Alexandria, he received from Ptolemaios IX an emerald (smaragdai) engraved with a portrait of the king.\textsuperscript{32} The rarity and value of the stone may well account for the reason that the memory of this gesture was preserved in the authority Plutarch consulted; for against this, the literary sources normally attest items of costly silver plate as the gifts bestowed in sign of royal favor on the occasion of symposia and formal gatherings of the court. This custom ensued from a tradition long observed by the Argead monarchy.\textsuperscript{33} The passage in Plutarch leaves it to speculation that many of the large, more finely engraved intagli may have been presentation pieces.

The inventories of the dedications to the sanctuary at Delos and numerous accounts attest to the lavish taste of the royal courts in Asia and Alexandria for gold and silver vessels, phialai, crowns and accouterments ornamented with precious and semi-precious stones.\textsuperscript{34} It is not implied, however, that the stones utilized to this purpose bore figural motifs. If not an omission in the sources drawn upon by the authors, nor an oversight on their part, the absence of the specification might imply nothing more than the jewels were ancillary to the engraved motifs and the decoration in repoussé work.\textsuperscript{35} For one category of the above objects, the crowns that were an element of the priestly regalia, literary and epigraphical evidence, substantiated by a legacy of sculptural monuments, allows one to infer that a cameo or a relief medallion normally constituted the principal ornamental device. The edict of Antiokhos III, dated year 119 of the Seleucid Era (193), enjoining the institution of a cult dedicated to his consort, Laodike, prescribes that the head-priestesses to be appointed in the administrative districts “shall wear golden crowns bearing her images.”\textsuperscript{36} The directives of the edict further reveal that, in certain aspects, her cult was to be organized on the precedent of the dynastic state cult, then recently appointed by Antiokhos. Thus it admits speculation that the priestesses’ crowns were similar in form to that article of the head-priests who attended the state cult.
Athenaios preserves an anecdotal notice that directly correlates to the testimony of the edict. It records that Diogenes, an Epicurean resident at the Seleucid court under Alexander Balas (d. 145), made it known to his patron that he wished to be acclaimed as a priest of Arete, and in recognition of this, to receive with a purple khitoniskos a golden crown, bearing her countenance in the middle. The noun Athenaios employs (prosopon) designates that the image is en face.

The material evidence that might bear upon the above sources is of a wide geographic distribution. Asia Minor and Palmyra have bequeathed the weight of it. From the western and central regions of Anatolia there are the honorific statuary portraits of over twenty religious functionaries, whose office entailed a joined ministration to the civic and Imperial cults. The stelae and reliefs from Palmyra constitute a portion of the monuments excavated in the mausolea of prominent families. Several carry inscriptions that record the lineages of the deceased; however, this documentation affords no definite insight into the nature of the cults involved. Rome or its immediate environs provide the funerary reliefs of priests associated with the cults of Kybele or Magna Mater and Ma Bellona, her Latin incarnations, and a marble portrait of Antinoös. For the rest, there are only the isolated monuments, originating in the Aegean and Syria. Substantially, the chronology of this sculpture includes the second and the first half of the third century A.D., although several of the Anatolian monuments and the portrait from Melos date to the period of the Julio-Claudian and the Flavian dynasties (A.D. 14-98).

The Hellenistic period should be considered to pass in virtual silence on material evidence, granting that it has proved indefensible to assign the famous portrait of a priest in the Vatican to the third or the second century B.C. on the misguided premise that the iconography is attributable to a king of the Seleucid or the Attalid dynasty (pl. 20). The most qualified comparative criteria thus far educated well situate the portrait in the last quarter of the first century B.C.; however, the ethos of it solidly inheres in the current of late Hellenistic realism.
The commentary on the Vatican portrait iteratively submits that the forehead garniture of
the crown it renders is a cameo. The crown assumes the form of an annular *strophia*, or band,
and is worn over a wreath of vine leaves. Enriched in low relief with small leaves, probably
laurel, it is fastened by means of projecting joins to a roundlet, positioned at the apex of the
forehead. This device bears the profile head of a man, beardless and apparently young; though
severe erosion precludes that the iconography can be further assessed. The method of direct
attachment should well indicate that the device itself is metal. In order to set a cameo or
gemstone by this means a separate fitting would be required, either a frame or pins, to evidence
the articles employed for the mounting of jeweled emblazonments on the Imperial insignia.

The portraits and funerary monuments from Latium, Melos, and Syria, and actual gold
wreaths (*stephanoi*) found in tumuli of the second to the third century A.D. at Kerch introduce
various forehead pieces in the description of roundels, metal plaques, and Imperial coins. Exceptionally, the *strophia* represented on the Latium reliefs bear side roundels with the device
in profile; the depth of the relief would imply a simulation of embossed work or appliqués. The
standard schema, however, is that of a frontal bust, which emerges at the shoulders from the
ground, the head being rendered in high, prominent relief. Immediate parallels are invited by
the en face busts of cast bronze and repoussé gold and silver decorative *emblemata* (pl. 18).
The en face bust was itself introduced into the repertoire of glyptographers before the mid-first
century A.D., although the dissemination of the type in Hellenistic glyptics, had it indeed
occurred, remains obscure (infra).

Whereas the above material may give evidence of historiated insignia that descend from
types of the Hellenistic period, to all indications the composite *Büstenkrone*, so named, of the
statuary portraiture from Asia Minor are a phenomenon specific to this region. The chronology
of the monuments suggest that this peculiar headpiece was not introduced prior to the third or
the last quarter of the first century A.D.\textsuperscript{49} From the perspective of the present inquiry, it is only relevant to observe that the rare surviving crowns, or the fragments of such, found at Ephesos and Thera, are all of bronze, once gilt.\textsuperscript{50}

To conclude. The record of the sculpture and the direct evidence of the fragments presume a dominant tradition of metalwork for the garnitures of the historiated crowns. Allowing for the verdict of recent scholarship, it is indeed difficult to accept the very premise that cameos might have been the insignia of the priests who attended the dynastic cults, at least during the period of the third and the second century. The literature on the corpus of ancient cameos has tolerably established that in substance the Hellenistic material belongs to the late period, and that on criteria of style and iconography not a few of the large sardonyx pieces and the en face busts in unbanded agate, hitherto considered Hellenistic, must be reassigned to the first century of the Imperium, if not to the category of works in imitation of the Antique.\textsuperscript{51} Granted the probable rarity of such works, one is led to reason that because of their splendor and value, the large cameos and agates worked in relief were principally appreciated as objets d’art, and therefore commissioned by or on behalf of the kings to be displayed in the royal residences or housed in treasuries. This theory has been most often propounded in connection with the Imperial cameos, which more so than either the engraved gems or the die types, manifest a continuation of iconographic elements based in the portraiture of Hellenistic royalty.\textsuperscript{52} The literary sources pass in silence on the amassing of carved gems by the Seleucids and the Lagids, although Plinius recounts that Mithradates Eupator had assembled a \textit{daktyliothekē}, or gem collection, which Gn. Pompeius seized as plunder, and later dedicated on the Capitoline.\textsuperscript{53} It is a foregone conclusion that behind the enthusiastic reception of this practice by Eupator and, eventually, the Imperial household, rests a precedent set at the courts of the two great monarchies.
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Florence, Museo Archeologico. Fragment of an onyx portrait of Mithradates Eupator. Furtwängler II, 266, no. 5, pl. LIX. Lippold, pl. LXIX.5. Megow, 1985, 454-55. Megow, leaving aside an analysis of the style, has brought into question the antiquity of the cameo. He cites an accurate replica, formerly in the Hamilton and Chittenden collections, which assuredly is not ancient and evidently dates to the sixteenth or the seventeenth century. The sardonyx, he concludes, is presumably of the late Renaissance period, carved by a glyptographer, who had for his model a tetradrachm of Eupator. The uniformly level surfaces of hair and the peculiar orbicular curls, in which terminate several locks at the nape and to the fore of the diadem, are without parallels in works of an authentic antiquity, and therefore sustain the reservation Megow raises.


The iconography is comparable to that of several other stylistically heterogeneous en face busts of women worked in amethyst and agate. Vollenweider ascribes them to the Ptolemaic court of the third century, and asserts that the iconography is of Arsinoë II, deified in the aspects of Hera and Aphrodite. Spier, 1992, cat. 443, however, more cogently situates the entire series in the period of the early Empire on criteria of style and technique inferred from several gemstone heads of Eros that are certainly dated to the first century A.D. The iconography, he reasons, is devoted to women of the Imperial house. For the few parallels of this typology, cf. Spier, 1992, cat. 432, and Megow, 1987, cat. B7, D5, and F42. The amethyst in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, cited by Vollenweider, 13, c, pls. 5.7-8.10, 6.1-3, Megow, D7, submits is attributable to Antonia Minor.


CHAPTER TWO

THE DYNASTIES OF MACEDONIA AND WESTERN ASIA TO THE MID-SECOND CENTURY B.C.

INTRODUCTION

The analysis of the royal iconography pursued in the following chapters is presented through an arrangement of the glyptics and signet devices that adheres less to the chronology of the period than to the apparent distribution of the material evidence. This distribution in the case of the engraved gems is uneven and leaves many lacunae. Considering that the numismatic record and the hoards of document sealings preserve the iconographies of thirty-seven kings and twelve consorts of the Seleucid and Ptolemaic dynasties, not more than twenty-three of them can be recognized in forty-four glyptics and ring shields on certain or probable criteria. All save twelve are associated with the Ptolemies. For the iconography of the Antigonids and the Attalids, the testimony is deficient, a direct consequence of the adherence of the mints to a conservative typology (infra); what the emissions transmit, however, is virtually complemented in the engraved gemstones. Eleven glyphs are attributable to nine kings of the dynasties established in northern and east-central Asia Minor, as against the twenty-three kings attested iconographically in the numismatic record.

Thus, the Ptolemaic dynasty alone has what approaches a solid representation in the corpus. The core of this portraiture is attributed to the kings and royal consorts of the period from the mid-second to the early first century, although for the preceding generations of the monarchy, the distribution of the glyptics is not considerably thinner. It is in this respect that the Ptolemaic series establishes an incomparable basis for the assessment of glyptic portraiture in parallel with the iconographic content and stylistic development of the obverse types. Considered from this perspective, the commissioners of the Ptolemaic court appear to have exercised a somewhat
stricter control over the iconography prescribed for glyptographers than was the case at the royal centers to the east.

The material that relates to the dynasties established in western Asia is not quite as substantial, and centers on the late Hellenistic period. Attributed portraits of the Seleucids, Mithradates VI of Pontos, and, evidently, several kings of Kappadokia constitute the greater part of this glyptic. Beside it, however, may be assembled a second class of portrait intaglios, which although not well-defined iconographically in relation to the numismatic series, are congruent with the imposing, overtly heroic style that the late Seleucid kings and Eupator, driven by separate political motives, sanctioned. The formal language of this style, however, is strongly indebted to the contemporary images of the deified Alexander.

The posthumous iconography of Alexander developed along heterogeneous lines well into the period of the Imperium. As several commentators elucidate, interdependent processes of diffusion that in general transcended style and the various media involved, albeit not necessarily the contexts for which his imagines were destined, had sustained this development. The glyptic iconography should present exceptional problems of interpretation, in theory by reason of the fact that the gems were not intended to function within the officialdom of the realm. Being under the patronage of private individuals, the glyptographers, so it is argued, would have been less constrained to typify the iconography in canonical form than the médailleurs of the posthumous emissions of Alexander and Lysimakhos. The pervasive unconventionalities apparent in the physiognomic structure and the coiffing of the locks are indeed difficult to explain on grounds other than that of the stated premise. In certain instances these anomalies may well be intercalations introduced, perhaps arbitrarily, through the stylistic assimilation of elements then current in the dynastic portraiture. Appositions with the die series, however, are not particularly instructive for isolating any such presumed strains of influence. Rare, moreover,
are the glyphs that derive their iconography from the obverse for the mintage of Lysimakhos and the posthumous emissions in his name. Those of the so-designated Lysippic type and of Alexander-Helios evidently constitute the only significant portion of the corpus that can be closely aligned with the iconography of the statuary.\footnote{7}

A comprehensive and well-reasoned assessment of the Alexander glyphs is had in the study by K. Gebauer.\footnote{8} Therefore, lengthy discussions of this material are omitted here in favor of arguments that address only the ambiguous iconography of the glyptic works referred to above. The literature disputes the attributions for all of these engraved gemstones between Alexander and the kings of the later generations of the dynasties in western Asia. I would submit, however, that leaving aside the intaglios IV 20 and IV 22, the iconography is of Alexander.

Granted the incomparably greater diffusion of the royal iconography in the mintage, and the solid evidence indicating that the portrait types of the emissions struck at the capitals and the main regional centers of the realms were warranted by court advisors, if not the mint officials alone, the numismatic corpus therefore should establish the soundest insight into the self-imagery that the monarchies wished to project. In view of the foregoing, and considering the central importance of the numismatic evidence for an analysis of the glyptic iconography, a brief commentary on the content and political intent of the typology for the regnal emissions is in order. Before the end of the first quarter of the third century this typology was prescribed in enduring form. The reverse with the legend in the name and title of the king in the genitive singular held the arms adopted by the monarchy or the tutelary deities of the royal family. The obverse, which since the inception of the medium in the sixth century bore witness to the religious sanction of the state, was appropriated for the portraiture of the dynasty. In the Ptolemaic realm, and later, the Attalid, the standard emissions retained the profile of the founder of the dynasty. Fiscal considerations weighed as a determinative factor of this continuity
no less than reverence for the apotheosized founder from whose person the dynastic claim derived.\textsuperscript{9} Portraits of the later Ptolemies, whether contemporary or posthumous, were introduced in exceptional circumstances on auxiliary emissions that functioned, in part, as bounties for the recruitment of mercenaries or largess for the accession.\textsuperscript{10} The Seleucid standard, set by Antiokhos I (d. 261) and subsequently adopted by the dynasties of northern and eastern Asia Minor, was directed to the reigning king’s iconography. Rarely, under the Seleucids and the Bithynian royal house, were appeals to the memory of a deceased predecessor made to shore up loyalty to the succession.\textsuperscript{11}

This iconography of state, in the realm of ideological theory, served to promulgate the foundation to the autocracy the kings exercised.\textsuperscript{12} For the Diadokhoi, who entered upon the inheritance of the dominion of Alexander through usurpation, and therefore could foster loyalty on the strength of their charismatic leadership alone, the right to territorial possession by force of arms had vindicated the assumption of the royal title.\textsuperscript{13} Whereas the command of victory remained a pivotal justification of rule in the ideology of kingship, and in reality was vital to the preservation of the realm, with the passing of the Diadokhoi and the consolidation of the new regimes under their issue, the legitimacy of the reign came to devolve first and foremost upon the principle of hereditary succession.\textsuperscript{14} Moreover, to sustain this dynastic prerogative and invest it with the agency of divine ordination, the monarchic houses professed to a filial descent from Zeus, thus voicing a dogma held in Hellenic thought since the Homeric Age.\textsuperscript{15}

Until the early decades of the second century the reverse legend in general comprised only the title \textit{basileus} and the personal name of the king, which itself being almost invariably of a dynastic origin thus bore explicit witness to the fact of legitimate filiation. Thereafter, the legend might be augmented to record one or several of the official epithets the king held. The initiative for this rested with Antiokhos IV (d. 164); for it was on his precedent that the Seleucids and the
kings of the realms situated in northern and inner Asia Minor adopted the practice. The Ptolemies, from the early third century onwards, introduced the epithets, albeit virtually on the posthumous auxiliary emissions alone; however, after the reign of the fifth Ptolemaios the uncompounded form of the legend was retained exclusively.\textsuperscript{16}

The kings envisioned and extolled in the language of this titulature attributes which, regarded to be innately possessed, deemed them worthy of absolute power in their own perception and that of the élite of Hellenic society. Evocations of the divinity of the ruler loom large in the titulatures of the Seleucids and the Ptolemies, although the Seleucids stand virtually alone in having assumed epithets that bespeak invincibility.\textsuperscript{17}

In Alexandria the titulature witnessed a separate development until the mid-second century through the adoption of cognomina, which announced the profession of a familial devotion.\textsuperscript{18} The singular conception the Ptolemies held of the nature of monarchy gives insight into the genesis of this development. It is to be sought in the political and religious motives of Ptolemaios II who, to mandate the legitimacy of his accession and sanctify the marriage with Arsinoë, his half-sister, laid the foundation of the eponymous dynastic cult. For the later generations, his precedent established an alternative style of monarchy in which ancestral piety, the veneration of the divine progenitors of the dynasty, and the fulfillment of the sacerdotal role of Pharanoic kingship eclipsed the charismatic role of the individual, especially in the sphere of martial enterprises.\textsuperscript{19}

Toward the mid-second century the Attalids and the other royal houses of Asia Minor began to assume familial cognomina, although eventually it proved to be the kings of the restored, senior line of the Seleucid dynasty who, having ties of marriage to the Ptolemies, would most strongly embrace this innovation.
I. THE ANTIGONIDS

Pursuant to a sound monetary policy, and in observance of tradition, Antigonas Gonatas refrained from having his portrait set on the new emissions that were introduced within a few years of his defacto accession in ca. 276. His immediate successors, Demetrios II (r. 239-229) and Antigonos III Doson (r. 229-221), if the attributions of the silver and bronze series to the reign of the latter are indeed warranted, further adhered to this precedent. Under Philip V it was abandoned.

The chronology of Philip’s coinage remains in dispute, specifically as it pertains to the date of the inaugural emission, composed of tetradrachms. A majority of the commentators assert that the minting should fall prior to 212. Against this consensus, Hammond and Walbank advanced a solid argument for a date after 186, in the last years of his reign when the realm witnessed a significant economic recovery attended by the opening of new mines. More decisive to their argument, however, is the presence of the monogram ΕΡ, which recurs on the bronze issues of his successor Perseus (r. 179-168). Since only three obverse dies were employed, the emission was struck for a short period, presumably not longer than a year. The obverse bears a portrait of the king interpreted in a refined, idealizing style, the reverse being devoted to a figure of Athena Alkidemos wielding a thunderbolt, a type revived from the first mintage in silver of Gonatas (pl. 21, 1).

If the revised date Hammond and Walbank submit proves valid, as is probable, then one may reasonably conjecture that the issue was minted in the aftermath of the two separate campaigns Philip had waged in 184 and 183 to subjugate the dominant confederations in Thrace. The campaigns renewed the Macedonian suzerainty over central Thrace, and by this feat of arms he rivaled the advance of Philip II into that region. From the perspective of this historical precedent a plausible motive emerges for the directive to set the portrait on the coinage: that
is, to extol the victory of Philip by mediating his claim to be a descendant of Philip II. Polybios avers that Philip laid much emphasis on this claim, and the assertion is manifestly sustained by the appearance he cultivated. It was, no doubt, to evoke his renowned predecessor that Philip abandoned the fashion of his fellow monarchs and wore a beard.

Near to the portrait on the inaugural issue is the impressive and superbly executed bust of a youthful ruler preserved on a cornelian in the Müller collection (II 4). A second portrait, of a comparable quality and carved in a sard or chalcedony ringstone, now lost, was recognized by E. Zwierlein-Diehl as the subject of the former work (II 3). It is accepted without reservation that her conclusion regarding the association is valid, for the divergent emphases apparent in the interpretations of the iconography are minor, and therefore should not warrant an attribution of the second to another individual.

In the respective portraits the king is portrayed at the age of some twenty years, his head set level, or nearly so, on a pronouncedly muscular neck. The hair is dressed in a similar fashion, the long sinuous locks falling to the upper shoulder and being swept back from the forehead and the temple in lively, disarrayed aggregations. Over the apex of the forehead the waves form thick, prominent tufts. The individual locks are accorded a meticulous linear definition, although on the Müller piece the effect is decidedly subdued, for the engraving is devoid of the depth and variation that distinguish the style of the sard. An analogous restraint informs the interpretation of the physiognomic aspects. The lineaments of the profile are slight and aligned within the narrow frontal plane of the face, the points of convergence with the forehead and the cheek being delineated by modeled nuances in the flesh surfaces. In the sard portrait, the relative depth of the features and the asymmetry of the profile are augmented, with the plastically rendered forms being treated in bolder accentuations. He wears a cheek beard of dense, luxuriant curls that border the jaw and reach just to the chin.
A more subtle portrait quality imbues the head of the Müller piece, and on this criterion it should take precedence over the second version for the argument of an attribution. The prominent contours of the brow and the base of the forehead, the slight curvature and the long slender build of the nose, and the firm, advanced chin are congruent with the profile of Philip on the inaugural emission. Certain variances discerned in the particulars of the iconography and the manner in which the hair and beard are styled, however, may refute that the iconography of the gem portraits derives from this obverse type. If indeed of Philip, then a distance of some years may separate the glyptics and the emission, with the former, as Zwierlein-Diehl plausibly argues, having been fashioned at the time of his accession, or shortly thereafter. A stronger case for an attribution to his successor, Perseus (r. 179-168), however, is admitted by the fact that the iconographic disparities of the glyphs recede vis-à-vis his numismatic portraiture.

The iconography of Perseus on the tetradrachms of his inaugural emission in silver, evidently struck at Amphipolis and bearing on the obverse die the signature of Zoilos, the mint administrator, was modeled as a complement to that of Philip. The import of this assimilation, it may be deduced, was to mediate the legitimacy of Perseus’ succession. Save for the short beard worn by him to affect a resemblance to his father, the approximation to the iconography of Philip is most pronounced in the lineaments of the profile. The high forehead articulated by a prominent median crease and the broad, shallow contour of the cheek, however, impart a clear physiognomic distinction. In the subsequent minting, which dates to the second or third year of the reign, a variant portrait type is introduced that remains standard for the duration of the coinage (pl. 21, 3). Designated by a somewhat heavier facial structure and a richer elaboration of the hair, specifically of the forelocks, it still retains the some salient features and the aura of an indomitable will that imbues the former portrait.
Rendered in a style allied to that of the numismatic types by the degree of the idealization and the sound plasticity of the forms, the intaglios reiterate to varying degrees of modification and emphasis the iconography and the impressively arrayed forelocks of the later portrait series. Accordingly, the busts are conceivably versions of the original model for the obverse dies of the second minting.\(^{28}\) The details of the bare chin and upper lip, however, are alien to the obverse type. If indeed not misinterpreted by the gem engravers, the cheek beard is plausibly a feature that derives from the iconography of Perseus during the period when he held the dignity of the heir apparent.

The extensive mintage in silver of Philip, designated in the chronology of Boehringer as Series III, apparently was inaugurated not later than 187-186, and continued until 179, the last year of the reign.\(^{29}\) Composed of nine separate emissions, the series bears two variant portraits of Philip for the obverse type. That of the lesser denominations is a diademed head of the king in the manner of the issue previously cited (pl. 21, 2).\(^{30}\) For the tetradrachms, however, the obverse was altered to represent the face of a Macedonian shield, the central blazon of which is a bust of Philip arrayed with the winged helmet and the \textit{harpa} of Perseus.\(^{31}\) The import of his assimilation to the hero revered in tradition as having ruled Argos is unequivocal, for it renders explicitly that same motive implicit in the obverse of the previous minting: the claim of Philip and of the Antigonid dynasty to descent from the Argeads, or Temenids, the old ruling house of Macedonia.\(^{32}\)

Replicas of the variant types for this last mintage of Philip are preserved on a small lapis ringstone in London, and in a relief fragment, the location of which cannot now be determined (II 1-2). In iconography, neither glyph is of a particular significance vis-à-vis the numismatic evidence. The lapis repeats the iconography of the shield type, and reflects the style of the dies for the late emissions of the tetradrachms in the reduction of the features and the indifferent
execution so strongly as to indicate that the engraver had modeled the image directly upon an actual obverse type.  

Held by Furtwängler to portray a dynast of Bithynia or one of the neighboring lesser realms in Anatolia, the attribution of the gem fragment to Philip should stand, for it renders the narrowed profile of a stout aquiline nose and a salient square chin, the trim and luxuriantly curled beard, and the dense, tufted forelocks that set apart the iconography of the lesser denominations. Carved in a studied, accomplished manner, it captures more decisively than the dies the nuances that ostensibly informed the archetypal portrait. The tempered realism of the countenance is founded in a style that had entered the royal portraiture in the decades after 280. For that period, however, it is documented only by the coinages of Asia Minor and of the Seleucid realm (infra).

III. SELEUCID ICONOGRAPHY

During the early years of the reign of Antiokhos I (281-261) the mints principally maintained the posthumous Alexander emissions of Seleukos Nikator in concert with the innovative types introduced for him at Seleukeia on the Tigris and the centers of western Iran. From ca. 278, however, the typology of the emissions was restyled to carry on the obverse the portrait of Antiokhos, diademed, and on the reverse a figure of Apollo, seated upon the omphalos of Delphi. 34 Significantly, this conversion attended the initial advances Antiokhos obtained, by force of arms, in consolidating his authority, having quelled a revolt in the royal tetrapolis of northern Syria and restored, in some measure, the Seleucid sovereignty over western Asia Minor. 35 The motive that led to the adoption of the reverse device is read distinctly in the policies Antiokhos had enacted to invest the monarchy with a basis of legitimacy. Pivotal to the realization of this political ambition were the institution of a posthumous cult dedicated to Nikator and the promulgation of his filial descent from Apollo. 36
The reform of the typology under Antiokhos established a direct precedent for the individuality that informs Seleucid numismatic iconography. What sustained it, decisively, however, was the precarious stability of the dynasty. Repeatedly in the course of the Empire, regicide and the intervention of pretenders to the royal title gave rise to the succession. Thus, in open declaration of having assumed the diadem, it became prescriptive for each king or usurper to inaugurate a coinage with the obverse held by his own profile. Leaving considerations of iconography to the side, the chronology of the regnal emissions and the ascertainment of the issuing mints are critical to the historiography on the late Seleucid period. Virtually to the exclusion of epigraphy and the narrative accounts, the numismatic record establishes the evidence for the reach of power wielded by the usurpers and rival kings, the latter being the descendants of Demetrios II and Antiokhos VII.37

The Seleucids whose reigns antedated the third quarter of the third century, have no presence in the glyptic corpus. This factor is plausibly not alone the consequence of fortuity. Rather, it may witness what might have been a late reception of this medium as a vehicle for the royal iconography, vis-à-vis the apparent priority of the Ptolemaic house. The material evidence, however, in substance is of the period from the mid-second to the early first century. The late Selucids sanctioned an openly heroized style of iconography, which itself constitutes a distinct phase in the portraiture of the dynasty. Moreover, inherently the language of this imagery is allied to that of the contemporary Mithradatid portraiture and the posthumous iconography of Alexander. Thus, it demands to be addressed in a wider context.38

In a recent monograph devoted to Seleucid portraiture, R. Fleischer discerned certain tendencies in glyptic representation, which he maintains are without correlation in this medium at the other dynastic centers. This disparity he regards as being manifested on two levels: a more pervasive dependence upon the typologies established in the coinages, and commensurate
with it, a moderation in the assimilation of idealizing physiognomic aspects. The present writer asserts that the conclusions Fleischer reached are evidently founded upon an overly restrictive assessment of the material. Admittedly, the glyptic portraits and the more numerous depictions preserved in the sphragistic material present few difficulties of attribution, since the iconography adheres to that of the coinage. This said, the strict interdependence Fleischer implies begs qualification; for in the engraved portraits one may discern a spectrum of iconographic variations and individual nuances of style, relative to the die types, greater than that observed in the Ptolemaic glyptics. Concerning the second facet of the disparity, an even more serious reservation may be raised. His assessment ignores the evidence of some unattributed portraits, which plausibly might be tied to the aggrandizing style of image cultivated by the monarchy during the second century.

The literature is in consensus with respect to the attribution of the garnet fragment II 6 in Athens, bearing a portrait of Antiokhos III with the signature of the engraver, Apollonios, appended. A second glyph of a diademed king, recently ascribed to the Ptolemaic house, however, must certainly be set in the context of the Seleucid iconography. Stylistically, the glyptics and the obverse dies of a parallel content are based in the refinements advanced during the reign of Antiokhos II, the dependence being manifested in the ordered contours of the facial structure, the subtle gradations of form, and in the impassivity of the features. In antithesis to the portraiture of Nikator and Antiokhos I, which evoked in their severe features the qualities of pragmatic experience and might, the new style sanctioned a handsome and beneficent countenance that, conceivably, is indebted to the precedent of the contemporary Ptolemaic idiom. The second Antiokhos was the first of five heirs to assume the diadem at a young age, and it ensued that his portraiture determined the ethos of the iconography promoted by the
dynasty to the end of the third century, and the formal means by which it was mediated (pl. 21, 7-8).43

The iconography of Seleukos II (r. 246-226/5), represented on his inaugural emission at Antiokheia, is replicated by the portrait II 5 with sufficient accuracy to establish attribution, although the corpulent flesh of the cheek and the distinctively mature appearance of the king are indicative that it is a version of the type employed for the second and third series, minted at the capital from c. 240-32 to 228 (pl. 21, 9-10).44 For the ascription of the portrait on the garnet fragment II 6 to Antiokhos III, the numismatic evidence is decisive. The portrait may be dated to the early years of his reign, since it is allied to the iconography of a series of tetradrachms that belongs to the first emission minted at Antiokheia from 223 to 213 or slightly thereafter.45 In effect, the resemblance to the obverse types ascertained in the details of the finely articulated features, in the structure of the face, and to a lesser extent in the stylistic treatment of the hair is such that one may posit a precise derivation for the glyptic portrait from the same model employed by the die engravers. As will be remarked upon below, certain mannerisms in the execution of the garnet that are reiterated in the finer representative dies of the series further substantiate this conclusion. In qualitative terms, however, the correlations fall short, for in the subtleties of the modeling style, the elevated sensitivity to tectonic form and the unusual depth and tactile presence accorded the delineation of the locks plainly distinguish the glyptic rendition from the mere competence evident in the technique of the dies.

The garnet fragment is inscribed with the name Apollonios, in the nominative, and the absence of the imperfect eπoiē notwithstanding, the inscription should be interpreted as the signature of the engraver, and not the name of the owner of the gem.46 A second garnet ringstone, preserved intact, bears the same name in the genitive inscribed beneath a fine portrait head (pl. 2, 3-4).47 The individual letters are rendered in the manner of the signature on the
fragment. Significantly, the issue of the single authorship of the portraits is resolved in light of the decided affinities that surface in the particularities of the stylistic execution. In the fluent passages of the cheek, the jaw and the neck there is revealed an analogous sensitivity to the plastic substance of the forms. The method of delineating the iris by a faint incision and the pupil in an emphatic, elliptical mark is the same in each portrait, as is the articulation of the upper eyelid. Further similarities are observed in the repetition of the wide, prominent fold of the nostril and the conspicuous thickening of the attenuated end of the nose. Even more indicative of the same hand is the idiosyncratic rendering of the small, though full, lips, the profile of the upper being pointed at the base of the philtrum, and the parting of the lips that assumes the distinctive shape of a re-curved bow. The stylistic affinities to the garnet fragment, being so precise, may indicate that the ringstone is of a contemporary date, perhaps executed by Apollonios while in residence at the Seleucid court. Assuredly, against the consensus in the literature, the portrait should be regarded as a private commission, since the individual bears no insignia.48

The garnets afford a rare case, prior, that is, to the later first century, by which to assess the artistic personality of an engraver of the first rank on the evidence of more than a single, signed work. As it bears upon the problems raised in the present study, the criterion established by the individual style of Apollonios is of significance, to the degree that it may illuminate a factor that in theory could have contributed to the typological alliance of the portraiture in the numismatic and glyptic media. Specifically, the influence of gem engravers engaged as intermediaries in the production of the models that were dispatched to the royal mints. Reminiscences of the distinctive and somewhat mannered style of Apollonios are manifested in the inaugural emission of Antiokheia, the iconography of which is close to that of the garnet fragment. At the head of the later variants in this series stands the fourth obverse die, which most nearly approximates
the glyptic portrait (pl. 21, 12).49 The affinity to the latter, however, is not merely confined to
iconography. In executing the details of the profile, the curled lock at the temple, and the single,
pointed wisp of the hair that lies over the diadem behind the ear, the die engraver so narrowly
recalls the idiosyncratic style of the glyptic portrait that one may conjecture he had at his
disposal a model fashioned by Apollonios himself, if not by another artist who in turn based the
study on a design by the gem engraver.

The corpus of sphragistic material associated with the Res sanctuary of Uruk, modern
Warka, and the insula of Seleukeia on the Tigris excavated in the 1930-31 campaign in general
is contemporary with the period from the last quarter of the third century to the end of the
decade after the mid-second century, when the Arsakids extinguished Seleucid rule in Babylonia.
Iconographic criteria, however, admit that elements of the corpus should be assigned to the
reign of Antiokhos I. The sigillary impressions that constitute the substantially greater hoard
recovered at Seleukeia during the campaigns of 1967 to 1972 begin in the second decade of the
third century and extend to the same terminal date. For the weight of the material from each
site this chronology is absolute, its foundation being the numerically superior, though not
continuous series of impressions carrying the inscriptions of tax stamps and the date reckoned
in accordance with the Seleucid Era.50

The Seleucid portraiture, as the impressions that derive from the finer signets present it, is
not subject to disputed attributions; for the origin of the iconographic content distinctly rests
in the standard types of the emissions minted at the eastern and western centers of the realm
(pl. 17, 1-4).51 This stated, stylistic analysis should well prove that the mintage of Seleukeia,
Nisibis, Karrhai, and perhaps Susa provided the principal models for the signet devices.
Considering that the monographs of A. Invernizzi and R. Fleischer provide judicious analyses
of the material, the present discussion is limited to certain problems that concern the iconography of Antikhos IV.

A separate series of bulla and individual sealing impressions from the archives of the Res sanctuary at Uruk preserves a superior portrait of Antiokhos IV Epiphanes (pl. 17, 3). The signet device is that of a bust of the king, truncated at the upper shoulders and edged with the folds of a *khamys*. The lean features and high, prominent forehead bared by receding locks answer to the iconography, which the mints of Soli, Ake-Ptolemais, Seleukeia and Ecbatana had introduced during the early years of his reign, prior, that is, to ca. 168; however, the direct model for the signet image is not to be recognized in the typology of any given die series. Six rays rise autonomously just above the diadem in the manner of the obverse dies reserved for the hemidrachms of Series II minted at Antiokheia and subsequently, for an extensive municipal emission in bronze (pl. 28, 12). Hitherto, the Ptolemies alone of the Hellenistic kings had appropriated the rays, specifically to connote their filial relation to Re, the manifestation of the Amun of Thebes in his transcendent form as the supreme deity and physical procreator of kings (pl. 27.6, 9).

The rays entered the legacies of iconography inherited by the late Ptolemaic and Seleucid kings, although the greater diffusion of this attribute would be witnessed in the Alexander monuments and the Imperial portraiture, Caligula and Nero having been the first of the reigning emperors to assume the radiate *corona*. The literature of the Imperial period, moreover, preserves a tradition, or rather the fragments of such, reaching back to the end of the fourth century B.C., in which the aura of majesty was likened to the radiance of Helios, the sun, and the concept of world dominion became the subsistent principle of the solar incarnation of Alexander. The origin of this hypostasis was apparently based in the remembrance of the fact
that after the defeat of Poros at the Hydaspes, Alexander had sacrificed to Helios alone for
having delivered the conquest of the East to him.\footnote{58}

The motive that led Antiokhos IV to assume this attribute has engendered hardly more than
a passing interest, save for the lengthy commentaries of J. Bunge.\footnote{59} The central problem is
whether the rays annunciate that in his deformed person the king possesses qualities specific
to Helios, or constitute a metaphor of radiant, divine manifestation, the literal meaning of his
epithet *Theos Epiphanes*.\footnote{60} Bunge elucidates his thesis from the perspective of the political crises
that attended the accession of Antiokhos. Late in the year 175, on learning of the death of his
older brother, Seleukos IV, he concluded an alliance with the Attalids, and at the head of an
army that Eumenes II had levied, laid claim to the throne. The issue of the succession was
resolved without the eruption of open hostilities, albeit not until the summer of 170, when
Antiokhos, it is alleged, conspired the murder of his adopted nephew and appointed co-regent,
the young Antiokhos, who had been recognized as king after the death of his father.\footnote{61} In the
measure of assuming this heliacal iconography, Bunge reasons, Antiokhos then sought to elicit
a divine analogue for his assertion of sovereign rule. A priori, however, the numismatic
evidence may establish that the latter interpretation is nearer the truth; for, the nimbus
complements another, more prominent astral symbol, reserved for the main emissions in silver.
Internal criteria date the inauguration of Series II of the mint of Antiokheia to ca. 173/2, the
second year of the co-regency. Antiokhos, in a calculated move, had the reverse type of the
tetradrachms altered. The obverse bears a restyled portrait of the king that incorporates stars
adorning the ends of the diadem.\footnote{62} This astral symbolism subsequently passed into the
iconography of the third series of the capital and Series I-II of Ake-Ptolemais, although on the
inaugural issues of the Ake the engravers modified the schema by introducing a single star that
appears above the forehead. The first emissions of Antiokheia in Characene repeat this peculiar variation.63

The artistry of this signet is nearly equaled by that of an uninscribed piece, attested by a pair of impressions from the same archive, which bear the diadem and draped bust of a Seleucid. In the manner of Alexander, he is arrayed in the exuvium of an elephant (pl. 17, 4).64 The attribution of the portrait has been variously argued on the evidence of certain rare bronze emissions minted during the reigns of Antiokhos IV and Demetrios II, which depict the sovereigns wearing this exuvium.65 Consideration of the bronze denominations, however, is of little weight to an assessment of the iconography: the stylistic qualities of the dies are too meager. The profile on the sealings reiterates the high prominent forehead and the stout, subtly articulated nose that designates the portrait employed for the inaugural issue of Antiokhos at the mint of the capital, and warrants no comparison to the numismatic iconography of Demetrios II.66

III. THE DYNASTIES OF ASIA Minor

After a period of internal consolidation during the second to the third quarter of the third century, the dynasties established in Bithynia, Pontic Kappadokia and in Mysia, centered on Pergamon, assumed the constitution of Hellenistic monarchies. Demonstrations of philhellenism proclaimed their cultural aspirations, while in witness to the assertion of sovereign power at the expense of the Seleucids, there followed the inauguration of coinages. Moreover, through the probable course of diplomatic exchanges with the great monarchies and, plausibly, the arrival of engravers from the main centers of patronage, the tradition of commissioning glyptic portraiture for the courts was introduced.67 Nothing certain of this glyptic remains, save for the chalcedony II 7 of Philetairos and a qualitatively exceptional pyrope of Mithradates IV (II 11). Besides them, the modern glass paste cast II 8 bears a portrait that epitomizes the
iconography of the second obverse type introduced for the emissions of Prousias I of Bithynia. Iconographic criteria, moreover, may well assign to Prousias II several glyphs that ostensibly form a stylistic group (II 9-10, Add. 15).

Alone of the dynasties in Asia, the Attalids maintained a strict accordance in the typology of the royal mintage. The standard was set by Eumenes I who, having elevated Pergamon to the standing of an independent power upon his victory over Antiokhos I at Sardeis in 262, minted an emission of tetradrachms bearing the portrait of Philetairos, the founder of the dynasty and his adoptive father. Eumenes’ successors, their assumption of the royal title notwithstanding, retained the head of Philetairos. The motive for this conservatism, from the outset, was a profession of dynastic consciousness; however, during the late third century and the second, purely monetary considerations weighed no less significantly in determining the continuity of the obverse and reverse types.68 Leaving aside the posthumous series of Philetairos, after ca. 180 Pergamon minted an auxiliary emission that carries a portrait of Eumenes II (pl. 24, 5).69 Pergamon itself has yielded several marble portraits, all of which elude precise identification, save P 130 and P 87 in Berlin, attributable to Attalos I and Apollonis, respectively.70 The attribution to Attalos I is well-defended by a recent interpretation that focuses on the motive for its ancient restoration.71

The evidence of the numismatic material and the sculpture denotes that under the patronage of the Attalids there never coalesced a style of portraiture which, in its formal aspects, was distinct from that of the courts of Macedonia and western Asia.72 Thus, it ensues that the attribution of portraits in the glyptic corpus not obviously allied to the obverse types is hardly a valid pursuit.

In his treatise of 1900, A. Furtwängler assigned to Philetairos the portrait on the convexly-faced, variegated chalcedony II 7, then recently acquired for the British Museum. His argument
is endorsed by a majority of the commentators, although A. Wace, upon a second analysis of
the piece, pronounced it to be a modern forgery, and K. Lehmann-Hartleben, for reasons not
stated, doubted the validity of the association. Their dissenting opinions, however, are not
sustainable on technical or iconographic criteria.

The relationship of the glyptic portrait to the iconography of the posthumous Philetairos
emissions of the third century can be discerned in the massive structure of the head, the
pronounced corpulence of the face, and in the distinctions of the low, receding forehead, the
broad, moderately curved nose and the salient protrusion of the lower jaw and chin. The gem,
however, presents in the portrait a vivid delineation of the coarse, aberrant features of his profile
and the dense, flaccid masses of the flesh that dissipate the ridge of the cheek and the frame of
the jaw. Such qualities and the rather terse carving of the work infuse the piece with a prosaic
realism that is in contrast to the dominant mode of the posthumous issues. Here, the portrai-
ture is couched in the imposing style that had evolved in the numismatic art of Asia Minor and
the centers of the Seleucid realm in northern Syria and Babylonia by the third decade of the
third century. At Pergamon itself the issues minted under Philetairos that bore the portrait of
his late benefactor and lord, Seleukos Nikator, superlatively represent the style (pl. 24, 1). In
the impressive dies of this series of tetradrachms rests the immediate precedent for the plastic
aggregations that augment the internal forms, the pronounced depth accorded the relief work
of the locks, and the formidable aura of the countenance, which in the gem portrait of
Philetairos, remains merely latent. In the manner of this received style, however, the structure
of the profile on the posthumous emissions integrates subtle symmetries.

In the principal literature on the gem, the commentators have mainly addressed the realistic
style of the portrait as a criterion for narrowing the date within the third century. Thus,
Furtwängler regards the iconography to be close to that of the obverse type of the issues minted
under Eumenes I, although by reason of the literalism of the interpretation, he concludes that the gem was executed during the lifetime of Philetairos. 76 Wace, in his initial analysis of the piece, argues against this conclusion and proposes a posthumous date on the grounds that the restrained style of the gem is comparable to that of the dies for Series V, dating presumably to the middle and later years of the reign of Attalos I (241-197). 77 Westermark reaches a similar conclusion and dates it to after ca. 230. Her argument, however, is predicated on the similarities it bears to the style that prevailed in the numismatic portraiture of the dynasts who ruled in northern and central Anatolia during the last decades of the century. 78

In the sober effect of the interpretation, though not in the rendering of the individual physiognomic aspects, the gem portrait is indeed close to the style of the dies for Series V, and therefore the conclusions of Wace and Westermark may well be valid regarding a date in the later third century, although, as Westermark propounds it, the argument presumes the development toward a style, which, distinguished by an “unheroische, detailscharfe Art der Darstellung,” came to be realized only at the end of the century. 79 Her assessment is without foundation. The realism of the glyptic image is by no means incongruous with a date in the principate of Philetairos or in the middle decades of the third century, as documented by the numismatic portraits of Antiokhos I and Ziaëlas of Bithynia. 80

Considering the developments in the iconography of the posthumous issues, it is obvious that the gem was not fashioned with a direct reference to any given variant represented in the sequence of the obverses. Nor should one anticipate a strict correlation. As set forth above, the iconography and the realism in which the portrait is interpreted are determined by the motive of the depiction, which is not that of the emissions. Adorned with neither a tainia nor a laurel wreath, the attributes of the heroized founder of the dynasty whose image on the obverse embodies the sovereignty of the state, the gem is intended to portray the mortal
appearance of Philetairos. This divergence, however, is only marked to a significant degree if
the work is held up against the portraiture of the issues that were minted during the last years
of Eumenes I and under Attalos I. It is the portrait at the head of the posthumous series and
the types in direct descent from it that the gem study most nearly approaches, the effect being
apparent in the pronounced cast of the profile features, the structure of the face, and in the
particular heaviness of the flesh at the lower jaw (pl. 24, 2). On the grounds of this admittedly
limited correlation, and the mid-third century parallels for the style of the gem, the writer would
suggest a date in the principate of Eumenes I (263-241), with the reservation that a later revival
of aspects of this archetypal iconography cannot be firmly excluded.

Inaugurated under Nikomedes I, apparently in 264, the year that he had founded
Nikomedeia on the Propontis as his capital, the coinage of Bithynia preserves a continuous
tradition of portraiture that ends with the reign of Nikomedes II (d. 127). For virtually the
duration of this period, the styles of the successive emissions stand in relative proximity to the
formal development manifested in the coinage of the Seleucids, while remaining uninfluenced
by the idealizing vein that came to the fore at the time of Antiokhos II and prevailed until the
last decade of the century, only to be revived in the second century. Subsequent to the formi-
dable and august style that imbues the portraits of Nikomedes I, the rare specimens of the
bronze denomination minted for Ziaëlas witness the inception of an austere realism. Albeit
devoid of much inner vitality, it well accords with the dominant style in the portraiture of
Antiokhos I, and more pointedly, with that of his posthumous series at Apameia and Aigai.
Under the sovereigns who succeeded Ziaëlas, this mundane realism remained a constant,
determinative factor.

The obverse type of the tetradrachms minted in the early years of Prousias I reiterates the
spare, taut forms that designate the portraits of Ziaëlas. Toward the close of the century,
however, the introduction of a variant rendered the iconography of this initial portrait of Prousias obsolete (pl. 24, 7). In a bust-length version, truncated at the upper sternum, the later portrait is represented on an intaglio cornelian, now lost (II 8). Aside from the aberrant coarsening of the profile features, the approximation to the iconography of this later variant warrants no further qualification. The gem portrait, moreover, is interpreted in a style analogous to that of the respective die types, which abandon the surface rigidity and sharp delineations characteristic of the former series. Rounded contours and emphatic modulations here determine the structures of the head and the internal forms, the corpulent masses of the flesh being rendered in large, fluent planes. Such linear adjuncts as there are serve merely to define a few subordinate details. Allied with the realism inherited from the mid-third century tradition, the plasticity and depth that is brought to the relief betray the renewed influence of the contemporary style of portraiture at the courts of Asia.

If no attributed portraits of Nikomedes I and Ziaëlas, or of Nikomedes II, the last prominent ruler of Bithynia, survive in glyptics, the present writer would submit that a dynastic affiliation is assured concerning the diademed sovereign portrayed on a second cornelian, executed in a finer manner (II 9). Furtwängler perceived in the subject a vague resemblance to Prousias I. The severe, though largely regular, features, the salient jaw and chin, and the distended brow, however, recall the iconographies of Nikomedes I and Ziaëlas. Such traits designate, no less conspicuously, the variant types of Prousias II, while the emphatic separation at the brow and the sparse locks that curl over the apex of the forehead further answer to the particularities of his iconography. The presence of a thin beard on the jaw, moreover, is relevant to the attribution proposed here. Rendered in irregular, slightly curling wisps, the form has no direct correlations in the die engraving, yet it leaves the chin bare in the manner of the one worn by the sovereign, apparently to affect a resemblance to his father and namesake. The portraiture
on the issues presumably minted during the later years of his reign is the closer parallel for the
profile of the gem figure, with the reservation that in the glyptic work the interpretation of the
iconography subsumes nothing of the uncompromising mien that informed the imagery of the
dies (pl. 24, 8).89

The style of the gem may well indicate a date in the second quarter of the second century,
thus coinciding with the reign of Prousias II. As is paralleled in the typology of the dies, it
revives aspects of the early to mid-third century royal portraits in the expansive dimensions of
the head and the substantial modulations accorded the main tectonic stresses of the face. The
relief of the glyptic, however, manifests neither a sound integration of the dominant features
with subordinate though clearly delineated forms, nor the subtle penetrations of the surfaces,
which formally distinguish the style of that period. It is instead constituted of firm and relatively
level, modeled passages in which the individual forms remain inert. The inclination to solidify
the planes and harshen the detailing of the features, however, is brought to an advanced degree
in the oeuvre of the médailleurs, and on this account neither of the variant types yields an entirely
convincing analogy for the stylistic rendering of the piece. Significantly, the nearer comparanda
can be detected in the obverse types and glyptics of the contemporary Antigonids and
Seleucids.90 The late Philetairos issues, also, embody an analogous style that, beyond the
resemblance in the flat surface treatment, evinces a close affinity for the rich, plastic elaboration
of the dense locks which wreath the head on the gem (pl. 24, 4).91 To a degree not present in
the die series, moreover, the glyptic approaches the standard of the foregoing portraiture
associated with the main dynastic centers by virtue of its qualitative character and the subdued
tenor of the portrayal, which may suggest that it is the work of an engraver formerly under the
patronage of one of the great courts, whether in Asia or of Macedonia, the Antigonids having
in this period ties of marriage to the Thracian royal family of Bithynia.
The chronology for the early coinages of Kappadokia on the Pontos remains somewhat obscure, in some measure at least owing to the problem of reconciling the divergent historical accounts that treat the foundation of the realm and the succession of the Mithradatids who ruled prior to the elevation of Pharnakes I in about 196.\textsuperscript{92} It is the consensus, however, that the inaugural series, an issue of staters in the style of the gold pieces struck by Alexander, should probably fall in the reign of Mithradates II (d. c. 220), while it remained for the third Mithradates, evidently at the outset of the second century, to mint the first of the emissions in silver that bear the portrait of the reigning monarch for the obverse type.\textsuperscript{93} With the recent appearance of a tetradrachm of Mithradates V Euergetes (d. 120), the portraiture of the dynasty is now preserved in a continuous tradition that ends in the first century with Ariarathes IX and Pharnakes II, the sons of Mithradates VI Eupator who ruled in Tauric Kappadokia and the Bosphoran realm (pls. 24.10-12, 25.1-9).\textsuperscript{94}

Whereas the numismatic series admits the attribution of several glyptics in the rhetorical style cultivated by Mithradates VI and his heirs, no certain portraits of the dynasts who preceded Euergetes survive in this medium, save for the arresting subject of the garnet II 11 in the Museum of Geneva. The piece, properly designated as a pyrope, is fashioned with a level face, beveled edges and a convex back in adherence to a form of ringstone that was evidently first devised in the ateliers of the Ptolemaic court during the later third century.\textsuperscript{95} Portrayed is a young man aged some thirty years, his head raised and set back on a thick muscular neck, the sternocleidomastoid being modeled in a strong contour. He wears a sparse moustache and a short curly beard that reaches to the throat and leaves the chin bare in the manner affected by the Mithradatids until Eupator deemed it politic to mediate a radically divergent self-image.\textsuperscript{96} The hair is rendered in profuse accumulations of rhythmically counter oriented locks, articulated
as pointed and acutely incurved elements, the forelocks forming dense tufts that are of no little significance to the attribution of the portrait.

The interpretation of the physiognomy draws heavily upon the repertoire of unaesthetic iconographic elements that were improvised by the engravers of the die series as a vehicle for vividly evoking the foreign lineage of the dynasty. Modeled in subtle gradations, the substantial flesh descends at the cheek and the points of convergence with the nose and mouth in soft, loose folds. The formal structure of the face is devoid of symmetries, the blunt rustic features being aligned on divergent axes, while the lower jaw and the small rounded chin recede abruptly beneath the thick, protrusive lips. Notwithstanding that the foregoing components are determinative to the continuity of the dynastic style the sovereigns of Pontos promoted, the repetition of the same is tempered by variations in the proportions of the heads and the rendition of the profile traits that convey the individualism of the sitters. The high, rounded cranium and the lineament of the profile, distinguished by the subtly aquiline nose, incontrovertibly refer to the iconography of Mithradates IV Philopator Philadelphos (r. ca. 162/1-150) on the first emission of his reign, a series of tetradrachms bearing on the reverse the figure of Perseus, the eponymous ancestor of the Persians, and thus of the Mithradatid family itself (pls. 24.12, 25.1). The attribution is further sustained by the profuse forelocks, not affected in the portraiture of his predecessors, and in the style of the execution that abandons the hardness and linearity present in the obverses of Mithradates III for the more subdued plastic contours, introduced in the portraiture of Pharnakes I. Since he is not adorned with a diadem, it is probable that the portrait dates to the later years of the reign of Pharnakes, during which period Mithradates evidently had a role in the exercise of power.

The pyrope is inscribed with the name of the engraver, Nikias, in the nominative, and rendered in a style comparable to that of Apollonios’ signature. Apparently, the work is the
only surviving glyph to bear the signature of Nikias, and his hand is yet to be discerned in the corpus of unsigned material. M.L. Vollenweider, however, posits the engagement of Nikias as a die engraver in the years prior and subsequent to his appointment at the Mithradatid court. Her argument proceeds with the assumption that his signature may be read in the monogram NK on two reverse dies of the tetradrachms belonging to series V of Perseus’ reign. The same monogram is present on a late emission of Antiokhos III, minted at Tarsos. She further maintains that the monogram ΑΠΟ on a tetradrachm of the third series of Antiokhos at Nisibis may be the signature of Apollonios.

If the signed portrait of Mithradates IV is validly dated to the decade preceding his accession in ca. 162/1, then an interval of only several years should separate it from the fifth emission of Perseus. It would ensue that if Nikias is indeed the author of the die, one might logically expect to discern in the respective portraits consistencies in the plastic treatment of the forms and in the details rendered in the features and hair. Evidently, such are wanting, and the affinities Vollenweider adduces in the proportional, rounded contours of the heads, the benignity of the countenances, and in the vigorous articulation of the locks are too superficial to sustain her argument. Still more ill-founded are the attributions to Nikias and Apollonios she guardedly proposes for the obverse types of Antiokhos III.

As concerns the interpretation of the monograms, it would appear that her premise is dictated by a purely ad hoc evaluation of the evidence. The quantities of the royal and the municipal emissions of the period attest that the die engravers pursued their art in virtual anonymity. Exceptional specimens preserve signatures; however, these invariably accompany the obverse device and render the name beneath it, either in full or in an abbreviated form. An alternative practice was to insert within the design itself a diminutive initial, if not the first two to three letters. The monograms Vollenweider attributes to the engravers of the gems are of a
limited distribution in the respective series. In view of the foregoing evidence, and what may be reconstructed of the minting process, speculation that these are other than the personal ciphers of the subordinate officials, who directed the various aspects of production, is not warranted.\(^\text{106}\)

Several commentators hypothesize that it was probably a normal circumstance for the same engravers to have executed works in both media.\(^\text{107}\) Granted the analogous technical and formal demands that a die or glyph imposes, and the typological unity much of the iconography evinces, the elucidation of attributions to individual artists on the basis of stylistic criticism is, at face value, a legitimate pursuit which might sustain this theory. The writer has systematically studied the portraiture from this perspective, however, and concludes that there is little weight to it. Allowing that the greater intractability of the gemstones necessitated the use of drills and probably files, whereas the metal dies were engraved directly with the burin, which yielded a sharper, linear definition of the forms, the details designative of an individual’s style might therefore be obscured in all save the oeuvre of those practitioners who had consummate command of both materials.\(^\text{108}\) The engraver of the amethyst IV 13 of Mithradates Eupator, whose style is plainly discerned in a continuous series of obverse dies, I would submit, presents this case uniquely in the glyptic iconography of the dynasties.\(^\text{109}\)
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CHAPTER THREE
THE PTOLEMAIC DYNASTY

I. THE EARLY PTOLEMAIC PERIOD

Ptolemaios I, who from 322 held the governorship of Egypt, assumed the royal title and diadem in 305/4. That year or shortly thereafter the mints of Alexandria and Kyrenaika inaugurated an emission of gold staters, the obverse of which bore a bust of the king, diademed and arrayed in the Aegis (pl. 26,10). This iconography, accompanied by the reverse device of an eagle standing on a fulmen, was subsequently adopted for a new series of tetradrachms. Introduced not later than 298, and before long supplemented chiefly with gold pentadrachms and hemidrachms, which carried the same types, the tetradrachms became henceforth the standard issue in silver of the realm. The image that served the die engravers is distinctly a version of the related portrait types epitomized by the marble fragments in the Louvre and the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek. Conceived in an imposing style comparable to that of the posthumous emissions of Seleukos I and Philetairos in the assimilation of realistic physiognomic nuances to a severe, ordered facial structure, the numismatic portraiture of Ptolemaios nonetheless subsumes formal qualities that are without precise correlations in the later Asiatic renditions of the style. The dense, plastic tectonic emphases of the face are invariably reshaped in rounded, more abstract forms, while in the dominant planes there is a commensurate reduction of the modulations that constitute the masses of the flesh.

In the portraiture of the third century Ptolemies, the dynamism and imposing forms of the Soter type yielded to the mannerisms of a classicizing, courtly style that endows the image of the monarchy with a distant and impassive aura. First embodied in the numismatic medium by the portrait busts of Ptolemaios II and Arsinoë Philadelphos jugate that hold the obverse of the Theon-Adelphon series coinage and the portrait of Arsinoë alone on the issues
struck posthumously in her name, the style manifestly evolved by means of elaborations on
the abstracting qualities that emerged in the Soter portraiture, united with the progressive
tendency to divorce the flesh surfaces and features from the internal structure. With this
development there coincides a crystallization of the lineaments in immobile and even more
simplified contours (pl. 26, 11-14). Standing at the head of the auxiliary emissions that were
minted at Alexandria and the centers of the Ptolemaic dependencies well into the second
century, the topology of the Adelphon and posthumous Arsinoë coinages bore a profound
influence on the portraiture of the reigning and deceased members of the house normally
reserved for the obverses. Beyond the legacy of the stylistic idiom, the topology of the
Philadelphoi set the precedents for the idealization of the portraiture and its extrinsic
iconographic elements. Such components, by perpetuation throughout the die sequence of
the third century mintings, impose upon the royal imagery a salient unity of tone. While
adherence to a received style by the engravers may account for this phenomenon in some
measure, a probable factor of equal weight came from the directive of the monarchy for the
iconography to mediate the concept it held of a dynastic singleness of purpose, and the tenet
that hereditary succession alone mandated the legitimacy of rule.

The posthumous series of Arsinoë II and the Philopatres, and the contemporary
mintings of Berenike II and Epiphanes convey the iconography of the dynasty in portrait
types that image distinct physiognomies. In contrast, the iconography for the regnal and
posthumous emissions of Euergetes I is decidedly a sterile adaptation of the Adelphon type
of Philadelphos, distinguishable only by the subtlest deviation in the physiognomic structure.
Several of the glyphs discussed presently stand in a close relation to typology of the auxiliary
emissions, and however subject to the free interpretation of iconographic details, must, in
essence, depend upon models comparable to those held by the médailleurs. Stylistic continuity
with the emissions of Philadelphos’ reign is accompanied in the die series by formal innovations, which the glyptics collaterally evince (infra).

The material catalogued here constitutes the hard evidence for the portraiture of the Ptolemaic dynasty in glyptics (III 1–III 37). Extraneous to it, I believe, are the numerous gemstones, the iconography of which is asserted to effect syncretisms of the royal family with the deities named in their cult titles.¹¹ This theory has found its leading exponent in M.-L. Vollenweider, who, paradoxically, has not articulated it in terms of an underlying principle.¹² There is, however, at basis, a fault to this theory. The Ptolemaic lineaments perceived to inform this iconography of the divinities give the appearance of having been excerpted arbitrarily from the royal portraiture. Moreover, it cannot be dismissed that mere idiosyncrasies of style might contribute to this impression. The very amorphous nature of this imagery casts into serious doubt the implication that it was the intent of the engravers to subsume the identities of the kings and their consorts in the form of divinity.¹³

Considerations of iconography should place the onyx cameo III 5 in the decades after the mid-third century. By reason of this presumed date the onyx is evidently an exceptional work; for categorically the majority of the cameos ascribed to the Ptolemaic family, which alone of the dynasties has any representation to speak of in this medium, are of the late period. This fact, it may be reasoned, is not entirely the consequence of fortuitous survival. The level of production inevitably attended the course of the commercial contacts with India. The subcontinent was, to the end of Antiquity, the sole source of the quartz gemstone employed, fine agate layered with onyx or sardonyx.¹⁴ Not until the end of the second century had the Ptolemies succeeded in exercising control over the straits of the Red Sea and establishing a direct, regular commerce via the navigation of coastal routes to the Indus.¹⁵
The century-old verdict on the centrality of the Cameo Gonzaga and the *Ptolemäerkameo*, so called, to glyptic art under the patronage of the early Ptolemaic court must be laid to rest.\textsuperscript{16} The iconographic evidence and in depth formal analyses H. Kyrieleis and W.R. Megow have mounted soundly vindicate the reattributions they propose to the Julio-Claudian period and the Principate of Augustus, respectively.\textsuperscript{17} Their arguments still await a cogent refutation.\textsuperscript{18} Moreover, since the date assigned by tradition to the sardonyxes is now proven to be erroneous, the hypothesis that large cameos fashioned in this splendid stone may have existed in Alexandria during the third century, can only devolve upon a determination of the original object for the cast plaster relief in the Museum of Alexandria, which depicts the apotheosized Ptolemaios Soter and Berenike I.\textsuperscript{19}

The attribution to Ptolemaios II of the imposing portrait on the amethyst in the Ashmolean Museum requires a brief defense here, since in the commentaries, save for that by Kyrieleis, it is asserted that the bust may instead portray Euergetes I (III 3). The iconography, unequivocally, is of the respective portrait type on the obverse of the Theon-Adelphon series. At first evident in the sound ovoid structure of the head and the profile of the long, slightly curved nose, the affinity is reiterated in the specification of the arched brow, the heavy orbital frame, the fleshy pendent tip of the nose and the raised contour of the firm chin. It is not refuted that in the numismatic portraiture of Euergetes analogous physiognomic details recur; however, in the latter they appear merely in isolation and are confined only to certain die variants. Moreover, his profile features rarely acquire the pronounced cast that distinguishes the countenance of Ptolemaios II.

In his treatment of the portraiture of Ptolemaios II, Kyrieleis refers the style of the glyptic study to that of several small sculptured heads on the criteria of the conspicuously rounded, hard smooth forms and the locks rendered in plain repetitions. The plastic works, he argues,
must assuredly date to after the death of Arsinoë Philadelphos, since a bronze statuette of the
sovereign paired with one of the deified Arsinoë stylistically belongs to this class. A further
criterion that the style of the statuary pieces and the amethyst epitomize a development in the
later years of his reign, Kyrieleis maintains, is the iconographic trait of the marked folds at the
mouth and the nose, which should indicate that the glyptic portrait was fashioned when the
sovereign had reached an advanced age. 20

The arguments Kyrieleis raises for dating the gem to late in the reign of Ptolemaios are
not entirely convincing. To begin with, the statuary heads cannot be attributed with any
certainty, and even if a few of them may represent him, the level of the execution is so meager
as to preclude their admission as evidence for the stylistic development Kyrieleis presumes to
have occurred in the major dedications. 21 As the minting of the Theon-Adelphon coinage
commenced not later than 272/1, the year the epithet Theon Adelphon is first attested for the
reigning couple in the documentary sources, 22 it ensues that the busts of the obverse and the
amethyst adhere to the iconography of a portrait type, which was created within a decade of
Ptolemaios’ accession as sole ruler in 282. The style of the glyptic portrait, granting the diver-
gence in the rendering of the locks and the sharper delineation accorded the profile and the
brow, more nearly answers to that of the initial emissions, the obverse of which bears the full
legend (pl. 26, 11). 23 While outwardly apparent in the softened modulations that shape the
nasolabial folds and the flesh of the cheek and neck, the correlation is perhaps more saliently
discerned in the vividness and directness of the imagery. Such qualities, indeed, are not
inherent to the portraiture of the series minted in the later years of his reign, which is
designated by a subtle inflation of the forms and a rather coarsened treatment of the internal
features (pl. 26, 12). 24
The no less imposing portrait preserved in the fragment of large, convexly-faced glass in Warsaw (III 4), may be directly referred to the iconography of Ptolemaios II, since the profile embodies the same dominant, subtly arched form of the nose, the protuberant brow and orbital, and the stout advanced chin. In the rounded contours of the head and in the severity of the features, the portrait approximates the topology established by the first series of the Theon-Adelphon emission and narrowly reflected in the amethyst bust. Notwithstanding this parity of the extrinsic aspects, the interpretation is couched in a style that remains not entirely reconcilable with that of the former works, the divergence being conspicuous in the expansive, cubic structure of the face, the augmented solidity and depth of the forms that define the lower jaw and the cheek, and in the denser plastic elaborations of the corpulent flesh. Such qualities directly anticipate the style of the Theon-Adelphon emissions minted under Euergetes I, while the inception of the development toward it rests in the issues of the middle and later years of Philadelphos. On this consideration, the original of the glass then may well date to that same period.

Foundational to the iconography of Euergetes I is an emission of tetradrachms, presumably of Alexandria. To assess from the contents of the hoard found at Sophikon, near Epidauros, and the relevance of the typology to that held by certain silver and bronze issues minted at various cities on the littorals of Thrace and Asia Minor, the tetradrachms may be plausibly assigned to the early years of his reign (pl. 26, 15). Evidently contemporary with it is a series of gold drachms that bore a related iconography, which itself was subsequently revived for a bronze denomination and reinterpreted to depict the king adorned with a laurel wreath and arrayed in the aigis, worn in the manner of a klimmys. The onyx cameo III 5, in the Merz Collection, Bern, probably epitomizes the portrait type of the Alexandrian issues, as Vollenweider observes.
The handsome intaglio portrait bust on an unbanded sardonyx ringstone of exceptional dimensions in The Hermitage, which Richter attributes to Ptolemaios II and Neverov to Euergetes I, is not plausibly of the former (III 6). Bearing no affinity to the obverse of the Theon-Adelphon denominations or to the glyptics of Ptolemaios II, the subdued rendering of the lineaments and the muted plasticity of the flesh surfaces ally the style of the head with the Alexandrian emissions of Euergetes and the onyx cameo in Bern. The refined linearity of the forms, moreover, is suited to a date in his reign, with the reservation that on this and the former stylistic criteria the piece may well have been fashioned at the end of the century, if not in the first decades of the second (infra). The iconography, however, is at variance to that of Euergetes’ numismatic portraiture. Merely a faint indication of corpulence is discerned, while the structure of the head deviates conspicuously, the cranium being high and proportionately more narrow. Such aspects instead refer the portrait to the Phoenician emissions of Ptolemaios Epiphanes and certain die variants which portray him with a somewhat more mature countenance than is standard to his numismatic iconography (pl. 27, 10).28 The physiognomic particulars of the slight brow and shallow orbital arc, the slender attenuated nose, and the acute, prominent chin accord with the distinctive profile of Epiphanes, save that on the die types it is normally of an angular cast. Further, the delineation of the hair on the crown of the head in closely arrayed and emphatically articulated short locks is near in effect to the execution of the Alexandrian and Phoenician series, albeit much elaborated (pl. 27. 9, 11). Indeed, correlations for it are significantly wanting in the engraved portraiture of the second and third Ptolemies, a consideration that further warrants a lowering of the date to the turn of the century, and thus should reaffirm the attribution to Epiphanes suggested by the fine, mannered lineaments of the profile.
Alexandria and the cities of Phoenicia continued the minting of the Theon-Adelphon and the posthumous Arsinoë Philadelphos emissions under the early reign of Euergetes whereas Alexandria alone during his absence in the preliminary phase of the Third Syrian War (246-241) struck a succession of issues on the Attic standard in the name of his consort, Berenike II, who then held the regency (pl. 27, 1-3). The obverse series for the emissions Ptolemaios II had inaugurated perpetuate the linear contrasts and subtly merging planes of the model typology. Certain dies, however, in particular of the Arsinoë denominations, by degrees admit formal modifications, which complement the style of the new mintage. A refined, emphatic precision is imparted to the accentuation of the external contours and the internal lineaments, while the depth of the plasticly rendered components is augmented so that in positive relief the images rise sharply against the ground, and assume a vivid, tactile presence. Again, the modeling effects stress and generalize the flesh surfaces, although to the near loss of the modulation formerly reserved to delimit the subordinate forms. As the foregoing tendencies became dominant, the court style reached a culminating phase in the decades after 250, since one may judge that the refinements then brought to it subsequently were to exert a determinative influence on the portraiture of the dynasty until the end of the second century.

Several engraved gemstones and the relief garnet III 9 can be assigned to the period of the stylistic developments set forth above (III 8, 10-11). The relief itself typifies the iconography of Berenike II borne on the emissions of Alexandria. It is, however, controvertible that the subject of a glyph in the former Velay collection, and the superlative portrait bust on the signed garnet of Nikandros are attributable to her. Arguably the Velay glyph carries a posthumous portrait of Berenike I, albeit one of no obvious correlation with the iconography for the reverse type of the Theon-Adelphon mintage.  
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The Nikandros gem invites deliberation on certain iconological problems, which should be approached from a wider perspective. There exists a related class of stone and glass glyphs, cameos, gold signets, and bronze rings, the iconography of which is devoted to women of a matronal status, their hair representatively dressed in the so-called Melonfrisur. The prevailing verdict asserts that portraits of Berenike II and other women of the Ptolemaic house account for this entire class, although several commentators submit that the iconography of the gold signets in St. Petersburg and Tarentum should be ascribed to private women. The hypothesis of this Ptolemaic connection, however, is not substantiated by a convincing decipherment of the headbands that the women wear, which, a priori, are considered to be articles of royal insignia. Invariably, the bands lack the long, tasseled fillets of the diadem proper as distinct from a tainia or mitra, an omission of no importance were the iconographies definitely styled after the official types of the mintage.

The contradictions that this broad interpretation of the portraiture entails can be resolved, if instead it is reasoned that the iconographies are of private women. Purely internal evidence, however, such as might be educed in the related glyphs that depict women or deities, veiled or wearing headbands and scarves of various descriptions, is of no avail to this inquiry, for to rely upon it would only invite circular arguments. The premise must, of necessity, be developed on criteria of a comparative iconography that is in some measure independently verified.

From the late third century onwards, at first on initiatives in the private sector of society, and subsequently, on resolutions passed by civil assemblies, women were accorded the privilege of receiving honorific and commemorative statuary dedications in testimony to their feminine modesty (sophrosyne), conduct (eutaxia, eukosmia) and civic contributions. Asia Minor and the Aegean isles have bequeathed the mass of this marble portraiture.
quarter of the eighty-eight statues are preserved intact, and of the entire corpus, not more than eight are associated with inscribed bases. The anonymous majority, however, is solidly coordinated around this core of documented portraits on the standard of a highly codified language of gesture and dress. An idealism born in the late fourth century canon of the feminine countenance determines the prevailing style of the iconography, although in several instances this idealistic idiom is sacrificed by degrees to interpret selectively the physiognomic idiosyncrasies of the women. This individualizing quality raises parallels in the finer glyphs and signets, and therefore leaves it to reason that their subjects come from the same social class as the recipients of the statuary honors.

Alone of the works considered here, the sardonyx cameo in the Merz collection must be of a Ptolemaic origin, its thorough parallels with the quiet, formal style of the royal cameos III 5 and III 34 requiring no further comment. Moreover, the ethos of this portrait stands so close to that of the third century queens as to convince that it depicts a woman of stature at the court. The Nikandros gem encourages the same interpretation, considering that it is ostensibly styled in the manner of the late third century dynastic image. Despite this, its relationship to the court style is not so definite as the commentators would lead us to believe; for the influence they presume hardly penetrates to the rendering of the individual lineaments. Ptolemaic glyptography, so it is evident, affords no certain instances of private portraiture save the Merz cameo. Therefore, one is at a loss for a comparative perspective on which the fine realism of the features, and indeed also the more trenchant delineation of the physiognomies observed on the gold signets in Tarentum and Corfu, might be assessed.

The gold signet in The Hermitage presumably depicts a private individual, albeit idealized in the vein of the Merz cameo portrait to which it bears a probably fortuitous resemblance in both the iconographic content and certain details of the style. Concerning the many bronze
rings with the device in relief and the sealing impressions of the Elephantine hoard of a related iconography, it is impractical to consider that their subjects can stand for portraiture. The decided homogeneity of the devices and the generalized features of the iconography should confirm that purely genre types dominate here.

Within a year of Epiphanes’ accession in 204, the mint of Alexandria inaugurated an issue of gold octadrachms bearing the portrait of Ptolemaios Philopator that, in short order, was to be replicated in a series of tetradrachms minted in the cities of the Phoenician littoral (pl. 27, 7). Presumably based on a model that imparted the iconography of a statuary portrait under the commission of the court of Philopator, the dies of the Alexandrian series perpetuate the stylistic refinements that came to the fore during the period of his reign, being epitomized in the posthumous coinage devoted to Euergetes I. Notwithstanding the received, formal aspects of the style and the extrinsic assimilation to the dynastic image effected in the portraiture of Ptolemaios II and Euergetes, the subtle asymmetries of the profile and the distinctive, stout retroussé nose render a more salient, individual presence than is discerned in the iconographies of the immediate precursors to Ptolemaios IV.

A glass, formerly in the Postalakka collection, reproduces this portrait type of Philopator paired with a bust of his consort Arsinoë III, which adheres to the iconography of her posthumous coinage minted at Alexandria (III 12). The stone from which the matrix of the paste was cast remains the single attested specimen of early Ptolemaic glyptics to preserve an independent composition of jugate portraits. The archetype for its topology, however, obviously rests in the imagery of the Theon-Adelphon coinage. As the face of the glass was well preserved, it may be assessed that the original was interpreted in a style having precise correlations to that of the die series, significantly in reference to the conspicuous inflation of the cheek and the corpulent lower jaw, and the unusual articulation of the hair in repetitions
of raised, orbed locks. The style of execution, in concert with the decided relevance to the iconographies of the die types, then should assign the gem to the period of Epiphanes, although it is a reasonable conjecture that the probable, direct model was an *emblema* or cameo contemporary with the reign of the Philopatores.

The hoard of sealing impressions uncovered at Edfu attests the devices of several signets, which represent various members of the dynasty arrayed with the attributes of Hermes. One of them, incontrovertibly, typifies the iconography of Philopator in the style of the posthumous series. The numismatic evidence, however, is not decisive to the repeated assertion that the Harpokrates, Horos the Child, depicted on a fine sardonyx cameo in the Cabinet des Médailles, assimilates the iconography of the king (III 15). G. Blum, the first to propound this argument, predicated it on a perceived resemblance of the physiognomic traits. To sustain it, however, he rightly observes that distinct parallels for the royal regalia of the cameo image are not encountered in the substantial corpus of Harpokrates monuments, the chronology of which mainly comprehends the period from the late first century B.C. to the end of the Antonine dynasty (A.D. 192). Thus, he concludes that the Ptolemy, who was himself Horos incarnate, must be the intended subject of this cameo.

The central premises of the interpretation Blum argues elicit immediate contradiction, despite the evidence, ignored by all commentators, that submits Philopator profoundly venerated the deity, and thus might have been identified in iconography with him. There are first the features to consider. The rounded contours of the head, the fleshliness of the forms, and the stout retroussé nose, which he refers to the obverse types of Philopator, in essence are the complements of an iconography for Harpokrates, as it was conceived in the Hellenistic style. Nor is it accurate to posit the regalia of the cameo image as a criterion of uniqueness. The corpus affords a few monuments that are paradigms of this iconography: a
silver statuette and the glass gem III 16, both of the Ptolemaic period, and a gray basalt effigy in the Vatican, of the first to the second century A.D., albeit couched in an Egyptianizing style. The silver object is plausibly of a third century date, which thus might place it well before the mass of the statuettes and reliefs that comprise this corpus.

This iconography must, of necessity, refer to a tradition that was inherited from the bronze industry of the Saite and the Late Periods. The legacy it bequeathed was a convention of representing divinities in the form of a naked youth, his head shaven save a long, plaited sidelock. The statuettes, votives in fact, constitute in part the archetype of the cameo image, that is, of the youth invested with the *pschent*; when inscribed, invariably the dedication is to Horos the Child. The cameo, therefore, epitomizes an iconography of Harpokrates that evokes by means of the royal insignia his predestined inheritance of the kingship over the Lands of Egypt.

II. THE SECOND CENTURY AND THE LATE PTOLEMAIC PERIOD

In the course of the second century, to the general detriment of the evidence for the iconography of the later dynasty, few innovations had been brought to the topology of the coinage. Attendant emissions bearing the portraiture of the reigning sovereigns were rarely minted, while the obverse of the standard tetradrachms continued to hold the image of the deified Ptolemaios Soter I. For an indeterminate period Alexandria and the cities of Cyprus resumed minting in gold denominations of the posthumous series in the name of Arsinoë Philadelphos. The Alexandrian mintage may have commenced during the reign of Epiphanes, allowing that stylistic criteria evidently assign the weight of it to the reign of Philometor (pl. 28, 4). The emissions of Cyprus were inaugurated not later than 193, and plausibly continued for a period under Philometor (pl. 27, 12). It is the inference of several authorities that the imagery of the successive issues subsumes aspects of the contemporary royal iconography,
which is to assert that the consorts in whose reigns the mintings fell are represented \textit{sub specie deae Arsinoë}.\textsuperscript{48} The rationale of this hypothesis, however, is seriously undermined by the contention that the aberrant features which, it is alleged, were excerpted from the iconographies of the royal women who reigned before the accession of Kleopatra VII in 51, can be apprehended plainly in terms of a progressive deformation of the received archetypes.\textsuperscript{49}

The exemplary types themselves, as recognized in the early emissions of Cyprus and the Alexandrian issues assigned provisionally to the period of Epiphanes and the first reign of Philometor, hold conservatively to the iconography of the third posthumous series, minted during the last years of Ptolemaios II (pl. 26, 14).\textsuperscript{50}

Aside from the posthumous coinage of Philadelphos, and the standard tetradrachms and regular bronze issues, stand the singular emissions in silver and gold that were minted during the reigns of Philometor and Euergetes II.\textsuperscript{51} For Philometor the numismatic evidence preserves a succession of portraits, of a divergent iconographic content, which may be distinguished in one or more variants. Represented foremost by the imposing portrait on a pair of tetradrachms from the mint of Ake-Ptolemais, dated 149/8, the imagery of the later versions is not immediately relevant to the sphragistic material treated here presently.\textsuperscript{52}

In a study of 1962, D. Kiang assigned to the coinage of Philometor a tetradrachm, the only attested specimen of its issue, on a close analysis of the style of the reverse device and by the presence of a monogram, which, significantly, recurs on a few bronze denominations that antedate 176, the last year in the period of his minority (pl. 28, 3).\textsuperscript{53} His conclusion that the portrait on this silver piece is of Philometor himself remains decisive, since the archetype for the iconography has been subsequently established by the appearance of a unique gold octadrachm that bears on the reverse a bust of the sovereign, represented at a youthful age, and on the obverse a portrait of Kleopatra I Epiphanes. The minting, therefore, must be
assigned to the end of the period during which she held the regency on behalf of her son (pl. 28, 1-2).  

The designation of the tetradrachm portrait by Kiang, and the correlative evidence had for it in this gold piece, should now resolve in full the long controversy over the interpretation of the famous gold signet rings in Paris.  Indisputably of the same personage arrayed in Pharaonic regalia on the rectangular bezel of one ring, and in the manner of a Hellenistic monarch on the work having an oval face, the portraits replicate the salient features of the high, arched brow, the long, thin and articulated nose and the narrow, acute chin that distinguish the gaunt visage of Philometor as it is portrayed on the respective emissions in silver and gold. By reason of its finer execution, the portrait adorned with the diadem may be discerned to stand nearer to the iconography of the tetradrachm in the rendering of the individual lineaments, although as observed in the companion piece, a minor deviation intrudes with the presence of the sparse cheek beard that reaches beneath the chin, although leaving it bare.

To recapitulate. The archetype for the iconography of the signets then rests in a portrait that had been created prior to the accession of Philometor in his own right in 176. At a later time, presumably within a decade of his advent, the iconography of this portrait type was renewed with the intention of embodying the altered appearance of the sovereign, who by then had attained the age of early manhood. The articulation of the nose, the more prominent contours of the brow, the cheek and the lower jaw and, most conspicuously, the sideburns or the down of the beard render this distinction to equal effect on both the signets and the unique tetradrachm. The decided relevance to the iconography of this obverse type indicates that the signets are not much removed from the date of the minting, for which Kiang posits a terminus ante quem of ca. 160.
The approximation to the portrait type of this later coinage is reiterated in the execution and stylistic qualities of the signets, the parity being most evident in the attenuation of the features, the delineative precision brought to the angular contours of the profile and the aggregations of the locks at the forehead and the temple. Analogous to the signets and the die type, moreover, are the linear enhancement of the internal features and the separation of the later from the modeled forms of the facial structure. In the rendering of the signets this effect is pronounced to a somewhat greater degree owing to the articulation of the inner contours by means of acute, slightly undercut edges and the emphatic incising reserved for the brow and the eyelids, so as to impart in positive relief the form of distinct appliqués. The plastic forms of the forehead, the cheek, and the lower jaw are consolidated in planes that admit nuances of depth solely at the points of convergence with the profile lineaments.57

In essence, the highly wrought style of the Paris rings is a late variation on an earlier theme. For the precision accorded the delineation of the forms and the mannerisms that infuse it, a close precedent exists in the portraiture of the octadrachm piece, which itself evinces an unmediated continuity of the numismatic style established under Ptolemaios V.58

That this revised iconography of Philometor had entered the repertoire of devices held by the signets for royal officials is further evidenced by the gold ring III 20 in the Kanellopoulos collection and a sealing impression from Alexandria (pl. 17, 5).59 The stylistic qualities of each accord well with elements observed in the engravers’ rendering of the Paris rings, although only the signet that yielded this impression may be tied to their atelier on any criterion: the image plainly derives from, and closely replicates the model for, the portrait of the king in Hellenistic regalia.

The portraiture of the Ptolemaic consorts from the second to the first century constitutes a considerable legacy. Adversely, however, the numismatic material is inadequate to an
assessment of this diverse corpus. During the entire course of this period, at intervals over a century apart, the auxiliary emissions bring into evidence the iconographies of only the first and seventh queens to bear the name Kleopatra. Further, as set forth above, the disputed chronology of the posthumous Arsinoë mintage after the initial decade of the second century and, significantly, the apparent internal development of the typology, invalidate the series as a standard by which the iconographies of the contemporary royal women may be assayed. The one class of objects, which should countervail the deficiency of the numismatic record to the degree that it establishes a context for the recognition of individuals, has proved to be well nigh useless: the signet impresses, principally from the Edfu hoard, that preserve dyads and triads of the royal family. Besides the occurrences of severe damage and the coarse engraving of certain signets, in general the iconographies of the women are ill-conceived, probably an indication that the engravers had at their disposal models of an inferior delineative quality, and therefore the signets impede further analysis. The sculptured portraiture may afford a sounder perspective on the problem.

Research on the dynastic sculpture in the Egyptian and hellenizing styles of the second century and the late period submits reasoned speculation that several monuments are attributable to Kleopatra II, the sister-consort of Philometor and Euergetes II, and Kleopatra III, her daughter, the niece and consort of Euergetes, and mother of Soter II and Alexander I. Formal analysis and, most persuasively, the inference that particular details of their physiognomies are styled closely in the manner of the portraiture of the kings well justify this contention. The iconography that the monuments ascribed to Kleopatra II epitomize is probably distinguished in an imposing marble of the Antikensammlung, Kassel, and the bronze herm bust of a Ptolemaic queen from the series of replica portraits installed in the Villa dei Papyri at Herculaneum, evidently during the early decades of the first century A.D.
Virtually universal opinion has attributed the marble to Berenike II; however, as Stanwick cogently argues, the physiognomy is rendered in a style that presumes a date in the advanced second century. The bronze is not unequivocally to the standard of this iconography, although quite aside from the lineaments, which impart a sharper individuality, the structural emphases of the face are congruent with the respective components of the other versions. Therefore, the identity of the type should be established.

The basalt portrait (I 406) in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, establishes sound evidence for the iconography of Kleopatra III. Stylistic qualities consistent with criteria deduced in the portraiture of Soter II and Alexander I firmly date it to the end of the second century, during the last years of her reign. To an earlier period, perhaps the decade after her marriage to Euergetes II in 140 or 139, I would assign the marble bust in the Louvre, despite the fact that the schema of the head and shoulders and the style of the features closely ally it to the famous marble portrait of Philometor in Alexandria. The base of the nose, preserved in its original state, indicates that the Louvre bust presented a strong aquiline profile which, although comparable to that of the basalt head, is not distinctive of the portraits provisionally attributed to Kleopatra II, the elder sister of Philometor.

The iconographies that this portrait sculpture attests can be appreciated in the gemstone glyphs III 22 and III 35, the former a superlative chalcedony inscribed in the name of the engraver, Lykomedes. Besides them, however, there are few other glyphs and signets from this period that definitely bear portraits of the Ptolemaic women. In the manner of the Lykomedes gem, the iconography of these articles invests the royal consorts with plaits or ringleted side locks and the horned solar disc crown of Hathor, attributes of strong Isiac connotations.
The name piece of Lykomedes has engendered controversy, much of it unnecessary in retrospect. Furtwängler, contradicting the attribution to Kleopatra I raised by Froehner, held the inscriptive style and the “breite grosse Manier” of the portrait to be indicative of a third century date. His attribution to Berenike I was guardedly accepted by Beazley, who maintains that it may instead depict Arsinoë Philadelphos. Richter discerned in the iconography an affinity to that of the posthumous Arsinoë series, whereas to Vollenweider it affirmed an ascription to Berenike II. If the opulence of the face indeed evokes the iconography of Berenike II, and of the Arsinoë emissions minted in the reign of the Euergetai, the pronouncedly vacuous structural forms and the heightened amorphousness of the flesh surfaces should, however, assign the piece to the second century. As commented upon by several authorities, the style is allied to that of marble and limestone royal portraits and Isiac heads of the period, and as well to the Villa dei Papyri bronze bust. Kyrieleis asserts that the glyph may be plausibly narrowed to the late third quarter of the century, in part on the argument that the style emphatically answers to that of the obverse types of Diodotos Tryphon and the Seleucid consort, Kleopatra Thea, herself a scion of the Ptolemaic house. Interpreted in an idealizing vein that manifests no less a concession to the canonical imagery of the Hellenized Isis than to the portraiture of the third century consorts, the portrait by Lykomedes still retains a subdued, though perceptible individuality: a shallow recess at the brow articulates the profile, while the nose is of a subtly arched form with a blunt pendant tip. The chin is heavy and recedes, being defined by a strong ovoid contour continuous with that of the lower jaw. Muted folds emerge in the soft, barely modulated flesh surfaces at the nostril lobe and the mouth, which is small; the lips are full with the lower one having a conspicuously turned under contour. The aforementioned physiognomic elements assert a positive correlation with the iconography that the limestone portrait in Alexandria epitomizes.
The iconography of the gemstone accords with that of the limestone portrait and the bronze herm bust in one further detail: the wearing of the diadem in a conspicuous manner, that is, without the veil normally worn by the consorts of the early Ptolemaic house. This mode of wearing the diadem, A. Krug and R. Smith reason, is an innovation manifest of the political equality attained by the queens in the second century. To H. Kyrieleis, its assumption denotes undivided sovereignty, and therefore he posits that the engraved portrait should date precisely to 131-130, the year when during the course of the civil war waged by factions loyal to herself and to Ptolemaios VIII, Kleopatra was acclaimed sole ruler in Alexandria.\(^69\) The material evidence, however, may refute the broad interpretation of the former, and the more narrow one advocated by Kyrieleis. This manner of adornment was hardly an innovation of the second century, since precedents for it exist in statuary portraits of Berenike II and Arsinoë III, and as well in the faience ware from the period of Arsinoë II until the turn of the century.\(^70\) The inscription, moreover, is in a style that apparently will not sustain the date he proposes. Rendered in standard epigraphical forms of a third century derivation, the letters are not delineated with the distinctive enlargements at the ends of the hastas, which only by degrees came into fashion during the second century.\(^71\) Therefore, the chronological implication of the inscriptive style is a date not later than ca. 150 to 145.\(^72\)

With the death of Euergetes II in 116, the minting of the singular emissions fell entirely into disuse until Ptolemaios XII revived it in 54, during his second reign. It is by reason of this interruption in the sequence of the numismatic portraiture that the evidence to be had in the hoard of contemporary sealing impressions, allegedly found at Edfu on the Upper Nile, assumes a critical importance for the iconography of the late Ptolemaic kings.\(^73\)

The impressions constitute a diverse thematic repertoire. Nearly a fifth bear the hieroglyphic inscriptions and Egyptian iconography of the signets held by the priesthood in
the Thebaid, several being associated with that of the Isiac sanctuary at Philae. The crown officials appointed to the temple administration in the capacity of priests or financial agents are attested by the impresses from two signets, the more elaborate of which carried the cartouches of Ptolemaios IX Soter II (r. 116-107, 88-80) and the names of his predecessors. The complement of the archival sealings, with figural and genre motif devices in a thoroughly Hellenistic style, is principally formed by the portraiture of the royal house.

The numismatic evidence admits the attribution of a relatively few portraits to the Epiphaneis, the Philometores, Euergetes II, Ptolemaios XII, and Kleopatra VII. Aside from a single posthumous depiction of Ptolemaios Soter I and the portrait of Philopator, previously cited, the Ptolemies who reigned during the third century do not figure prominently in the corpus. The roster of the identified sovereigns, then, indicates that the chronology for nearly the entire hoard should extend from the first quarter or so of the second century to about the year 30.

The greater share of the signet impresses carry portraits of the Ptolemaic kings not represented in the numismatic record. Almost invariably, the diadems worn by them assume the form of the flat and conspicuously wide band, which under the late dynasty virtually superseded the traditional narrow type. Therefore, the innovation reaffirms a date for the portraiture in the last two decades of the second century, with a continuation during the first. Leaving aside a lesser category of impressions portraying youthful rulers, the successors to Ptolemaios XII, the iconographies resolve into two prominent series that evince a varied, albeit correlative typology.

The portrait type dominating the first and more extensive series is of an individual, whose corpulent cheek and generous folds of flesh at the jaw indicate of an advanced state of obesity. His facial structure, massive and framed in clear planes, is delineated by a low forehead,
prominent brow, emphatically recessed at the base of the nose, and by a severe, rounded chin. The nose is stout and assumes either a full even curve or a true aquiline profile, though consistently its tip is strongly pendent. An ample, protrusive lower lip distinguishes the small mouth, and in the majority of impressions the hair over the apex of the forehead rises to form a tuft of short, dense locks. Normally, a beard of slight growth covers the cheek and curls below the chin, rendered by means of engraving in a fine stippled effect (pl. 17, 8).80

Additional impressions bear a portrait that is intimately allied to the former in the structural contours of the face and the individual physiognomic aspects of the profile. Affinities to the main type further carry over in the arrangement of the forelocks and the manner in which the beard is worn. Iconographically, the variant deviates from this standard by the presence of not quite so heavy layers of flesh at the lower jaw and the narrower form and more salient thrust of the chin (pl. 17, 9).81

The iconography of the second series manifests no less of a subtle variation than is observed in the first. Irrespective of the mediocre to inferior execution of the signet devices and the abrasion of the impressions, it is plainly evident that the portraiture embraces two principal types representing the individual arrayed in the standard regalia of the diadem and khlamys and wearing a composite corselet fitted with reinforcement plates over the shoulders and pteryges to protect the upper arms. The king is bearded in a manner similar to that of the former subject. However, in the few better preserved specimens his beard is differentiated by a denser growth of the locks. The low, receding forehead demarcated at the brow by an acute in curve, the arched nose, stout and pendent, and the full protuberant lower lip are depicted with a relative conformity among the types. Invariably, the jaw is of a wide, angular build, and the firm, though slight, chin is distinguished by a linear profile. On several impressions the features are based within a rather massive structure and the flesh of the cheek
and nasolabial region manifests a tendency toward corpulence, although this latter aspect is
not quite so pronounced as in the portraiture of the first series (pl. 17, 7).\textsuperscript{82} Better attested is
the physiognomy of a slighter build with the profile often assuming a more gaunt cast (pl. 17,
6).\textsuperscript{83}

In the commentaries devoted to the corpus it is not a matter of dispute that the weight of
this portraiture should be attributed to Ptolemaios IX Soter II (r. 116-107, 88-80) and
Ptolemaios X Alexander I (r. 107-88). The conclusion is founded, in part, upon the argument
that, of the late Ptolemies whose iconography is not attested in the mintage, they alone
reached an age which is in accord with the appearance of the individuals portrayed, and that
the pronounced corpulence of the latter may be decisively correlated to the evidence of
inscriptions and the literary tradition, which testify that Soter II and Alexander I received, as
had Euergetes II, the appellation of \textit{Physkon} in reference to the girth they attained in later life.\textsuperscript{84}

The problem of attribution to the sovereigns is compounded by the fact that, although
certain portrait types may be relatively coherent over a sequence of the impressions, the subtle
modifications to which they are subject, in the last analysis, render it difficult to ascertain
objectively whether a given class of portraits merely constitutes a variant on a single
established type, or should be taken to represent an independent one. The latter case would
then admit the possibility of an alternative association, and it is precisely this problem of
interpretation posed by the iconography, in particular with respect to the portraiture of the
first series, which has engendered much of the divergence of opinion regarding the individual
designations.

K. Parlasca addressed this problem in the context of positing the attribution of a late
Ptolemaic portrait head in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, which is indisputably of a related
iconography.\textsuperscript{85} Executed for insertion into a marble statue of twice life-size proportions, the
head in its present state has been reworked, principally by means of a reduction of the surfaces of the lower portion of the face and the upper part of the neck, with the addition in stucco of a short, curly beard. For the date of this alteration, Parlasca argues that the chronology of the reigns of the two kings would favor a *terminus post quem* of 88, the year in which Soter II regained the throne from his younger brother. The alternative date, which would place it in the reign of Alexander I, he cogently maintains, is less probable for, if the marble originally represented Soter II, and was appropriated by Alexander I, it is implausible that such an imposing work would have been left standing in this state following the restoration of sovereignty to the former. Proceeding on this conclusion, Parlasca asserts that of the brothers, Soter II alone wore a beard. Accordingly, he correlated the entire series of the signet portraiture into two principal divisions with the bearded types being assigned to that sovereign. His argument here is not thoroughly convincing, for it fails to bring into proper consideration the aspects of the iconography that firmly separate the portraits in the respective series.

H. Kyrieleis reaches substantially different conclusions, for he attributes the portraiture in the first series alone to Soter II and Alexander I. His argument revolves primarily on an interpretation of the significance accorded certain attributes in two of the portraits, the typology of which he assigns to the works designated here as a sub-class of this series. The first, he asserts, depicts the king clad in the *exuvium* of a lion. Since the attribute had long become assimilated to the imagery of Alexander the Great, Kyrieleis concludes that its presence in all probability was intended to refer to the surname assumed by Ptolemaios X (pl. 17, 12). With respect to the second portrait he considers, an corseleted bust of superior execution, his argument that the helmet worn by the figure bore a specific association with the
Macedonian king, by reason of the manner in which the crests are arrayed on it, is not substantiated (pl. 17, 11).

The remaining portraits in the first series, formerly cited as constituting the principal representative type, he ascribes to Soter II. The entire second series Kyrieleis maintains is attributable to Ptolemaios XI Alexander II on the basis of two variants in which the *exuvium* of an animal, incorrectly identified by him as that of a lion, is worn well back on the head. To sustain the association he further asserts that the particular style of the beard first came into fashion among the rulers of the kingdoms in northern Asia Minor and that it was Alexander II, having been raised in exile at the court of Mithradates Eupator, who introduced the mode into the Ptolemaic realm (pl. 17, 10).

The arguments raised by Kyrieleis and his conclusions regarding the ascription of the portraits was subsequently accepted by A. Krug, with the reservation that the attribute attested in the latter series had now been accurately recognized to be the *exuvium* of an eagle. Krug further concurred with the explanation advanced by Kyrieleis for the considerable presence of the portraits of Alexander II, whose reign lasted a mere nineteen days: that his position in exile prior to the accession would have necessitated a concerted effort to disseminate his likeness in the realm.

It is difficult to accept readily the arguments of Kyrieleis and Krug regarding the attribution of the second series of portraits to Alexander II. The iconography of a variant in this series, distinguished by a heavier facial structure, is unequivocally reflected in the Boston head, which on compelling circumstantial evidence should be held to portray Soter II. Indisputably, this same portrait type is attested in glyptic art and the head from a bronze statuette. Moreover, several portraits of a less well-defined iconographic cast, at least, may be placed in the orbit of the marble. That Alexander II is depicted in the preceding
monuments, as Kyrieleis proposes, remains suspect, for, even if the theory advanced by him, and reiterated by Krug, that a concerted program was instituted some months prior to his advent in Egypt is valid, it is not highly probable that this alleged program could have progressed to such a point by the time of his demise. In view of this consideration, then, it is implausible that the portraiture of Alexander II should be so well represented, if at all, in this corpus.92

In the first series, the portraits assigned to Alexander I by Kyrieleis and Krug, with few exceptions, cannot be convincingly divorced from the principal type, of Soter II, according to their argument, for the differences they isolate in the iconography are too insignificant to warrant distinction. In contrast, those portraits that evince iconographic aberrations are under represented in the series and thus probably constitute a mere variant rather than an independent type. The attribute Kyrieleis interpreted to be the exuvium of a lion is, in fact, that of an eagle. As the evidence stands, augmented now by a pair of sealings in the Amsterdam collection, one must conclude that both kings had adopted this attribute on the precedent of their father, Euergetes II.93 The marble portrait in Boston, on the criterion of the alterations, then, establishes the only solid evidence for the separation of the first series, devoted to Alexander I, and the second, of Soter II.

The evidence culled in the material of the Edfu hoard establishes a sound foundation for interpreting the iconography of several glyphs and glass cameos. Attribution should raise few problems that require a lengthy elucidation, since demonstrably the content is allied to the typologies that the corpus attests.94 The superbly engraved intagli III 28 and 29 depict an imposing, obese countenance which, although accorded varying emphases and articulations of the formal structure and the individual lineaments, obviously is related to the first series of the portraiture.
In the garnet piece, the salient abstraction of the lower jaw and chin into an ovoid contour, the acutely bent upper ridge and blunt, pendent tip of the nose, the hair gathered to form prominent tufts over the apex of the forehead, and the latent power that rises in the visage more narrowly correlate with the iconography that dominates the series. The affinity is pointedly observed in several of the more accomplished specimens, in particular that of the corseleted bust, which approach the subdued and refined plastic effects that distinguish the garnet. On the intaglio cornelian this portrait type is recast in a style that moderates the severity of the physiognomy and represses inner vitality. To judge from the presence of several impressions bearing portraits of a similar character and, significantly, the garnet III 31 that evidently reproduces this same portrait, it would appear that the iconography reflects a distinct variant type well-established in the portraiture of Alexander I.

The gemstones that remain to be considered here are of a competent execution, although none manifest the subtleties rendered in the preceding glyphs. Garnets, specifically of the dark sanguine hue termed pyrope, constitute the principal material, and on this criterion, as well as that of the distinctive form employed, all are attributed to the atelier, which J. Spier first identified. Leaving aside the intaglio III 31, Alexander I is to be further recognized in the singularly unimpressive portrait III 30. The iconography of the somewhat less inferior portrait III 32, however, is sufficiently congruent with that held by the emission of Euergetes II to refute the ascription to Soter II Spier has proposed.

Analogous stylistic properties distinguish the garnet intaglio III 25 and the hessonite fragment III 26. The iconography stands close to that of the bust-length diademed portrait on the bronze signet ring III 27, which itself is indisputably related to the typology of the second series in the sphragistic corpus, and therefore should depict Soter II. Albeit harsh and entailing in some measure a distortion of the physiognomic elements, the execution of the
gemstones surpasses in quality that of the bronze work and, to a greater degree, of the ring shields from which the sealing impressions derive, the representation of the features being more considered and delineative. Evidently, then, the glyphs may record with greater accurateness the standard iconography of Soter II, which is properly discerned by the profile of the nose, aquiline rather than curved and pendent.

Several of the glass cameos plainly represent versions of the type that dominates the series of Alexander I in the Edfu hoard. The features of the portrait bust on the qualitatively finer glass III 33 in Geneva, however, stand in such an ambiguous relationship to the iconography of Alexander I and of Soter II that it is well-nigh futile to judge the intended identity of the subject. Vaguely, there is a correlation with a minor variant in the typology of the former. More equivocal and difficult to fathom is the iconography of the sardonyx cameo III 34 that depicts a king invested with the pschent. The tone of the portrait is highly retrospective, the slight structural articulation of the face, the formless flesh surfaces, and the composed features being couched in the style of this medium during the third century. These properties account for the willingness of most commentators to assign it to that period. The iconography, moreover, bears no direct relation to the obverse types of the early Ptolemaic kings. Whereas the depth of the idealization may equally negate a reasoned argument of attribution to Soter II or Alexander I, the particulars of the dilated nostril, the pendent tumescent tip of the nose, the aquiline cast of the nose, while barely suggested, and the ample pursed lips, however, are leitmotifs in the iconography of the late dynasty.

The finer quality engraved gems and the signet devices of a comparable level of execution reveal a plain dependence on stylistic idioms inherited from previous generations. Pervasive is the salient tendency toward the hardening of internal forms and contours, commensurate with an increased reliance upon harsh, linear adjuncts to the modeled passages. This direction,
first observed in the numismatic portraiture of Epiphanes, had reached an advanced degree under Philometor. In a retrospective vein, moreover, the engravers of the portraits ascribed to Alexander I availed themselves of rounded structural emphases, heavy facial proportions and muted surfaces on the model of the dynastic style of the third century, which initially was revived under Euergetes II who, significantly, had assumed the epithet of Ptolemaios III. Concession to the face of the monarchy presented during the time of its ascendancy could, in part, account for this phenomenon; however, one may well posit that this received formal language of representation was deemed suited to the peculiar physiognomies of Euergetes II and his younger son.

The illegitimate line of the dynasty, which Ptolemaios XII founded in the year 80, commands little relevance to the present study. Emissions in silver and bronze attest the iconographies of Ptolemaios and his daughter, Kleopatra VII. Her gaunt lineaments are congruous with the physiognomy of the king and plainly evoke the epithet she bore, Philopator. The signets applied by subordinate functionaries in the bureaucracy replicate the numismatic typology, as the Edfu hoard confirms. Moreover, the material of the Edfu and Nea Paphos archives has preserved what is ostensibly the sole evidence for the official iconographies of Ptolemaios XIII, the elder of the two younger brothers of Kleopatra, and Ptolemaios XV Kaisar, her son by Iulius Caesar, both of whom she associated with herself on the throne. Glyptic portraiture in the iconographic tradition represented by the numismatic and sigillary records, however, still proves to be elusive in the published holdings of the cabinets.
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28. Phoenician emissions: Br.M. Ptolemies, 68, no. 1, pl. XVI.1; Svoronos II, no. 1291, pl. 
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90. Krug, 10-18, passim, and 11, 17, on the portraits with the exuvium.
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CHAPTER FOUR
WESTERN ASIA DURING THE LATE HELLENISTIC PERIOD

I. SELEUCID ICONOGRAPHY

The previous discussion of the Seleucid iconography submits that for the period of the late third century the style and substance of the dynastic image were profoundly influenced by the innovations effected in the portraiture of Antiokhos II.1 During the last decade, however, this influence diminished when on an ensuing basis the mints of Antiokheia, Seleukeia on the Tigris and the provinces to the east restyled the portraiture for the second to the fourth series of Antiokhos III (pl. 22, 1-5).2 Formally, the dies perpetuate the contained forms observed in the previous emissions, albeit that the tendency prevailed to modulate the contours of the facial structure and the flesh surfaces with an emphasized depth and plasticity. The salient quality of the conversion is that in interpreting the gaunt features of Antiokhos’ appearance the engravers elicit an element of realism.

The official style of the late reign of Antiokhos was established in the numismatic portraiture of his immediate successor, Seleukos IV (pl. 22, 6).3 Thereafter, aspects of this style became a constituent of the types held by the inaugural emissions of Antiokhos IV and Demetrios I at the capital and the centers of Kilikia, Palestine and the East (pls. 22.7-9, 23.1).4

The numismatic portraiture of the late Seleucids, so Fleischer has elucidated at length, is in substance informed by iconographic assimilations that prescribe the typologies of the kings in reference to their descent within the collateral line of the dynasty established by Antiokhos IV, and in the senior line restored by Demetrios II and Antiokhos VII. As an integral element of the iconography, principally it is the arrangement of the forelocks and the fall of the hair at the neck that convey the filiations.5 Stylistically, the dies evince a slow development.6 Invariably,
the features are disposed within an ordered, cubic facial structure, which in the portraiture of Antiokhos VII and the last successors assumes the imposing dimensions first manifested in the iconographies of Demetrios I and Alexander I Balas (pl. 23, 3-5). The surfaces of the flesh remain impassive, being virtually devoid of subtle modulations, and stand in studied contrast to the richly engraved aggregations of the locks. Imbued with asymmetries of movement, the rendering of the hair endows the imagery with a dynamism that complements the sublime, charismatic aura simulated in the well-chiseled lineaments. From the outset of the first century, however, as the quality of the execution declines, the sustained effect is that of a hardening and abstraction of the forms. In concert with the sharp linearity in the execution of the locks, this direction betrays the influence of the ateliers attached to the mints of Damascus and the cities of the Phoenician littoral, and derives, ultimately, from the contemporary Ptolemaic style.

Whereas the portraiture of the late kings remains directly indebted to the emissions of Demetrios II and Antiokhos VII for the augmentation of the physiognomic components and the different modes in which the hair is styled, the genesis of its idealizing ethos may be pursued continuously through the reigns to the standard typology of Antiokhos IV, which the mints of Antiokheia and Ake-Ptolemais introduced in ca. 172 and 168, respectively. Conceived to embody his epithet Theos Epiphanes Nikephoros in the placid, rejuvenated features and luxuriantly curled hair, it had eclipsed the subdued realism from which the Seleucid portraiture derived its strength under his immediate predecessors, and gave definitive form to the public image the monarchy would promote until its demise a full century later (pl. 22, 10-12). From the perspective of the political reality of late Seleucid rule and the precipitate decline of the dynasty after the death of Antiokhos IV in 164, the sanction of this style of iconography, which answers to the rhetoric of the official titulature carried on the reverse of the emissions, would thus evoke the aspiration of the kings to restore the realm as a power to be reckoned with.
The portraiture of the late Seleucid dynasty is recognized in glyptics, glass gemstones, and in the sphragistic material recovered at the sites of Seleukeia and Uruk. It is at once noticed that the iconography of the signet impressions is styled in the manner of the standard types employed for the die series. The glyphs, although of a related iconographic content, are more freely interpreted. From this perspective, however, the cornelian in Paris bearing a handsome portrait of Demetrios II Nikator alone warrants close study (IV 5). Corseleted and arrayed in the *exuvium* of a steer, the bust is rendered by a second gem, now lost, of which a modern glass paste cast has been made (IV 6). The two versions evince deviations in the interpretation of the iconographic particulars and the forms of the scalp. Such differences are minor, however, and the affinities of the style and imagery so strongly apparent as to affirm a contemporary date for the works and their execution in accordance with the same model. The image of the cornelian, as distinguished by the arched profile of the nose and a richer rendering of the cheek beard, verifies a derivation for the iconography of this hypothetical model from the portrait type employed by the atelier of the Nisibis mint for the emissions in silver and bronze of 141/1 (pl. 23, 6).

Although conceived in the manner of the lion and elephant scalps that figure prominently in the iconography of Alexander and were seldom assimilated by the dynasts who entered upon his heritage, the steer *exuvium*, in royal portraiture, remains unique to the present depictions. The taurine element of the imagery is without parallels in the coinage of Demetrios’ first reign. However, the obverse types of several tetradrachm issues minted at Antiokheia and the cities of Kilikia and the Levant during his second reign (129-126/5) represent him adorned with a small horn that emerges in the locks at the temple. The circumstances that attended the accession of Demetrios explain this attribute. He assumed the diadem following the overthrow of the usurper Alexander I Balas, allegedly the younger, illegitimate son of Antiokhos IV. His
advent thus had restored the hereditary succession, and Demetrios, in witness to this restoration, augmented his titles with the epithet Nikator, hitherto borne only by the dynastic founder, Seleukos I. The horn then is evocative of the epithet, and hence of the legitimacy of his descent, since in the portraiture of the dynasty it was formerly an attribute exclusive to the iconography of Seleukos.15

To an extent, the analogy with the iconography of the later emissions of Demetrios may illuminate the motive for the singular imagery of the glyptics. The present writer, however, would submit that the significance of this symbolism may indeed transcend the mediation of his legitimacy. Implicit in the taurine attributes of the portraiture of the Seleucids who bore the epithet Nikator is a Dionysiac aura, for in the literary tradition the bull stands foremost among the animal epiphanies of the deity.16 The aura, however, is elevated in the present images by the endowment of the monarch with the luxuriant shoulder-length hair of the god, the exuvium being parted in an unusual manner so as to reveal conspicuously the locks. Since the Nisibis mintings establish a definitive correlation for the iconography of the features, it is reasonable to infer that the glyptic portraits should be assigned to the last year of his first reign. The imbuing of the sovereign with the power of the divinity then is plausibly interpreted in light of the course he set upon in that year. Having been routed and compelled to abandon the capital and Apameia by the usurper Diodotos Tryphon, he entered Mesopotamia to lay preparations for a campaign to restore the Seleucid dominion in Babylonia and Media. Profiting from the internal conflicts that pressed the monarchy in the years following the death of Antiokhos IV, the Arsacid Mithradates I subjugated Elam and the western regions of Iran early in the reign of Alexander I (150-145), and by 141 had overrun Babylonia.17 It is therefore appropriate that on the eve of the offensive against the Parthians the king may have bestowed such precious objects upon his
II. THE ICONOGRAPHY OF MITHRADATES VI

The numismatic portraiture of Mithradates VI, surnamed Eupator Dionysos, has been treated in several commentaries. As an instrument of the rhetoric he wielded to persuasive effect in the pursuit of his expansionist policies, it presents few, if any, difficulties of interpretation vis-à-vis the historical documentation. This notwithstanding, the influences that bear on his iconography and the style in which it is couched continue to elicit dispute. By way of introduction to the glyptics surveyed in the following, certain issues may be briefly addressed.

Leaving aside the bronze pieces of Amisos with a portrait of the adolescent king that stands isolated from the subsequent development of the iconography, an emission of tetradrachms, attested by three specimens, first commands attention (pl. 25, 3). The reverse bears no date, nor is the device, Pegasos with his head lowered to drink, accompanied by the ivy wreath surround, invariably present on the main emissions of Pontos minted from the year 96. On such criteria and the fact that an unusually long period of some twenty years intervenes between his accession and the inauguration of that dated coinage, it is plausibly argued by some authorities that the tetradrachms were minted during the last decade of the second century.

The realism of the iconography adheres to the tradition of his predecessors’ numismatic portraiture, whereas the subtle idealization that informs the rendering of the flesh surfaces and, perceivably, the structural forms, is directly indebted to the obverse type of his father, Mithradates Euergetes. Innovative, however, are the locks that descend to the shoulders in unruly aggregations. R. Smith, in a novel argument, maintains that the typology of Mithradates’ portraiture constitutes, in essence, an adaptation and development of the late Seleucid style. If, however, the date proposed for the first of his emissions in silver proves valid, then
emphatically the significance of the transformed style of iconography it carries should be weighed against the first and paramount political achievement of his reign: the conquest of the Crimea and the annexation of the Bosphoran realm. The sovereignty Mithradates extended to the northern littoral of the Euxine followed upon a course of prolonged campaigns waged by his generals Diophantos and Neoptolemos, probably commencing before ca. 110. The subjugation of this region must have been a source of great personal prestige for him, since he achieved what neither the Achaemenids Kyros and Dareios, nor Alexander, his putative ancestors, were able to realize. Moreover, although neither inscriptions nor the narrative accounts of later historians affirm it, Mithradates, at this early stage, probably assumed the posture of a liberator of the Hellenes, in emulation of Alexander himself. Indeed, on the testimony of Strabo, it was an entreaty from Khersonesos for his protection against the mounting incursions of the Scythians and the Tauri that had roused Mithradates to set upon this daring enterprise. Regarded from the perspective of his ascendancy, the metaphors of inspired, charismatic kingship elicited in the kinetic disposition of the locks and the physiognomy of this and the subsequent portrait types of Mithradates thus evoke the iconography of Alexander. The posthumous Lysimakhos emissions of Byzantion and Khalkedon, which circulated widely among the cities of the northern Euxine orbit until the later decades of the second century, were probably the immediate source of inspiration (pl. 28, 10-11).

The main portrait series of the substantial emissions in gold and silver of the year 96 onwards is based directly on this first type (pl. 25, 4). On certain dies of the Pontic issues, and on the undated tetradrachms that may have been minted in Greece under his general Arkheaos, the features however become more regular, the flesh surfaces softer and more corpulent. In these qualities the variants anticipate and parallel his second main portrait type and, apparently,
were the direct models for the style of the portraiture embraced by his two sons, Ariarathes IX and Pharnakes II (pl. 25, 8-9).  

The second portrait type itself was introduced with the emissions minted at Pergamon, where the king resided during his prosecution of the first war against Rome (89/8-85). The recasting of the lineaments within a well-ordered, proportionate facial structure all but entirely submerges the individuality that informs the first type. The genesis of this heightened idealizing tone has been variously interpreted in light of his patrimonial claims and the self-advertisement with which he sought to sway the Greeks of Asia Minor during the confrontation with Rome. Price and Smith, in a contradiction of his thesis of a development from the late Seleucid style, regard the softened countenance and the waving, disheveled hair to be a clear evocation of Dionysos, whose name Eupator had assumed prior to the beginning of the first century. The Asiatic conquests of the god, and his aspect of a savior, therefore would prefigure the king’s aspirations. Reinach, Kleiner and McGing assert that the assimilation is directed to Alexander. The formal qualities of the image are not decisive to either interpretation. The peculiar rendering of the hair in backward-swept, waving strands has close parallels neither in the posthumous dedications to Alexander nor in the iconography of Dionysos, and therefore presumably is an invention of the engraver. Moreover, the Dionysian aspect read in the soft, corpulent flesh surfaces will not necessarily stand; for this stylistic element was by then widely disseminated in the Alexandrian imagery, and in the portraiture of the late Seleucids. Mithradates perhaps assumed the name Dionysos in reference to his claim of descent from Alexander: the deity was reputedly a progenitor of the Argead house. Lastly, at the time this new image of Eupator was created, the king was consciously promoting his claim to descent from Alexander by demonstrations of *philanthropia*, a moral quality of kingship particularly associated with Alexander.
III. Glyptic Portraiture in the Style of the Late Seleucids and Mithradates Eupator

The dynamic and aggrandizing style of portraiture encouraged by the late Seleucids and subsequently embraced by Mithradates Eupator, has been recognized in the glyptic medium since the publication in 1858 of the catalogue by A. Chabouillet devoted to the French royal cabinet. Furtwängler, in his treatise of 1900, referred several engraved portraits to the numismatic iconography of Eupator, while during the past three decades the studies of Vollenweider and Neverov, the latter treating articles recovered at sites along the northern littoral of the Black Sea, have augmented the core of the material he isolated. Here again, the attributions were directed unanimously to the Pontic sovereign. As it is presently assembled, however, the corpus stands in need of revision: the iconographic content is so diverse as to cast doubt on the accuracy of the proposed attributions.

To begin with, the corseleted bust IV 11, held by Vollenweider to depict Eupator, is evidently the portrait of a late Seleucid. Whereas admittedly the lineaments recall the former, the profile of a protrusive brow, imposing, arced nose and salient chin is no less congruent with that of Antiokhos VII, and of Antiokhos VIII borne on the tetradrachms of Antiokheia, Damascus, and Ake-Ptolemais minted during the first and third periods of his reign (pl. 23, 9). Decisively, however, the style of the hair refutes the ascription to Eupator, since it is rendered with neither the profusion of cascading disheveled locks at the nape and the side wisps that invariably designate his portrait type on the emissions of the Pontic realm, nor with the flaring waves proper to the variant for the series minted at Pergamon. The hair that wreathes the forehead of the Seleucid approaches vaguely the schema of the dense, swept cuspate locks, which had been introduced into the portraiture of the dynasty under Antiokhos VII. For Antiokhos VIII it is attested on the tetradrachms minted during the regency of his mother,
Kleopatra Thea, while in the ensuing emissions of the first, third and fourth periods of his reign the style would witness an occasional revival (pl. 23, 11). In concert with the forelocks arrayed in this mode, the glyph reiterates the mannerism of the attenuation of the nose observed in the series of Antiokhos VII at Tyre, and on several obverses, which directly replicate the portrait for the emission of tetradrachms inaugurated at Antiokheia within a year of the accession of Antiokhos VIII as sole ruler in 123 (pl. 23, 10).

To the Seleucid sphere, moreover, must be assigned the technically excellent pyrope intaglio IV 10 of the former de Clercq collection bearing the bust of a diademed ruler. Rejected by Fleischer without justification, assuredly it portrays the general Diodotos who governed Antiokheia and Apameia in the name of Antiokhos VI, and after the death of his protégée adopted the vainglorious title of Tryphon Autokrator. The distinctive counter rhythms in the disposition of the profuse forelocks and the tufts at the temple, with the splendid fall of the unruly hair to the shoulder plainly designate the style he affected; it was never pointedly imitated in the portraiture of the late dynasty. The gradual, arched contour of the brow and nose, and the soft corpulence of the flesh rest in the iconography of his emissions at Antiokheia (pl. 23, 7-8).

The attributions to Antiokhos VII and Philip I of the cuirassed portrait bust IV 12, proposed by Chabouillet and Vollenweider, respectively, are, I would submit, irrelevant. The subtle aquiline profile and the leanness of the countenance, however, well accord with the iconography of Eupator held by the first series of the Pontic mints, and in consequence may verify the attribution that Furtwängler indirectly stated. In consideration of the definite continuity with the iconography of Mithradates V revealed in the early numismatic portraiture of Eupator, alternatively the glyph may depict his predecessor. Again, the treatment of the hair should constitute a determinative criterion: overlaid on the cranium in short, disheveled locks
with merely a few wisps curling on the upper nape and dense tufts that accumulate at the temple, it is worn precisely in the manner of the portrait of Mithradates V on the unique specimen of his mintage (pl. 25, 2).  

For the duration of the first war against Rome, the minting of the silver emissions Eupator had inaugurated in 96 continued; in the final year of the conflict (85), however, the typology of the Pontic series was altered in conformity with that of the contemporary mintage at Pergamon. Renewed in the ensuing decade to defray the expenditure of his rearmament program, and composed entirely of tetradrachms that still bore on the obverse the Alexandrian style portrait, the series ended in 67.  

The imposing features of Eupator on the amethyst intaglio IV 13 in Florence evince an origin for the iconography in that same imago, which underlies the main portrait of the late emissions (pl. 25, 6-7).  The archetype itself may be recognized in certain die variants of the Pergamene minting, though distinctively for the Attic staters that carry the date year four of an era, the commencement of which was set in 89 when Eupator mounted his invasion of the Roman province of Asia (pl. 25, 5).  

Beyond the aspects of iconography, however, the forms rendered in the subordinate features, the depth and plastic consolidation of the facial structure, the nuances discerned in the modulation of the impassive surfaces of the flesh, and the linear refinement that imbues the articulation of the locks all merit scrutiny; for they are precisely the same qualities that also distinguish the engraving of the dies for the respective emissions of Pergamon and the Pontic realm.  The médailleur himself, I would therefore contend, is the author of this glyph. Moreover, in consideration of the dominant presence of his hand in the mintage of this and the ensuing period of the reign, and the positive detection of his style in the glass gem cited below, it would not be far wrong to reason that he stood in the company of the leading court artists entrusted
with the iconography of Eupator, and was himself responsible for the definitive embodiment of the Alexandrian style portrait in the allied media.

Further related to the numismatic typology of Eupator are the glass gems IV 14-15. The latter, a fragment with the image in relief, is of an iconography that derives from the main portrait series of the Pontic emissions minted prior to 85. The stylistic particulars of the other image are not seriously obscured, despite the corrosions that mar the surface of the glass, and should well confirm that the matrix was cast from a gemstone engraved by the author of the amethyst glyph.

A younger son, and the heir designate of Mithradates Eupator, Pharnakes II had intrigued against his father and laid claim to the inheritance of the northern Euxine regions of the Pontic realm in 63. Gnaeus Pompeius then conferred upon him the dignities of a rex externus and recognized ally of the Republic. After his death in 47, sovereignty over the Kimmerian Bosphoros passed to Asandros and a succession of dynasts of Anatolian and Sarmatian descent, who ruled as clients of Rome and received her consent to assume the title of basileus. Retaining the prerogative to mint, the kings principally had emissions struck in gold and bronze with the profile of the reigning sovereign normally reserved for the obverse type. Under Asandros, who deposed Pharnakes and ruled until 16/15, and the short-lived dynasty founded by Aspourgos (d. A.D. 37/38), the style of the iconography remained strongly indebted to that sanctioned for the portraiture of the last Mithradatids. In reinterpreting that idiom, however, the engravers of the Bosphoran series invariably modified its dynamism to a rather neutral statement of the physiognomic aspects, while eschewing the florid enrichments peculiar to the earlier renderings of the hair (pl. 25, 10).

The typology of the Bosphoran emissions establishes a definite context for the iconography of the amethystine glass gem IV 17, formerly attributed to the portraiture of Eupator by O.
Neverov. Reduced to the virtual elimination of localized modeling, the unvarying facial planes, the inert features and the perfunctory integration of the thin locks assign the image emphatically to the orbit of that stylistic tradition, which the dies represent. The evidence that can be deduced in the numismatic record, however, is of no certain value for positing an attribution. This dilemma is owed to the fact that the engravers of the die types for the emissions of the Aspurgian dynasty and Kotys I conceived the iconographic content and style in terms of a single, authoritative model: the obverse for the gold staters minted during the reign of Asandros. The typologies all complement the gem image in reiterating the lineaments of the subtly protrusive brow, the high, slightly arced bridge and blunt contour of the nose, and the salient thrust of the chin. The hair gathered about the forehead and temple in a fringe of close even curls, and descending to the neck in a mass of locks that somewhat resemble a chignon, however, more nearly approximates the effect observed in Asandros’ portraiture.

The portrait busts represented by the jasper glyph in the former Southesk collection and the sardonyx recovered at Pantikapaion, the capital of the northern possessions of Eupator, are, by consensus, assigned to the late Hellenistic period. No certainty can attend the proposed date on technical criteria, since the forms developed for engraved gemstones were received in Roman glyptography virtually unaltered. The material of the Southesk piece, however, may indeed prove an origin in the Imperial era; whereas Hellenistic glyptographers seldom employed jasper of a pure dark red hue, this, the principal variety of the stone, came to be much valued during the second century A.D.

Commentators have related the iconography of the intaglios to Eupator and the posthumous series of Alexander. The association of the Southesk work with the latter, however, should be decisive: the lock that stands erect and curls over the apex of the forehead in isolation unequivocally is intended to suggest the anastole, presumably an individual trait of his appearance.
Rarely, therefore, did the Hellenistic kings ever appropriate it, the late Seleucids and Eupator himself not being strictly exceptional in this respect.\textsuperscript{49} The retrospective style and rather cold, finely wrought execution of the jasper, reminiscent of the eclectic oeuvre of the glyptographer Aspasios I, are well in harmony with the taste that had prevailed during the reigns of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius (pl. 16, 1-2).\textsuperscript{50} The archetype evidently was a late second to first century depiction of Alexander on the order of the sardonyx cameo in Oxford, which is of a similar effect in the muted aura of the countenance, the smooth enamel-like quality of the surface, and the rhythmic articulation of the hair in dense, massed locks (pl. 16, 3).\textsuperscript{51}

Little credibility may be placed in the attribution of the sardonyx bust to Eupator, which Neverov has proposed. The iconographic aspects, specifically the irregular lineament of the nose, are not sufficiently congruous with the typology for the emissions of the Pontic realm and Pergamon to assert the relationship. Moreover, the numismatic evidence eliminates from consideration the portraiture of the last representative of his dynasty and the successors to Pharnakes II in the Kimmerian Bosphoros. Therefore, the sardonyx should portray Alexander himself, whose image engraved on precious gem stones, by the first century A.D., if not before, was believed to possess talismanic properties.\textsuperscript{52} To the posthumous series I would further ascribe two intagli in Vienna, for which E. Zwierlein-Diehl posits a date in the late Hellenistic period, and a cornelian in the former collection of the counts von Brühl.\textsuperscript{53} The relationship of the Vienna glyphs to the iconography of Alexander attested by the famous gem of Neisos in The Hermitage, and the archetype of the superlative marble \textit{agalma}, dedicated at Pergamon during the early second century, should be self-evident.\textsuperscript{54}

Adorned with solar rays, the image of the Brühl gem, which Zwierlein-Diehl ties to the portraiture of Eupator, in fact derives, ultimately, from a separate tradition of the posthumous iconography, which embodied the deification of Alexander in the aspect of Helios. The
principal qualities that would epitomize this iconography had assumed form by the early third century; the restyled obverse type for the mintage of Rhodes and the metope from the Athenaion at Ilion, representing the divinity mounted in a quadriga, admit virtual certainty on this. Several commentators have advanced the view that the genesis of this iconography rests in an especially celebrated work of the sculptor Lysippus of Sikyon: his bronze quadriga of the Sun, dedicated at Rhodes. The argument for his authorship of this iconography is predicated mainly on the assumption that the metope may reflect the schema of the monument. However, the necessary underpinning of this presumed association is an item of evidence from Rhodes itself. Near the end of the fourth century, or shortly thereafter, the magistrates of the island introduced on certain commercial amphorai a stamp device of the solar charioteer that distinctly compares with the composition of the metope.57

So far as the evidence of the sculptured portraits might lead, the radiant corona was not adopted to signify the solar apotheosis of Alexander before the mid-second century. Several engraved stone and glass gems, notably an amethyst in the former Nott collection, replicate the motive (pl. 16, 4). Standard to the imagery of the monuments and glyptic objects, aside from the rays, is the elaboration of the hair in an imposing wreath of locks that rise over the apex of the forehead, not invariably with the anastole parting, and descend radially in profuse waves to the base of the neck. The rays may emanate autonomously from the crown of the head or be attached to an annular strophion, if not set within a nimbus.

The marble portrait of Eupator in the Louvre, which represents him wearing the exuvium of a lion, testifies that the assertion of his claim to be descended from Alexander, while subtly imparted in adjustments of the iconography and the artifice of the hair, might be reinforced extrinsically through the appropriation of an attribute. Whether to that purpose the eikones
of Eupator ever bore rays cannot be answered. Nor, apparently, was his iconography assimilated into the Alexander-Helios monuments.\textsuperscript{61}

Of a less certain status in relation to the posthumous imagery of Alexander are the handsome portrait busts in dynamic bearing on the amethyst IV 21 of The Hermitage and the cornelian IV 22, attested in the inventories of the royal gem cabinet in Paris since the beginning of the eighteenth century. The latter has received more attention, with the bare consensus emerging that the cuirassed king it portrays is of the late Hellenistic period. This, the more recent view, must decisively prevail over the confounded arguments that associate the gem with the portraiture of the third century Ptolemies. No less astonishing is that this same assertion has been advanced for the amethyst glyph. Parallels with the general stylistic tendencies observed in the royal and civic mintage should assign the gemstones to the mid or later second century, if not to the second quarter.\textsuperscript{62} To this period, moreover, evidently belongs the amethyst IV 20 of the Gulbenkian bequest, which bears the portrait bust of a diademed king in the standard, truncated form.

The arguments that the commentators develop to relate this glyptic iconography to certain posthumous types of Alexander are not convincing in every instance. The strong aquiline countenance on the Gulbenkian work, in particular, has no presence to speak of in the Alexandrian repertoire of the die engravers and glyptographers. Accordingly, the gem may be re-ascribed to the contemporary dynastic portraiture, and of the Seleucids at that. Distinctly, the profile and the forelocks swept in counterpoised waves are congruent with the iconography of Demetrios I held by the emissions of tetradrachms, drachms, and gold octadrachms, which were minted at Antiokheia in 151 to 150, the final year of his reign (pl. 23, 4).\textsuperscript{63}
The Hermitage amethyst defies such a straightforward elucidation. Whereas the idealized facial structure and the endowment of the hair with a vibrant quality accord well with the iconography of Alexander as it was conceived during the late Hellenistic period, the physiognomy may not be allied to any of the defined archetypes manifested in the glyptic corpus and the numismatic evidence. Nor is the determinative parting of the central forelocks with the *anastole* discerned. Further, there is the dilemma, remarked upon by K. Gebauer, that the engraver, in deciding upon the rear perspectival view of the bust and the introduction of the scepter, in essence has composed a pastiche image that stands quite removed from the glyptic typology of Alexander. The foregoing considerations then allow one to reason that the amethyst should be classed with several other gems of the period, which bear what is by all appearances a freely interpreted imagery of Alexander. The iconography of the dynastic series will not prohibit this conclusion, for at best it may imply only a vague association with the portraiture of Diodotos Tryphon.

The proud mien and corseleted torso of the king depicted on the cornelian IV 22 are inherent to the typology of a separate class of engraved gemstones of the mid to the late Hellenistic period. The series comprehends a heterogeneous iconography, which invites speculation that this glyptic is associated with the patronage of the Seleucids and the dynasties of Asia Minor. It bears emphasis, however, that although individual components of this iconography are styled in the manner of the obverse dies, few of the glyphs can be held to epitomize the portrait types represented in that medium. Granting this, the imposing, aquiline profile and the particular schema of the forelocks might refer the iconography of the cuirassed king to the Seleucids or conceivably the Attalids. Several marbles found on the acropolis of Pergamon, of a disputed status, could testify that the kings had adopted an idealizing idiom of portraiture comparable to that of their erstwhile rivals at Antiokheia.
IV. THE FIRST CENTURY

With the formal annexation of what remained of the Seleucid realm by Gn. Pompeius in 64, and his settlement of the Mithradatid kingdom in the following year, whereby Kappadokia on the Pontos was annexed, the sway of the Republic was extended to central Anatolia and its southern periphery. As an expedient to the governing of these regions that during the previous centuries were little subject to urbanization and the intrusion of Hellenic culture and institutions, members of the landed aristocracies of Paphlagonia, Galatia, eastern Kilikia, and central Kappadokia, elevated with the title of basileus, were installed to rule in the interests of Rome.67

Several of the client rulers struck issues comprised of small denominations in silver or bronze that carry their iconographies on the obverse.68 The Ariobarzanids of Kappadokia alone, however, directly inherited a tradition of minting regnal emissions, which under their predecessors, the Ariarathids, reached back to the mid-third century (pls. 25. 11-12, 26.1-9).69 The iconography of the intaglio gemstones IV 24-27, I would venture, is attributable to the Ariobarzanid kings, albeit only on circumstantial arguments.70 Stylistically, the cameo fragment IV 25 assigned to Ariobarzanes II commands attention for the virtual banishment of nuances from the flesh surfaces, the rudimentary volumes of the facial structure, the radical abstraction of the physiognomic forms, and the schematic rendition of the locks. Such qualities, and the conspicuous lack of differentiation in the relief depth of the hair and countenance, accord so well with the stylistic particulars of Ptolemaic cameos, as to permit speculation that the author of the portrait was formerly attached to an Alexandrian atelier. The imposing portrait in armor on the sardonyx IV 27, apparently of Ariobarzanes III, even allowing for the superior technical capability at the command of the glyptographer, is closer to the style of the die types.
Epitomizing the dominant vein in the portraiture of the client kings by reason of the mundane, descriptive realism in which the interpretation of the physiognomy is couched, the sard IV 24 should, on the criteria of the numismatic comparanda, portray Ariobarzanes I Philorhomaios, the founder of the second dynasty to rule Kappadokia. Cognate with this is the diademed bust of the former Poniatowski collection rendered on a hyacinth in an en face perspective (IV 28). The parity emerges in the formal qualities of the solid, plastically conceived structural contours of the face, the modulation of the flesh in dense, though nuanced, surfaces, and in the uncompromising mien.

The Poniatowski bust has received recent attention from N. Himmelmann and R. Fleischer, who refer the iconography to Attalos II and Antiokhos III, respectively. Their conclusions, however, are not well founded in the numismatic evidence and the argument Himmelmann mounts for an attribution of the Quirinale bronze to Attalos II.71 Affinities to the portraiture of the client rulers observed in the aspects of the style and iconographic content should set the Poniatowski work in the milieu of Asia Minor during the period of late Hellenism, although not with the implication that it is necessarily of a first century date. The numismatic evidence will not lead to a definitive ascription of the portrait, owing in certain measure to the fact that the absence of subtlety in the engraving of some obverse dies is not conducive to comparison. If indeed the iconography of the glyph is attested in the emissions, then it might be associated with the dynasty of Paphlagonia.72 Excluded from consideration in this regard is the Ariobarzanid house.

Without accompanying numismatic documentation for a pointed attribution, it must be qualified that the Poniatowski glyph may well date to the early or mid second century. Intriguing, therefore, are the correlations with the portraiture of the second century Mithradatid kings, which one might educe in the pronounced receding of the short forelocks,
the acute contours of the brow, the peculiar flaring of the nostrils, and the full prominent lips. Ostensibly, the engraver has quoted elements distinctive to the iconography of the dynasty, although the absence of the sparse beard worn habitually by the predecessors of Eupator probably negates that he sought to represent a portrait type attested in the mintage. Should the association of the gemstone with the Mithradatid realm stand, however, then an alternative interpretation of the iconography is invited. Strabo, our principal authority on the cults of inner Asia Minor, relates that in the hierarchy of Kappadokia and Pontic Kappadokia alike the priests of the Great Mother, the goddess Ma at Komana, were second in eminence only to the king, and that in Kappadokia they were normally of the royal family.73 Whereas nothing comparable is stated concerning this relationship with respect to the priests of the Pontic cult, the author informs us that twice annually on the occasion of the great processions in honor of the goddess, they wore a royal diadem.74 The distinction of this article from the *strophion*, the canonical priestly attribute, is conveyed explicitly in the glyptic portrait through the display of the loose ribbons to either side of the head.
A SUMMARY

In the preceding chapters I have attempted to define and examine critically problems of iconography and attribution, and to establish the portraiture in a relative chronology. The analysis, I contend, more than tolerably establishes that the portrait types attested in the numismatic record and the sphragistic material have a strong representation in the glyptics, one that constitutes over two-thirds of the corpus. The Ptolemaic series, however, reveals this relationship in the most unequivocal terms; for the iconography common to the respective media developed within the formation of a singularly homogeneous style that conveys the impression of having been vaguely progressive until the end of the third century. Thereafter, in glyptics, at least from the mid-second to the early first century, this legacy was chiefly transmitted in the oeuvre of one or more ateliers that apparently flourished under direct royal patronage. Against this development, the engraved gem stones ascribed to the late Seleucids and the dynasties of northern and central Asia Minor, especially those of the standard cuirassed type, betray a subtle, though apparent stylistic heterogeneity independent of the obverse types, perhaps indicating the activity of itinerant engravers at the courts.

The above verdict concerning the close dependence in iconography of the glyphs and the obverse types invites dispute over a theory that several authorities have advanced recently, albeit without substantial arguments. Because the commission of the engraved gemstones originated with and remained the preserve of the royal house, and because what it mediated about the inherent charisma of the king and his mandate to rule was meant to be received by the aulic entourage, it is surmised that the iconography might exemplify separate and distinct qualities in fulfillment of these social requirements. Thus, R. Smith maintains that, although the obverse types may admit a positive individuality of the lineaments, in the glyptics there apparently emerges a more pervasive idealization or “divine pretension,” as he states it.
Fleischer concurs with, however, the qualification that in the Seleucid iconography this distinction recedes. Further, he queries rightly the conclusion Smith reached that posits the clear separation in royal portraiture of a court image and a public or official image.\textsuperscript{79} H. Kyrieleis, without a formal statement of the problem, assessed in the decorative arts of the Ptolemaic court a preoccupation with the divine lineage and apotheosis of the royal family. This he relates to the encomiastic spirit of Alexandrian poetry, specifically of Kallimakhos.\textsuperscript{80} W. Völcker-Janssen is disposed to accept this theory to the extent that it can be sustained by the Ptolemaic iconography. He contends that the hardened abstraction of form, which so prescribes the impersonal countenance of the third century monarchy and mediates the filial descent of the kings, was first advanced and strengthened in the style of the court arts, specifically in glyptics. The stability of the dynasty that alone secured the existence of the aulic elite in its privileged status, he reasons, would have been read implicitly in this stylistic idiom.\textsuperscript{81}

Implicit in the arguments of this theory, especially as Völcker-Janssen reasons, is the difficult premiss that a genre can necessarily determine the concept of the iconography. Apparently, this problem has not been studied in depth.\textsuperscript{82} Moreover, the material evidence is hardly sufficient to form a sound perspective on this inquiry, granted that the mass of the sculptured portraits comes to us with no documentation of the original context. Exceptional however, in this regard are several Ptolemaic marbles, which by either precise archaeological context or scale are determined to have been cult dedications.\textsuperscript{83} The idealized iconography of these monuments is comparable to that of apotheosis Kyrieleis observes in the few reproductions of toreutic work associated with the Alexandrian court (pl. 18.2, 19).\textsuperscript{84} Certain Ptolemaic gem stones and others associated with the Seleucids, or more probably Alexander, are of a related imagery.\textsuperscript{85} The iconography in this category, however, decidedly is not representative of the corpus as a whole. The prevasiveness among this material of the portrait
types employed on the emissions belies the theory that the iconography of the glyptics was separately directed to the court.
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CATALOGUE

The following seventy-nine entries record the principal glyptic portraits discussed or referred to in the text. The relevant material of the Seleucid and Ptolemaic archives is omitted here. Unless specified to the contrary, the gem stones are in intaglio and were fashioned to be mounted on finger rings. In the case of the entries headed by a designation of the collection that formerly held the work, it is to be understood that the present location has not been determined. The descriptions of the portraiture bear specific reference to the attributes and regalia. Attributions are stated if certain, or virtually so, on numismatic criteria. For the portraits that remain controversial with respect to iconographic content and the probable date, either a brief statement on the previous scholarship and the conclusions reached in the present study, or a full discussion, independent of the text, is presented. References for the technical specifications are to be had in the appended citations of the literature.

II 1

Formerly in a private collection in Rome. Fragment of a gem, in relief. A large, irregular fracture extends vertically through the center of the head and neck. The fragment preserves intact the face to the width of the temple and the jaw along with the anterior crown of the head.

Portrait of Philip V of Macedonia (r. 221-179), facing in profile to the right and adorned with a diadem.


II 2

London, the British Museum. Formerly in the Blacas Collection.

Lapis lazuli. Level face, 17.0 by 16.0 mm.

Portrait bust of Philip V of Macedonia in profile to the right, wearing a helmet arrayed with wings, the crest of which terminates in the head of a gryphon. At the base of his neck is a harpa.

Lit. Walters, cat. 1189, pl. XVII. Richter, 1968, 154, no. 609.

II 3

Formerly in the collections of H. Walpole, N.S. Maskelyne, and W. Forster. A glass paste cast is preserved in the Martin von Wagner Museum, Würzburg.

Sard, level face. Dim. of the inner face of the cast, 17.7 by 14.0 mm.

Portrait bust of a king facing in profile to the left and adorned with a narrow diadem.

The numismatic correlations for the style and iconography of the portrait should confirm that it depicts one of the Antigonids, evidently Perseus (r. 179-168) rather than Philip V.

II 4

Bonn, Sammlung Müller.
Cornelian. Level face, 22.3 by 19.2 mm. The upper edge of the stone and the adjacent part of the crown of the head are broken off. Further damage has removed sections of the hair and part of the diadem.
Portrait bust of a king adorned with a diadem and wearing a κhλαμυς fastened at the shoulder. The head is in profile to the left, the bust depicted in near profile.

II 5

From a private collection established by the early eighteenth century. A modern glass paste cast formerly in Berlin, Sammlung Stosch, is reproduced in the cited literature.
Portrait bust of Seleukos II Kallinikos (r. 246-266/5) in profile to the left, adorned with a narrow diadem and wearing a κhλαμυς.
Lit. Furtwängler II, 158, no. 18, pl. XXXII. Lippold, pl. LXIX.8. Plantzos, 1999, 45, cat. 7, pl. 2: Ptolemaios V.

II 6

Athens, National Museum, Numismatic Collection. Inv. 594. Formerly in the Karapanos Collection, Athens. Fragment of a garnet (pyrope). Level face, diam. 19.0 mm.
A large irregular fracture extends through the crown of the head and the forehead to a point just above the brow. The entire upper quarter of the stone is broken off. At the base is a second break with the lower edge of the bust missing. The remaining elements of the portrait are preserved intact.
Portrait bust of Antiokhos III Megas (r. 223-187) in profile to the left, adorned with a narrow diadem, the ribbons of which fall at the neck, and wearing a κhλαμυς fastened at the shoulder with a jeweled clasp. Inscribed in the field to the right of the head and neck: ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ.
II 7

London, The British Museum. Inv. 72.6-4.1333. Formerly in the Castellani Collection, acquired in 1872. Chalcedony of a yellow to brownish hue with significant inclusions of yellow jasper. High convex face, 28.0 by 23.0 mm. Portrait bust of Philetairos, dynast of Pergamon (r. 283-263), in profile to the left, wearing a khlamys fastened at the shoulder.

II 8

From a private collection established in the eighteenth century. A modern glass paste impression is in the Martin von Wagner Museum, Würzburg. Cornelian, level face. Dim. of the inner face of the impression, 17.2 by 15.8 mm. Portrait bust of Prousias I of Bithynia (r. 230-182) in profile to the left, adorned with a narrow diadem, the ribbons of which fall at the neck. Inscribed behind and to the fore of the head, respectively: Β and ΠΡΥ. The inscription is modern, being given in recognition of the subject.

II 9

Formerly in a private collection. Cornelian, level face. The stone was apparently well preserved, to judge from the condition of the impression reproduced in the literature cited below. Portrait bust of a king, presumably a ruler of Bithynia from the middle Hellenistic period, in profile to the left and wearing a narrow diadem with raised borders, the ribbons falling at the neck. The iconography is related to that of the obverse types of the Prousias II (r. 182-149).
Lit. Furtwängler II, 158, no. 22, pl. XXXIII. Lippold, pl. LXX.3.

II 10

Formerly in Chatsworth, the collection of the Duke of Devonshire. Cornelian, convex face. Portrait bust of a ruler from the middle Hellenistic period, probably a king of Bithynia, corseleted and adorned with a narrow diadem, the borders raised and with the ends waving in back of the neck. Over the corselet he wears a khlamys fastened at the left shoulder. His head is raised and faces in profile to the left, the bust being depicted en face.
The set of the profile, the facial structure, and the thin cheek beard recall the iconography of the portrait cited at no. II 9 and should at least confirm a dynastic affiliation, if indeed the portrait is not of Prousias II.

Lit. Furtwängler, II, 153, no. 20, pl. XXXI.

II 11

Geneva, Musée d’Art et d’Histoire. Inv. 22008. Pyrope (garnet) with internal fissures and black inclusions. Level face, 25.5 by 20.0 mm. Fine state of preservation.

Portrait head of Mithradates IV Philopator Philadelphos of Pontos (r. 162/1-150) in profile to the left. Inscribed beneath the base of the neck: ΝΙΚΙΑΣ.


II 12


Portrait head of a ruler, probably of the middle Hellenistic period, in profile to the left and wearing a laurel wreath bound by a tainia, the ends of which fall at the neck. Regarded by Furtwängler as bearing a plausible affinity to the portraits of Perseus, the iconography is more convincingly referred by Richter and Jenkins to Nabis, who usurped the throne of Lakedaimon in 207 and ruled until 192. The obverse type of Nabis is manifestly related to the head on the gem, though the resemblance remains most evident in the extrinsic aspects of the portraits, that is, the manner in which the close beard is styled and the attribute of the laurel wreath, which was rarely assumed in royal portraits. Further similarities may be observed in the profiles; however, the validity of the association is doubtful owing to the leanness of the features and the slighter build of the jaw and chin that distinguish the physiognomy of the gem figure. The interpretation of the physiognomic qualities approaches, albeit vaguely, the unsparing realism elicited in the iconography for the mintage of the dynasties that ruled Bithynia and Pontic Kappakokia. If indeed the gem has its proper context here, the numismatic evidence may lead to the portrait of Mithradates IV, wearing a laurel wreath, held by an emission of gold staters.


II 13

Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Médailles. Cornelian, the face level. 19.0 by 18.0 mm. Remounted in a gold and enameled frame at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The stone is well preserved, its face having suffered no apparent damage.
Portrait bust of a ruler, presumably of Alexander III, the Great, wearing a khlamys fastened at the shoulder and adorned with a narrow annular diadem, the ribbons of which wave in back of the neck. His head, raised and inclined back toward the shoulders, faces in profile to the left, the bust being depicted in a nearly en face view.

Ostensibly the portrait should be held to portray Alexander, to judge by the apparent articulation of the locks in his distinctive anastole. The physiognomy nevertheless subsumes certain peculiar aspects that cannot be directly reconciled with the canonical iconography of the king as it is preserved in the statuary portraiture and the royal and civic mintage of the period. Some commentators argue that the gem may well depict a later sovereign, although in this regard only Ptolemaios VI and Ptolemaios XII have been brought into consideration. Thus, Chabouillet remarked upon the striking resemblance of the long gaunt profile to that of Philometor as he is represented on the tetradrachm minted at Ake-Ptolemais in 149-48. As against his conclusion, Furtwängler likened the iconography to the obverse type of Lysimakhos’ coinage, and therefore set the gem among the portraits of Alexander. For Lippold the association with the Macedonian remained uncertain, while Gebauer similarly raised some doubt concerning it in view of the unusually fine and sharp features of the profile. The rich fall of the hair over the neck, however, and the particular form of the diadem, which he maintains was reserved for the portraits of deceased rulers as an attribute of deification, led him to accept the subject as Alexander. More recently, Richter has revived the attribution to Philometor.

However marked the affinity to the iconography of Philometor may be, the attribution to Alexander remains justified. The high, receding forehead, the gaunt features and the sparse locks of the anastole refer the countenance to that of Alexander on the famous cornelian of Neisos in St. Petersburg. More decisive, however, is the resemblance to the bust of the conqueror on a red jasper piece, apparently of Hadrianic date, signed by Platon. The Paris work, then, is representative of an aberrant iconography of Alexander, which on the evidence of the Neisos gem had been established in the glyptic repertoire by the early third century.


II 14 PL. 4, 1

Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Médailles. Inv. no. A10666. Agate of a dark red to brownish hue, in relief. 67.0 by 48.0 mm. Fine state of preservation, the figure itself being intact, and aside from a slight chip in the field on the upper right side, the stone evinces no damage. Remounted in an elaborate, enameled gold frame dating to the late sixteenth century.

Portrait bust of a ruler, presumably Philip II of Macedonia (r. 359-336), helmeted and bearing a lance in his right hand. The helmet, of a low conical form, has a wide border ornamented with a garland frieze, and on the skull,
simulating the effect of repoussé work, is a relief of a Lapith and centaur in combat. A *tainia* embroidered with ivy tendrils binds his hair, with the ribbons falling to the shoulders; the ends of the ribbons widen and terminate in single threads. The *aigis* is worn over his left shoulder, enriched with serpents and a small gorgoneion, the iconography of which derives from a fifth century model. Raised high, his head is in profile to the left, with the bust being represented in an oblique view from the back.

Philip V and his successor Perseus were exceptional among the royalty of the age for having worn full beards in disregard of the precedent set by Alexander, and it is on this criterion alone that the relevance of their iconographies to the present depiction stands. In the previous literature the weight of the arguments has revolved on the problem of a specific attribution, albeit without due consideration of the cult affiliation that the large dimensions of the piece may imply. The ascription to Perseus, as maintained in the first commentaries and last endorsed by Furtwängler, Möbius refutes on the assertion that the slight contours of the brow and nose, and the composure of the visage effect a sounder correlation to the portrait on the inaugural silver emission of Philip. While his reattribution has met with a virtually unanimous acceptance, still it should be plainly apparent that neither the iconography of Philip nor of Perseus directly underlies the relief image. Therefore, the problem remains without resolution in the numismatic evidence.

Kyrieleis dissents from this consensus and has posited a novel interpretation. The form of the band and its decoration, he contends, precludes that it is a diadem, which leaves one to infer that the portrait is not of a contemporary ruler. The style of the forelocks and the beard he further equates to the marble head 2466 in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek, viewed by many authorities to replicate a portrait of Philip II. Accordingly, Kyrieleis reasons that the agate may plausibly depict him, and by the presence of the ivy tendrils embroidered on the band, he conjectures that the work perhaps had originated at the Ptolemaic court. The motif is an explicit reference to Dionysos, who, with his son-in-law Herakles, was venerated as an ancestor by the Ptolemies in witness to their assertion of being related to the Argead house of Macedonia.

The argument Kyrieleis propounds, to the degree that it revolves upon the probability of the marble being a portrait of Philip II, is ill-founded. The physiognomic particulars and the hair curiously brushed forward over the temples significantly remove it from the iconography of the agate relief, and well-justify the alternative theory that the marble portrays a foreign ruler, perhaps of Thrace or Illyria. Nor will the fact that the band is not a diadem necessarily imply that the figure is of a long deceased king. For, in view of what meager evidence may be adduced in the quantities of marble works concerning the portraiture of ancestral monarchs, it cannot be stated that the sculptors were attentive to historical accuracy: the three portraits identified so far on probable grounds as belonging to this category bear a diadem, notwithstanding that it was first assumed as a royal attribute by Alexander. The sculptured portraits, nevertheless, elucidate a primary aspect of the agate’s imagery. That is, the palpable vagueness of the physiognomic content, which emphatically admits that the portrait is in essence an invention of the engraver. With the beard,
which was out of fashion among the Macedonian elite since the time of Alexander, this quality should be anticipated in the portraits of distant royal ancestors.

The dimensions of the agate relief permit two plausible interpretations of its function: that of a substantive piece, presumably intended for display, or that it was an object associated with the ritual requirements of a cult. If it served in the latter capacity, either as an adornment for a priest’s crown or as a votive, the argument generally posited for a Macedonian context becomes seriously undermined. It should hardly bear reiterating that the Antigonids never instituted a central dynastic cult. More to the point, however, it is difficult to defend that argument in terms of the Dionysiac import of the iconography. Images of the divinity are wanting in the typological repertoire of the royal Macedonian mintage, and significantly this absence is regarded in the emissions of Philip V and Perseus, which mediate the descent of their dynasty through attributes evocative of Zeus Naios and his sons, Perseus and Herakles. To the contrary, it is familiar that the encouragement accorded the cult of Dionysos by the Lagids was without precedent at the courts of Macedonia and Asia, and that being assimilated into the royal portraiture, his attributes came to signify the divine lineage of the monarchy (pl. 27, 5). This tenet found a second embodiment with the assumption of the aigis, which from the outset was an aspect of continuity with the iconography of the deified Alexander, whose cult Ptolemaios Soter I established as a state institution prior to 290 (pl. 28, 7-8). Under his successor, Ptolemaios II, the dynastic tie to Alexander was renewed through the directive of the king to merge with the state cult the ritual devoted to Arsinoë Philadelphos and himself as the Theoi Adelphoi. It was in the period of Ptolemaios II, moreover, that the official genealogical account of the royal family originated. The evidence of literary sources contemporary with Ptolemaios II and Philopator and the Adulis inscription of Euergetes I affirms that the account professed the ancestry of the Lagids as having issued from Herakles and Dionysos through their blood relationship to the Argead house. While the surviving literary fragments of the third century remain silent on the reputed filiation of Ptolemaios I to Philip II, it may well be that, as recounted by some later authors, the legend of his parentage and birth was then current.

The case for a Ptolemaic association of the agate image need not rest on the single criterion of the Dionysiac element, for the accumulation of attributes it evinces is exceptionally complemented in the Alexander iconography of the satrapal coinage of Ptolemaios I, and as well in the portraiture of several third to second century Lagids (pl. 27.6-9, 28.6). Underlying this peculiarly Ptolemaic elaboration of the royal portrait with attributes mediating the dynastic assertion to a divine lineage is the precedent of the Pharaonic tradition. If the work is accurately assigned to the Alexandrian court, and if on the basis of the previously stated iconographic considerations the portrait stands as that of a royal ancestor, then in light of what may be restored of the genealogical history of the dynasty it should most probably represent Philip II. Accordingly, he is here arrayed with the aigis in evocation of the divine progenitor of the Argead and Ptolemaic families.
The agate, on general stylistic criteria, is plausibly of the early Ptolemaic period. The essentially plastic conception of the forms and the retention of a physically coherent facial structure bring the style close to that of several glyptics dating to the reigns of the Euergetai and the Philopatores, with the nearest parallel being had in the garnet relief III 9 of Berenike II.\(^{22}\)


III 1

Bonn, Akademisches Kunstmuseum der Universität Bonn. Inv. B 174, 1. Formerly in a private collection, Alexandria; acquired by the museum in 1893. Agate, now lost; level face, 12.0 by 10.0 mm.

Portrait bust of Ptolemaios Soter I (r. 305/4-282) in profile to the left; his hair bound by a narrow diadem, knotted and with the ends falling at the neck. The style of the portrait may be indicative of a posthumous date.


III 2

Geneva, Musée d’Art et d’Histoire. Inv. no. 22017. Silver \textit{emblema}, level face, 30.5 by 25.0 mm. Fashioned for insertion into the bezel of a ring, the \textit{emblema} is well preserved, aside from minor abrasions and an irregular cavity that has obliterated some of the hair at the temple and the parts of the \textit{stephane} and the veil adjacent to it.

Portrait bust of Arsinoë II Philadelphos (d. 268), adorned with an enriched \textit{stephane}, the base of which is apparently bound by a narrow diadem. She wears an earring of suspended pearls and a thin necklace of the same. Her head and shoulders are veiled and face in profile to the left.

The high, prominent forehead and the fine features that distinguish the aristocratic countenance of this woman are held by Vollenweider to bear a plausible affinity to the iconography of Berenike I as she is portrayed on the Theon-Adelphon series of Philadelphos and on certain issues of bronze and silver minted at Rhodes and later, in Kyrenaika. Her argument, however, as regards the numismatic evidence, has no sound foundation: the Alexandrian issue and the emissions of Kyrenaika minted under Magas preserve the only portraits of the queen that have been identified with certainty. Incontestably, this iconography is not that of the \textit{emblema} portrait, the lineaments of which typify Arsinoë II, as represented on the posthumous mintage in her name. The nearest parallels are to certain obverse dies of the series issued at Alexandria, probably from ca. 261 to 246, and of the emissions of Tyre and Ioppa, which bear reverse dates by regnal years within that period.\(^{23}\) The style of the \textit{emblema}, moreover, is of a comparable effect. This, in and of itself, need not imply that
it is contemporary with these die types; however, there is nothing evident in the formal qualities of the *emblema*, I believe, that would assign it to the last quarter of the third century or later.


III 3


Portrait bust of Ptolemaios II Philadelphos (r. 282-246) adorned with a narrow diadem, tied in a prominent knot with the ribbons falling at the neck. Over a sleeved *khiton* he wears a *khamyss* fastened at the shoulder. The head and bust face in profile to the left.


III 4

Warsaw, Muzeum Narodowe. Inv. 199888 MN. Formerly in the Minutoli Collection. Fragment of a glass intaglio, translucent yellowish-white. H. as preserved, ca. 31.0 mm. A large, irregular fracture extends through the crown of the head and the forehead to a point just above the brow. The entire upper quarter is broken off. Aside from some minor corrosions, the surface is well preserved.

Portrait bust of an early Ptolemaic ruler, presumably Ptolemaios II, in profile to the left and arrayed in the same manner as the above portrait.

Lit. Furtwängler II, 158, no. 16, pl. XXXII. Kiss, 91-96, fig. 1. Plantzos, 1999, 44-45, cat. 2, pl. 1: Ptolemaios II.

III 5

Bern, Collection of Leo Merz. Onyx cameo in layers of white with dark violet flecks, and pale violet. Low convex face, 22.7 by 17.8 mm. The stone is well preserved, aside from some slight damage to the edges.

Portrait head of a Ptolemy, apparently of the middle or later third century, in profile to the right, and adorned with a narrow diadem, the ribbons falling at the neck.

Lit. Vollenweider, 1984, no. 259.
III 6

Saint Petersburg, State Collections of The Hermitage. Inv. Ž 614. Formerly in the collection of Philippe II, Duc d’Orleans (d. 1734). Acquired for the State Collections in 1787.

Sardonyx in two layers of dark brown, unbanded. Low convex face, 35.0 by 28.0 mm. Fine state of preservation. Remounted in a modern gold frame.

Portrait bust of a Ptolemy, of the late third or the early second century, adorned with a narrow diadem, the ribbons of which fall at the neck, and wearing a khamys fastened at the shoulder. His head is raised and faces in profile to the left, the bust being depicted in an oblique view.

The numismatic parallels for the iconography and the stylistic execution may favor an attribution to Ptolemaios V Epiphanes (r. 204-180).


III 7

Paris, formerly in the De Clercq Collection.

Cornelian. Level face, 12.0 by 8.0 mm. Mounted in an ancient gold ring.

Portrait bust of a Ptolemaic king, evidently of the later third century, in profile to the left, adorned with a narrow diadem and draped in a khamys. The character of the portrait is somewhat indifferent, thus precluding that it may be firmly placed in reference to the numismatic evidence. Notwithstanding this factor, the profile of the stout nose and the salient lower jaw is delineated with sufficient attention as to suggest an approximation to the iconography of Ptolemaios IV Philopator (r. 222-204).


III 8

New York, formerly the collection of Maxime Velay. Intaglio gem, the face convex. Fine state of preservation.

Portrait of a Ptolemaic queen of the third century, probably Berenike I Soteira (d. before 275), posthumous, in profile to the left, the base of her neck edged by the folds of a khiton. At her nape appears the ribbon of a diadem or tainia, the band of which is not rendered on the head.

The iconography is that of the obverse type for a mintage in silver and bronze, which bears on the reverse monograms that identify the issuer as Magas, the son of Berenike I, and stepson of Ptolemaios I. Having been appointed governor of Kyrenaika in ca. 300 through her influence, he usurped the title of king some twenty-five years later and ruled the province until his death in 250. Therefore, the inscription BASILISSES BERENIKES on the reverse must designate his mother, rather than his daughter Berenike II, after whose marriage to Euergetes I in 246 Kyrenaika was restored to the Ptolemaic empire.
III 9

Malibu, The J. Paul Getty Museum. Inv. 81.AN.76.59. Formerly in a private collection. Garnet, carved in relief. H. 18.0 mm. The stone is well preserved, aside from a missing piece of the plaits at the forehead and slight damage to the lower part of the neck and the folds of the veil at this part. The work is carved entirely to the contours of the figure and presumably was intended to be set in a gold ring.

Portrait bust of Berenike II Euergetis (d. 220) in profile to the right, veiled and adorned with a narrow diadem, the borders of which are raised. Decisive for the attribution is the portraiture of the coinage minted on both the Attic and Ptolemaic standards at Alexandria during the first years of her rule as the consort of Euergetes I (pl. 27, 2). The gem closely replicates the portrait type of these issues, even to the form in which the bust terminates. However, the subdued carving of the features and the surface passages, in concert with the symmetries brought to the profile, distance the effect of the portrait from the mannered style and the more pronounced individuality that imbue the die variants. On this criterion, the garnet may be classed here with several other glyptics representative of the independent styles that flourished in the court ateliers.

Lit. J. Boardman, Intaglio and Rings, Greek, Etruscan and Roman, from a private collection, 1975, 19, 92, no. 59. Spier, 1989, 30, fig. 36, 37, n. 34, concerning the technical aspects.

III 10

Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery. Inv. no. 49.1399. Formerly in the Marlborough and Evans Collections. Fragment of a garnet ringstone; high convex face, 24.0 by 25.0 mm. A large, irregular fracture extends through the crown of the head and the forehead to a point just above the brow, the entire upper third part of the stone missing Formerly restored in gold. The surface of the fragment is preserved intact.

Portrait bust, assumed to be of Berenike II, her hair bound by a narrow tainia, the borders raised, wearing a sleeved khiton and over the lower shoulders, a himation. Slightly raised, her head faces in profile to the left, the bust being depicted in near profile. Inscribed to the back of the nape: ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΕΠΟΙΕΙ. The stylistic execution of this handsome piece is indicative of a date in the third quarter of the third century, therefore in agreement with the virtually unanimous attribution to Berenike II. The matronly presence of the sitter certainly recalls the ideal projected by her numismatic portraits; however, it is apparent that the individual features have no immediate derivation in the archetype for the die variants. Further, the curious bifurcated headband, if rendered accurately, by no
means may be interpreted as a diadem, thus admitting that the royal status of the
subject remains in doubt. If indeed of Berenike, then it is to be regarded as an
independent variation on the portrait type of the coinage. The alternative
interpretation, as proposed by Brunelle, may well be the more valid one: that the
garnet represents a lady in the entourage of the Alexandrian court.
XXXII.D.K. Hill, *J. Walters Art Gallery* 6, 1943, 60, 64, fig. 1. Vollenweider, 1958,
30, pl. 6: Berenike II.

London, The British Museum. Found in Egypt, acquired in 1897 through the
Franks Bequest. Sard, or dark cornelian, the face convex. 26.0 by 20.0 mm. Set
in an ancient gold ring, the bezel of which is raised and has a pronounced,
molded profile.

Portrait head of the deified Arsinoë II Philadelphos (d. 68), facing in profile to
the left, veiled and adorned with a wreath of wheat.

The iconography of the features derives from the portraiture of Arsinoë for the
emissions in gold and silver inaugurated by the mint of Alexandria within a year
or so of her death. By 261 the mints of Phoenicia and Cyprus had received the
new coinage and there, as in Alexandria itself, the series continued under
Euergetes I until 242/1. It is to his reign that the sard should be attributed,
rather than to the period of Ptolemaios II, for in the turgid forms of the
forehead and the cheek and in the augmented depth of the contours, the work
more narrowly approximates the stylistic qualities that distinguish the die types
of the later issues (pl. 27, 3). In certain aspects of its fashioning, the gem is
near to the style of the posthumous portrait of Berenike I from the Velay
collection, cited at III.8. The affinity is most evident in the rendering of the hair,
the waves of which are raised in dense, plastic accumulations with the internal
articulation of the locks being reserved in precise and moderately varied linings,
carved well into the surfaces. For the muted modeling of the facial planes and
the structure accorded the lower jaw and the chin, the Velay piece manifests
further correlations, although not for the distinctions of the lesser features. On
the sard, the engraving of the brow, the nostril and the lips is in a more cursory
manner. Thus, the gems are apparently not from the same hand; however, in
view of their stylistic relevance a contemporary date may be inferred. The
stylistic criteria, moreover, suffice to warrant an attribution of the sard to
the same atelier.

The imagery endows the deified Arsinoë with wheat, the canonical attribute of
Demeter, and in the manner of the goddess her hair is not dressed in a
prominent chignon. Thus, save for the mediating presence of the long,
mannered profile the image is inseparable from contemporary representations
of the Olympian. The import of this unequivocal assimilation may be
interpreted on the evidence of papyrus documents dating to the third and the
second century that attest the bestowal upon Arsinoë of the cult epithets
Karpophoros and Eleusinia. In her divine nature, then, Arsinoë has subsumed the dominant aspects of Demeter.\textsuperscript{29}


\textbf{III 12}

Athens, formerly in the Postolakka Collection. Glass, apparently reassembled from two or three fragments. To the fore of the nearer figure is a vertical fracture that extends through the entire piece; joining it in the lower left third part is a second, more severe break.

Portrait bust of Ptolemaios IV Philopator (r. 222-204), jugate with a bust of Arsinoë III Philopator (r. 217-204). Adorned with a narrow diadem, he wears a sleeved \textit{khiton} and a \textit{khlamys} fastened at the left shoulder. His consort, adorned with a \textit{stephane}, wears a sleeveless \textit{khiton} and a \textit{himation} over her upper shoulders. Facing in an oblique view to the left with the heads in profile, the figures overlap only to a slight degree.

The iconography directly reflects the portraiture of the posthumous emissions in gold and silver minted under Ptolemaios V Epiphanes from 204/3 to an uncertain point in the 190s.\textsuperscript{30}


\textbf{III 13}

London, The British Museum. Garnet, level face, 18.0 by 14.0 mm. An irregular, transverse fracture mars the face of the stone; the surface is otherwise preserved intact.

Portrait bust of Arsinoë III, facing in profile to the left, adorned with a \textit{stephane} and wearing a sleeveless \textit{khiton} with a \textit{himation} draped about her shoulders.

The matronly demeanor of the figure, in concert with the firm modulations of the relief work and the strong articulation of the profile recall the iconography and style of the lesser variant type in the posthumous portrait series (pl. 27, 8).\textsuperscript{31}

Lit. Marshall, cat. 383, pl. XII. Walters, cat. 1186, pl. XVII.

\textbf{III 14}

Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum. Inv. VII 1016. Found in a grave on the island of Kos. Garnet, the face highly convex. 21.5 by 19.5 mm. Set in a gold ring, the bezel of which is offset from the band. Fine state of preservation.

Presumably a portrait bust of Arsinoë III, adorned with a \textit{stephane} and wearing a sleeveless \textit{khiton} fastened at the shoulders. Her head is in profile to the left, the bust in an oblique view.

Although the bust ostensibly reflects the portrait type of the garnet III 13 and the relevant die series, the attribution cannot be asserted with equal certainty, since the nearly straight lineament of the forehead and the nose mitigates the
individuality of the head. It may be that the figure is of Aphrodite, or perhaps of Arsinoë assimilated to the goddess, the diadem being removed so as to impart a certain ambiguity to the image.


III 15

Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Médailles. Cameo carved in sardonyx, the layers dark brown, honey yellow, and white with a blue tinge. Level face, 22.0 by 14.0 mm. Fine state of preservation.

Bust of Harpokrates, the youthful incarnation of Horos, his right hand raised to his mouth, the index finger extended. Over his ear is a long, plaited Horos lock that reaches to the shoulder. He is adorned with the *pschent*, the crown of Upper and Lower Egypt, and a diadem, the tasseled ends of which fall at the neck. On his breast is a round bulla suspended from a necklace. His head faces in profile to the right, the bust in an oblique view and issuing from the calyx of a lotus flower.

In the commentaries cited below, the cameo is unanimously held to represent Ptolemaios IV.


III 16

Boston, Museum of Fine Arts. EG 153. Fragment of a cameo, brown, iridescent glass; diam. 27.0 mm.

The surface of the fragment is moderately preserved, the most severe corrosion being confined to the field.

Head of Harpokrates, facing in profile to the right, adorned with the *pschent* and wearing a long Horos lock that curls behind the ear.

The iconography is close to that of the figure on the sardonyx cameo cited at no. III.15.


III 17

Boston, Museum of Fine Arts. Inv. 27.709. Formerly in the Lewes House, Tyszkiewicz, and Ludovisi Collections. Hyacinth, the face level. 18.5 by 13.5 mm. Fine state of preservation.

Portrait head of a Lagid queen, presumably the deified Arsinoë Philadelphos, if not Kleopatra I Epiphanes (d. 176), facing in profile to the left and adorned with a *stephane*, its base bound by a narrow diadem, the short ribbons of which fall at her neck. Her hair, dressed in narrow plaits at the forehead, is gathered on the crown of her head in a small chignon and secured by a thin band, with
several loose tresses waving over the nape. She wears an earring of three suspended pearls, and the base of her neck is edged with the folds of a himation. The attribution to Arsinoë Philadelphos, as advanced by Froehner, has been widely accepted, although the imagery of her posthumous series will not directly establish it. The profile, distinguished by the articulated lineament of the nose, has no accordant indications in the successive dies. On the criterion of this singular feature, Zwierlein-Diehl asserts that the portrait is near to that of the garnet signed by Nikandros, the iconography of which, she maintains, relates it to the bust of Kleopatra I on the gold octadrachm minted in the period of the regency (pl. 28, 1).32 The hyacinth, she thus infers, represents Kleopatra. If her attribution of the Nikandros gem to this queen is hardly warranted, the argument she proposes regarding the present work has a justification in that the structural proportions of the face and the cast of the profile bear affinities to the obverse type. The attribution to Philadelphos, however, is not refuted on account of this ostensible relevance to the emission of Kleopatra, since the style and iconographic aspects of her portrait are founded in the typology for the late third century posthumous mintage.

If the countenance of the hyacinth piece is without a derivation from the models that served the die engravers, still it approaches the effect of the marbles in Alexandria and the former Hirsch collection, unanimously regarded to portray Arsinoë.33 The intaglio work reiterates the proportions and the formations of the facial planes inherent to the sculptured portraits. Analogous, moreover, are the opulence of the flesh and the form of the neck. In the manner of the respective monuments, the brow assumes a fine, acute and slightly arced contour, while that of the upper lip is distinctly undulant. The lineaments of the stout, though recessive chin and the distended, somewhat raised nose define a profile, which well accords with the schema repeated in the statuary heads. The attribution, then, may remain with the deified Arsinoë Philadelphos, her apotheosis signified here, as in the posthumous issues, by the stephane.34 Specifically in respect to the modulations of the dominant planes, the conception of the tectonic forms, and the subdued linear articulation of the internal details, the style of execution sets the hyacinth in the proximity of the glyphs III 8 and 11, which are assigned here to the reign of the Euergetai. Accordingly, a date for the gem in the third quarter of the third century, rather than the early decades of the second century, should be affirmed.


III 18

Paris, Musée du Louvre. Inv. Bj. 1092. Formerly in the collection of Emperor Napoleon III. Gold signet ring, related to the cartouche type, the bezel rectangular and soldered to the band. Dim. of the bezel, 34.0 by 25.0 mm. The
face of the bezel is in a fine state of preservation, save for some minor abrasions.

Portrait bust of Ptolemaios VI Philometor (r. 180-145), arrayed in Pharaonic regalia. He is adorned with a diadem, the tasseled ribbons of which wave in back of the neck, and the pschent, the crown of Upper and Lower Egypt, a narrow tainia being tied round its base. An ornate pectoral, composed of three registers, rests over his shoulders. His head is in profile to the left, the bust in an en face view and represented by the pectoral alone.

III 19

Paris, Musée du Louvre. Inv. Bj. 1093. Formerly in the collection of Emperor Napoleon III. Gold signet ring, the bezel oval and continuous with the band. Dim. of the bezel, 25.0 by 19.0 mm. The face of the bezel is preserved in a condition similar to that of the above piece.

Portrait bust of Ptolemaios VI adorned with a wide, flat diadem, the tasseled ribbons of which wave at the back of the neck. He wears over a sleeved khiton a khlamys fastened at the shoulder. His head faces in profile to the left, the bust depicted in near profile.


III 20

Athens, the Collection of Paulos Kanellopoulos. Inv. 269. Acquired in Egypt. Gold signet ring, the bezel raised and offset from the band. Diam. of the bezel, 16.0 mm. The face of the bezel is well preserved, aside from some minor surface abrasions.

Portrait bust of Ptolemaios VI, in profile to the left and adorned with a wide, flat diadem, the tasseled ribbons of which fall at the neck.

III 21

Formerly in a private collection, established by the beginning of the nineteenth century. Cameo, the face level. A glass paste cast is in the Martin Von Wagner Museum, Würzburg. Dim. of the inner face of the cast, 15.4 by 12.0 mm. Portrait head of Ptolemaios VI in profile to the left, adorned with a wide, flat diadem, the ends of which fall at the neck. Lit. Zwierlein-Diehl, 1986, 47, cat. 1, pl. 1.

III 22

Boston, Museum of Fine Arts. Inv. 27.711. Formerly in the Tyszkiewicz and Lewes House Collections. Evidently the provenance was in Kilikia, in the vicinity of Tarsos, rather than the Levantine coast, as stated by Froehner. Chalcedony of a pale bluish-gray hue, the face highly convex. 31.0 by 26.0 mm. Fine state of preservation. Portrait head of a Ptolemaic queen, presumably Kleopatra II Thea Philometor (r. 170-116), wearing a wig plaited in the Libyan locks and bound by a narrow diadem, the tasseled ribbons of which fall at the neck. The horned solar disc crown of Hathor surmounts her forehead and the base of her neck is bordered by the folds of a himation. Her head is to the left in profile. Inscribed to the rear of the head and neck: ΛΥΚΟΜΗΔΗΣ. Lit. A. Furtwängler, JdI 4, 1889, 80-84, no. 2, pl. 2. Idem, II, 159, no. 31, pl. XXXII. Froehner, 24, cat. 17, pl. XXIV. 17. Beazley, cat. 95, pl. 19. Pfuhl, 44-45. Adriani, 1948, 18, 41, n. 56, pl. XV.4. Richter, 1968, 160, no. 635. A. Stazio, Enciclopedia dell Arte antica IV, 748, fig. 907. Kyrieleis, 1975, 117, pl. 100.2. Brunelle, 82, wrongly identified as a sardonyx cameo. Vollenweider, 1979, 66, n. 4, 67, n. 3. Smith, 76. Plantzos, 1999, 52, cat. 48, pl. 9: Kleopatra I.

III 23

Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery. Inv. 42.1319. Formerly in the collection of H. Walters. Peridot (olivine), the face highly convex. 28.0 by 22.0 mm. Aside from surface abrasions that slightly mar the profile and the lower jaw, the stone is well preserved. Portrait bust of a Ptolemaic queen of the second century, presumably Kleopatra II, facing to the left in profile and adorned with the crown of Isis-Hathor. Dressed in the Libyan locks, her hair is bound by a narrow diadem, knotted, and with the ribbons falling at the nape. She wears a sleeveless khiton fastened over the shoulders. The style and depth of the idealization invite comparison to the name piece of Lykomedes. Allowing for the surface imperfections, the lineaments, it would seem, assert the identity of this queen. The slightly retroussé nose is at variance with the iconography represented by the gem of Lykomedes and the Pisoni bronze; the general effect of the altered profile may be further recognized in a faience oinochoe figure of the early second century, and in a contemporary medallion bust of the same material.

III 24

Geneva, Musée d’Art et d’Histoire. Formerly in the collection of W. Fol. Cameo fragment, glass, in layers of a yellowish-brown, white and violet. 23.0 by 18.5 mm. The piece is in a poor state of preservation, the upper and side edges being broken off. A moderate to severe corrosion mars the entire surface.

Portrait head of a Ptolemaic king, in profile to the left, adorned with a wide, flat diadem.

The proportionately long facial structure and the dominant profile of the nose recall the portrait type of Ptolemaios VI attested by the issue of Ake-Ptolemais and a rare series of hemidrachms, apparently minted at Alexandria in the later years of his reign.

Lit. Vollenweider, 1979, no. 64, pl. 27.1-1a. Plantzos, 1996b, 41, 44, cat. A6, fig. 6: perhaps Ptolemaios XII.

III 25

Switzerland, private collection. Reportedly found at Alexandria. Garnet (pyrope), level face, 21.5 by 17.0 mm. Set in an ancient gold ring. Fine state of preservation, aside from some minor wear at the upper and lower edges of the stone.

Portrait bust of Ptolemaios IX Soter II (r. 116-107, 88-80), facing in profile to the left and adorned with a wide, flat diadem, the borders raised and the tasseled ribbons falling at the neck. He wears a corselet and a khlamys fastened over the shoulder.


III 26

Munich, Staatliche Münzsammlung. Inv. A. 1580. From Alexandria. Hessonite fragment; level face, 9.1 by 11.7 mm. The fragment preserves the upper part of the head to a level just below the upper lip and the ear; the face of the fragment is preserved intact.

Portrait of Ptolemaios Soter II adorned with a wide, flat diadem, the borders narrow and raised.

Evidently fashioned after the portrait type represented by the garnet cited at III 25, the style of execution and the interpretation of the iconographic aspects are sufficiently close as to warrant an attribution to the same atelier.

Lit. Brandt I, no. 527, pl. 56; Spier, 1989, 23, no. 5. Plantzos, 1999, 46, cat. 13, pl. 3: Ptolemaios IX.
London, University College, Petrie Museum. Inv. UC 17231. Found in Egypt. Bronze signet ring in the form of a continuous, convex band, the bezel inset and bearing traces of gilt. The bezel is reasonably well preserved, save for a slight to moderate corrosion that mars the entire surface and the figure, in particular on the upper anterior part of the head.

Portrait bust of Ptolemaios Soter II adorned with a wide, flat diadem, the borders raised and the tasseled ribbons falling to the shoulder, and wearing a khlamys fastened by a small clasp. His head faces in profile to the left, the bust being depicted in near profile.


Reportedly from a private collection in Vienna. Garnet (pyrope), the face convex. The piece was apparently in a fine state of preservation.

Portrait bust of Ptolemaios X Alexander I (r. 107-88), in profile to the left and adorned with a diadem, the narrow borders raised. The folds of a khlamys, fastened by a small clasp, edge the base of the neck.

Lit. Furtwängler II, 158, no. 12, pl. XXXII. Delbrück, lix, no. 4, pl. 58. Lippold, pl. LXX.1. Plantzos, 1999, 46, cat. 15, pl. 3.

Formerly in Chatsworth, the Devonshire Collection. A modern glass paste cast is in the Martin von Wagner Museum, Würzburg. Cornelian, the face convex.

Dim. of the inner face of the cast, 22.5 by 16.0 mm.

Portrait bust of Ptolemaios Alexander I, corseleted and adorned with a narrow diadem. Over the corselet he wears a khlamys fastened at the shoulder. His head faces in profile to the left, the bust in an oblique view.


Bloomington, Indiana University Art Museum. Inv. 76. 85.14. Formerly in the collection of B.Y. Burry. Garnet (pyrope), level face, 15.8 by 12.0 mm. Fine state of preservation.

Portrait head of a late Ptolemaic king, evidently Ptolemaios Alexander I, in profile to the left, diademed, and adorned with a laurel wreath.

III 31

Formerly in London, University College, The Petrie Museum. Probably found in Egypt. Garnet, level face, 15.0 by 10.5 mm. Fine state of preservation.
Portrait head of a late Ptolemaic king, probably Ptolemaios Alexander I, diademned and facing in profile to the left.
Lit. Spier, 1989, 23, no. 6, fig. 8, 30-31.

III 32

Bloomington, Indiana University Museum. Inv. no. 76.85. 13. Formerly in the B.Y. Burry collection. Garnet, level face, 13.2 by 11.6 mm. Fine state of preservation.
Portrait bust of a late Ptolemaic sovereign, apparently Ptolemaios VIII Euergetes II (r. 170-164, 145-116), in profile to the left, adorned with a wide diadem, the ribbons of which fall at the neck; a *khlamys* is fastened over the shoulder.
Lit. Spier, 1989, 23, no. 2, fig. 6, 30-31. Plantzos, 1999, 45, cat. 8, pl. 2: Ptolemaios VIII.

III 33 PL. 9, 1

Geneva, Musée d’Art et d’Histoire. Inv. 70/20886. Fragment of a glass cameo, in layers of dark brown, white, and yellowish-brown. 20.0 by 15.0 mm. The edges on each side and at the base are broken off, and around the crown of the head the dark ground is entirely lacking. A large, irregular fracture extends through the upper part of the head and the surface is largely marred by slight to moderate corrosions.
Portrait bust of a late Ptolemy adorned with a wide, flat diadem, the short ribbons of which fall at the neck, and wearing a *khlamys* fastened over the shoulder. His head faces in profile to the right, the bust being depicted in near profile.

III 34 PL. 9, 2

Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Médailles. Formerly in the French royal collection. Cameo, sardonyx in layers of dark brown, reddish brown, and grayish-white. 37.0 by 25.0 mm. The upper edge of the stone has been cut down, with the adjacent part of the crown removed. Engraved across the lower element of the crown is a meaningless inscription in Aramaic or Hebrew. Remounted in a gold and enameled frame of eighteenth century date.
Portrait bust of a Ptolemaic king in profile to the right, adorned with the *pschent*, and wearing a sleeved *khiton* with a *khlamys* fastened over the shoulder.
Florence, Museo Archeologico. Inv. 14977. Hyacinth, the face convex. 19.0 by 12.0 mm. Fine state of preservation, save for some minor damage to the edges.

Portrait bust of a Ptolemaic queen of the late second century, presumably Kleopatra III Thea Philometor (r. 116-101), veiled and adorned with a wreath of wheat. Her hair, dressed in the melon coiffure with Libyan locks at the temple, is bound by a thin *tainia*. The head and bust face in profile to the left.

Uncomely and masculine in appearance, the severe features delineate a profile, which is congruent with that of the basalt portrait I 406 in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.36

The execution of the hyacinth is of a high standard, and the style answers to that of the head of Alexander I on the pyrope III 28 in the treatment of the large, barely modulated planes of the face, the plastic form of the nose, and in the rendering of the thin, pursed lips. Such affinities should affirm an atelier connection, if indeed not the presence of the same hand.


Gold signet ring with an oval bezel, offset from the band. Length of the bezel, 19.0 mm. The face of the bezel is well preserved, save for some minor surface abrasions and slight damage to the edges.

Bust of Isis or of a Ptolemaic queen in Egyptian regalia, of the late second to the first century. Adorned with a headdress in the form of a vulture, surmounted by the horned solar disc crown of Hathor on a modius of uraei, she wears a long tripartite wig of echelon curls, the ends bound by three bands. Her torso is clad in a tight fitting sleeveless sheath dress and on her shoulders rests a *usekh* of three registers. Her head faces to the left in profile, the bust being in an en face view. In accordance to the conventional portrayal of women in Pharaonic reliefs, on the side to which the figure is oriented the breast is rendered in profile. The features are summarily executed in a purely Egyptian style, the effect of which is best regarded in the attenuation of the outer canthus and the brow, the latter deeply incised so as to assume the form of a distinct appliqué in positive relief.

The iconography of the signet is related to that of a series of sealing impressions from the Edfu hoard.37 All represent the divinity in her Egyptian aspect and vary somewhat in rendering the details of the vulture crown and the...
physiognomic features, conceived, however, in the Greek style. Several reiterate the schema of the signet image, which is without a history in the insignia of Pharaonic-period rings; plainly, the truncation to a bust form is a concession to the standard of Ptolemaic glyptics and sigillary art. Exceptionally, one of the impressions bears an iconography that is attested for Kleopatra VII.\textsuperscript{38} The rest, however, present so common an appearance as to preclude further analysis of a relationship to the royal iconography. Moreover, it is not relevant to press the argument, as Kyrieleis and Ashton have, that the features of this signet image are invested with a portrait quality. The iconography of the Ptolemaic consorts founded in the indigenous tradition comprehended only formalized elements, which typified the ideal countenance of divinity and mortal alike. The presence of the Isiac series in the hoard, which principally carries a chronology from the late second to the end of the first century, establishes the soundest evidence for positing the date of the gold signet.


III 37

Boston, Museum of Fine Arts. Inv. 23.592. Formerly in the Tyszkiewicz and Lewes House collections. Fragment of a sardonyx cameo. H. as preserved, 38.0 mm. Remounted in a modern frame. A large, irregular fracture extends diagonally through the neck to the back of the cranium, removing the looped knot of the band; secondary breaks have obliterated the tail of the headdress and the uraeus that ornamented the band. On the upper cranium there remains a bare trace of the modius that once bore a crown, presumably that of Hathor. Nothing of the original ground is preserved; restored in gold.

Portrait head of a late Ptolemaic queen facing to the left in profile. She wears the vulture headdress, bound by a narrow circlet. At her forehead is a single row of curls, which lengthen at the temple in three, finely curled locks. Apparently first assumed by the women of the Pharaonic house during the VI Dynasty, the uraeus diadem was, at all periods, appropriate to the regalia of either gender. Invariably, the consorts and princesses wore this article as a circlet for the wig, the latter normally of the tripartite form with lappets of echeloned curls or striae.\textsuperscript{39} Before the mid sixteenth century, however, the uraeus diadem became assimilated into the iconography of female divinities associated with the throne, which Isis herself personified.\textsuperscript{40} This attribute entered the iconographic heritage of the late dynasties, and was received under the Ptolemies. Several Egyptian votives of the third to the first century, all of which once bore a crown surmounting a modius, represent the diadem worn with a wig.\textsuperscript{41} In consequence of the loss of the crowning attribute, however, it is impossible to ascertain whether the image possesses a divine or royal status; the iconography of the features alone would not designate such.\textsuperscript{42} The hellenized style statuary of the Ptolemaic consorts, however, almost invariably bears the uraeus diadem as a circlet for the Libyan coiffure.\textsuperscript{43} To conclude from the preceding, the cameo then presents an unorthodox composite of attributes
through the conjoining of the diadem and the vulture crown. It is, evidently, an invention of the artist, presumably a Greek, given the medium, who was not conversant with the Egyptian iconographic tradition.

The fragment represents one of three sardonyx cameos of an Isiac image arrayed in the vulture crown, which D. Plantzos, in a recent study of Ptolemaic cameos, asserts may carry a later date on the criterion that under the Imperium an Egyptianizing style continued to invest the iconography of the divinity. I am inclined not to accept this argument, however, since the iconography of the features invites analogy with a marble portrait recovered at Tanis in the Delta. Detached from an acrolithic statue, the piece has received little attention in the literature. This, despite the fact that it is a positive rarity in the corpus of Ptolemaic marbles by reason of the Egyptianizing mannerisms, which infuse the style and the Pharaonic attributes it once bore. The level at which the head was finished to receive an attachment, presumably in stucco, is not inconsistent with the restoration of a vulture crown. The iconography of the cameo is difficult to assess for want of a comparability with the few portraits attributed in the iconology on the royal consorts of the second century. Moreover, given that the stylistic criteria educed for the chronology of the monuments associated with the late dynasty remain in dispute, and the virtual anonymity in the iconographic record of Kleopatra Berenike III, Kleopatra V, and Kleopatra Berenike IV, it is left to mere speculation that the cameo or, for that matter, the Tanis marble, may be ascribed to any one of them.


### IV 1

Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Inv. FG 5052. Impression in white glass paste. Fairly well preserved, aside from minor surface corrosions and a piece missing at the upper right side.

Portrait head of Demetrios I Soter (r. 162-150), facing in profile to the right and adorned with a narrow diadem, the ends of which fall at the neck. The gem from which the impression was made reproduces the portrait type on the tetradrachms assigned by Newell to the inaugural series of the mint at Antiokhea, issued from c. 162 to 156.


### IV 2

Saint Petersburg, State Collections of The Hermitage. Inv. Ž 64. Garnet, level face. 15.0 by 15.0 mm.
Portrait bust of a king, probably of the late Hellenistic period, adorned with a narrow diadem, corseleted and wearing a *khlamys* fastened at the shoulder. His head is in profile to the left, raised, the bust en face.


**IV 3**

Formerly in a private collection established in the eighteenth century. A modern glass paste cast is in the Martin von Wagner Museum, Wüzburg. Sard or chalcedony, low convex face. Dim. of the inner face of the cast, 26.5 by 18.0 mm.

Portrait bust of a king, corseleted and diademed, a replica of IV 2.

The correlations plainly evident in the rendering of the stylistic particulars should admit the probability of a single authorship for the portraits. For the iconography a close parallel is had in certain variant obverse types of the first and second emissions minted at Antiokheia under Demetrios I Soter from ca. 162-155, which represent the hair wreathing the forehead in short dense tufts of uniform length. The interpretation of the glyptographer deviates from this proposed model in the idealizing element imparted to the iconography through the more ordered contours of the profile and the augmentation of the locks at the ear.


**IV 4**

Munich, Museum antiker Kleinkunst. Inv. 11083. Gold ring with an oval bezel, offset and engraved in raised relief; dimensions of the bezel, 23.0 by 20.0 mm. The ring, of hollow construction throughout with the two respective parts being joined by solder, has suffered some moderate distortions and minor surface abrasions.

Portrait head of Alexander I Balas, (r. 150-145), facing in profile to the right and adorned with a narrow diadem, the borders of which are raised.

The long, aquiline cast of the profile and the heavy, though ordered structure of the features decidedly recall the iconography of Balas as it is attested by the fine series of his portraits from the mints in Syria and Phoenicia. With respect to the qualitative aspect of the execution, the work hardly attains the high standard that may be observed in the contemporary numismatic and glyptic art of the realm. Rendered in a markedly summary fashion, the planes of the face are devoid of plasticity and the individual physiognomic traits, being reduced to sharply delineated and schematic forms, remain structurally isolated. In spite of such mediocre artistry, the interpretation of the iconography retains a vestige of the handsome quality that infuses the portraiture of the emissions.

IV 5

Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Médailles. Formerly in a private collection established prior to the beginning of the eighteenth century. Cornelian, level face, 18.5 by 14.9 mm. Fine state of preservation. Portrait bust of Demetrios II Nikator (r. 145-140, 129-125), corseleted and wearing the scalp of a young steer, the lower part of the hide being fastened at the shoulder in the manner of a khammys. His head faces in profile to the left, while the bust is represented in a slightly oblique view from the back. Inscribed in the field to the fore of the head: AR: SCIPI.AF. The inscription is modern, being given in false recognition of the portrait as that of Scipio Africanus. Lit. Zwierlein-Diehl, 1986, cat. 64, pl. 15.A-B, who illustrates a modern glass paste impression in the Würzburg collection. Fleischer, 1991, 66-67, pl. 36 b.

IV 6

Würzburg, Residenz, Martin Von Wagner Museum. Glass paste cast, modern, of a now lost intaglio gem; low convex face. Dim. of the inner face of the cast: 2.44 by 1.74 mm. The original was apparently well preserved. Portrait bust of Demetrios II represented in the manner of the gem in the Cabinet des Médailles, cited at no. IV 5. The iconography derives from the model that served the engraver of the Paris cornelian. To judge by its close affinity to the style of the latter, the original was certainly fashioned in the same atelier. Lit. Zwierlein-Diehl, 1986, cat. 65, pl. 15. Fleischer, 1991, 67, pl. 36.c.

IV 7

Münster, Private Collection. Reportedly found in mainland Greece. Cornelian, the face level. Fine state of preservation. Portrait head of Antiokhos IX Philopator (r. 114/13-95) in profile to the right, adorned with a diadem, the borders raised and with the ribbons falling at the neck. The gem replicates the heavy features and the prominent aquiline nose that distinguish his iconography for the tetradrachms minted at Ake-Ptolemais, Damascus and Sidon (pl. 23, 12). Lit. R. Stupperich, Boreas 11, 1988, 299-300, no. 14, pl. 25.1-2. Fleischer, 1991, 85, pl. 46.f-g.

IV 8

Boston, Museum of Fine Arts. Inv. 13244. Formerly in the Morrison and Evans Collections. Hyacinth, the face level. H. 18.0 mm. Fine state of preservation. Portrait bust of Demetrios III Theos Philopator (r. 96/5-88/7) adorned with a diadem, the borders raised and with the ribbons falling at the neck, and wearing a khammys fastened at the shoulder. His head faces in profile to the left, the bust in an oblique view.
The iconography is modeled after a variant portrait in the series of tetradrachms minted at Damascus during the mid to later period of his reign.\textsuperscript{48}


IV 9

Munich, Staatliche Münzsammlung. Inv. A.122. Glass, translucent green, low convex face, 32.7 by 25.7 mm. A slight to moderate corrosion extends over nearly the entire surface; the edge at the lower left side is broken and adjacent to the break is a fracture that has obliterated a portion of the corselet and the \textit{pteryges} at the shoulder.

Portrait bust of a Seleucid ruler from the late second or early first century, corseleted and wearing a \textit{khlamys} fastened over the shoulder. He is adorned with a full diadem, the borders raised and with the ribbons waving in back of the neck. The head, slightly raised, is in profile to the right, the bust in an oblique view.

The numismatic evidence strongly suggests an attribution of the portrait to Seleukos VI Epiphanes (r. 95), if not to Demetrios III.\textsuperscript{49}


IV 10

Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Médailles. Formerly in the de Clercq Collection. Found at Baniyas in Syria. Garnet, the face level. 15.5 by 12.0 mm. Mounted in a gold ring, ancient.

Portrait bust of the usurper Diodotos Tryphon (r. 142-139/8) in profile to the left, the bust in near profile. He wears a narrow diadem with raised borders and a \textit{khlamys} fastened at the shoulder.


IV 11

Geneva, Musée d’Art et d’Histoire. Inv. 1978.22015. Cornelian, level face. 14.1 by 12.0 mm. The stone is fairly well preserved, aside from minor damage to the side and lower edges, and a fracture that has removed a section from the upper edge with part of the crown of the head.

Portrait bust of a ruler from the late second or early first century, adorned with a narrow diadem, the ribbons of which wave in back of the neck, and corseleted. Over the corselet he wears a \textit{khlamys} fastened at both shoulders. His head, raised slightly, is in profile to the left, the bust in a nearly en face view.

The numismatic evidence may confirm an attribution to Antiokhos VII. Megas Euergetes (r. 138-129) or Antiokhos VIII Epiphanes Philometor (r. 128, 126/5-96).

IV 12

Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Médailles. Formerly in the Royal Cabinet. Cornelian, level face. 32.0 by 25.0 mm. Well preserved, save for a small break at the upper left side and minor damage to the edges. Portrait bust of an Anatolian ruler of the late Hellenistic period, plausibly Mithradates V Euergetes of Pontos (r. 150-120), corseleted and wearing a khtlamys fastened over the left shoulder. His hair is bound by a diadem with raised borders and tasseled ribbons that fall at the neck. A thunderbolt ornaments the near shoulder plate, or epomis of the corselet. His head, raised and set back, faces in profile to the left, the bust being in an oblique view. Chabouillet regarded the iconography to be that of Antiokhos VIII. His conclusion is guardedly accepted by Richter. Poulsen refers it instead to the marble head 1583 in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek, which, on the basis of an overly circumstantial argument, he asserts is a portrait of Attalos III. The resemblance of the glyptic subject to the marble head, however, is vague and hardly warrants the identity of type he maintains. The numismatic evidence, it is argued here, favors an ascription to Mithradates V, as against his son Eupator, to whom Furtwängler would assign the portrait.


IV 13

Florence, Museo Archeologico. Inv. 14948. Presumably from a private collection. Amethyst. Highly convex face, 26.0 by 18.0 mm. The stone is well preserved, save for a fracture at the lower right side. The portrait remains intact. Portrait head of Mithradates VI Eupator of Pontos (r. 120-63), facing in profile to the left. His hair is bound by a narrow diadem with raised borders, the ends of the ribbons being embroidered and tasseled. The style of execution should affirm that the amethyst was fashioned by an engraver, whose hand is present in the emissions of the Pergamene mint and the late emissions of the king, struck after 80 in the Pontic realm.


IV 14

London, The British Museum. Inv. 1923.4-1.148. Glass, translucent yellowish-green. Convex face, 32.0 by 22.0 mm. Well preserved save for a slight break at the upper edge and moderate surface corrosion.
Portrait head of Mithradates VI in profile to the left, adorned with a narrow diadem, the ribbons of which fall at the neck.


IV 15

London, The British Museum. Inv. 3025. Fragment of a glass gem, in relief. The fragment preserves the head to the posterior cranium and nearly the base of the jaw. Slight corrosions mar the surface.

Portrait head of Mithradates VI Eupator, in profile to the left, adorned with a narrow diadem. The iconography, imbued with a subtle idealization, derives from the portrait type carried on the Pontic emissions of the king, minted from 96 to 88.

Lit. Plantzos, 1999, 56, cat. 88, pl. 15.

IV 16


Portrait of a king of the late Hellenistic period, in profile to the left, his hair bound by a narrow diadem. His neck is edged with the folds of a khamys, fastened at the throat.

The iconography is related, albeit vaguely, to that held by certain emissions of tetradrachms and drachms, which for the present have not been firmly established in the chronology of the mintage for the dynasties that ruled Kappadokia.50


IV 17

Saint Petersburg, State Collections of The Hermitage. Inv. Ž 464. Acquired in 1893 from the Lemme Collection, Odessa. Glass, amethystine. Convex face, 8.0 by 15.0 mm. Set in a gold ring, ancient, the bezel having a moulded, offset shoulder. Apparently in a fine state of preservation.

Portrait head of a ruler in the Mithradatid style, evidently Asandros of the Bosphoran realm (r. 46-16/15), facing in profile to the left, his hair held by a narrow diadem or tainia. At the base of his neck, a cluster of drapery folds.


IV 18

Saint Petersburg, State Collections of The Hermitage. Inv. Ž.1872.91. Found in 1872 at Kerch, ancient Pantikapaion, in a vaulted tomb on the so-named Hill
of Mithradates. Sard, level face. 9.0 by 8.0 mm. Set in a gold ring, ancient. The stone is evidently well preserved.

Portrait bust of a diademed king in profile to the left, wearing a khlamys fastened over the shoulder by a round clasp.

Portrait bust of Alexander the Great in profile to the left, diademed and wearing a khlamys.


IV 19

Switzerland, private collection. Formerly in the collection of James Carnegie, ninth Earl of Southesk (d. 1905). Reportedly found at Patras. Jasper, dark red. Level face, 18.0 by 12.5 mm. Reset in a modern gold ring.

Portrait bust of Alexander the Great, his hair bound by a diadem, knotted, facing in profile to the left, and wearing a khlamys fastened over the shoulder. Hadrianic or Antonine period, although based on models of the late second to the first century B.C.


IV 20

Lisbon, Museu Calouste Gulbenkian. Inv. 79. Amethyst, convex face. 39.0 by 31.0 mm.

Portrait bust of a king of the late Hellenistic period, if not Alexander the Great, adorned with a narrow, ribboned diadem and wearing a khlamys fastened over the right shoulder.


IV 21

Saint Petersburg, State Collections of The Hermitage. Inv. Ţ 610. Acquired in the late eighteenth century. Amethyst, the face slightly convex. 18.0 by 15.0 mm. Well preserved, save for a small fracture at the upper right edge that has removed part of the cranium.

Portrait bust of a late Hellenistic ruler, or conceivably Alexander the Great, bearing a scepter, and adorned with a narrow plaited diadem, a single ribbon of which falls at the neck. A khlamys is fastened over the left shoulder. His head, raised high and set back, faces in profile to the left, the bust in an oblique rear view.

The portrait has been held to depict Alexander by Furtwängler and Gebauer, the latter maintaining that it is interpreted without reference to any of the archetypal portraits of the conqueror. Neverov, without argument, attributes it to Ptolemaios Euergetes I. It is here assigned to the second century, the
attribution to Alexander being regarded as plausible with the reservation that the iconography may instead be directed to Diodotos Tryphon.


IV 22 PL. 13, 3

Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Médailles. Dark cornelian, or sard. Level face, 24.0 by 18.0 mm. Fine state of preservation, save for some minor damage on the back of the stone. Remounted in an ornate jeweled frame of gold and enamel work, dating to the beginning of the eighteenth century.

Portrait bust of a ruler, probably of the second century, corseleted and adorned with a diadem, the ribbons waving in back of the neck. A thunderbolt ornaments the epomides of the corselet, and over it is worn a kblamys fastened at both shoulders. His head, raised, faces to the left in profile, the bust being in an oblique view.

The style of the portrait would indicate a date in the second century, and will not sustain the Ptolemaic affiliations asserted by Chabouillet, Richter, and Kiss. Furtwängler has set it in the context of a class of unnamed portraits, the typology of which he maintains is dependent upon the portraiture of Alexander. To Gebauer the iconography recalls that of Alexander, as portrayed on the red jasper piece IV 19.


IV 23 PL. 13, 4

Auctioned in Munich, June, 1970, Münzhandlung Karl Kress; present location not attested. Reportedly from a hoard of precious objects found in a tumulus situated on the eastern bank of the Hylas River in the vicinity of the salt lakes near Kayseri, ancient Mazaka. Peridot with significant inclusions of whitish and olive-hued crystals. Convex face, 30.0 by 26.0 mm. Save for a deep transverse crack on the lower left side that mars the figure at the chin and the lower lip, the face of the stone was preserved intact.

Portrait bust of a ruler of Kappadokia, presumably of Ariarathes IV Eusebes (r. 220-163), if not Ariarathes VI Epiphanes (r. 130-116), facing in profile to the left, clad in a sleeved tunic and with a kblamys fastened over the shoulders. He wears a royal tiara of leather that leaves uncovered the anterior crown of the head and which is secured by an embroidered band tied around his forehead; the two pendants of the tiara are joined beneath the chin. The crest of the tiara, which widens to a strongly convex profile, is bound by a diadem, knotted and with the tasseled ribbons falling to the shoulders. A border of small, closely
spaced pearls ornaments the crest and the back of the tiara. Inscribed beneath the bust in two lines: ΔΗΜΑΣ ΕΠΟΕΙ.

The attribution to Ariarathes VI, raised by Seyrig and accepted by von Gall, rests on the assertion that the tiara is similar to that worn by the youthful ruler on a series of rare silver drachms, where he is portrayed at the side of his mother Nysa (pl. 26, 3). Further, Simonetta assigned to this king two other drachms, which bear his portrait alone, attired in the manner of the gem figure. Regarding the first, his argument is well founded, for the reverse reiterates the type of the enthroned Athena on the emission of the Ariarathes and Nysa, and it records the epithet Philopator, which is attested for the king by a dedicatory inscription at Delos (pl. 26, 4). The second drachm bears the royal title and the name Ariarathes with no designative epithets (pl. 25, 12). Simonetta maintains, however, that the tiara of the king on this drachm is strictly analogous to the one depicted on the joint issue of Ariarathes and Nysa. Moreover, he contends that the reverse type of the standing Athena and the shortened inscription relate the drachm to an issue in the same denomination, which may be referred to the king by virtue of the emission that succeeded it. The latter, comprised of drachms, repeats the reverse type of the former series, although the inscription is here augmented by the principal epithet of Ariarathes, Epiphanes (pl. 26, 5).

Notwithstanding the apparent relevance of the second drachm to the typology of the early mintage of Ariarathes VI, the present writer would submit that the attribution argued by Simonetta is tenuous. To begin with, the tiara is not strictly comparable to the elaborate version depicted on the silver issues of the king; the profile of the crest differs somewhat and it is without the embellishment of the star motifs that distinguish the latter. Alone, this point is not particularly telling, for the limitations of the numismatic evidence render it impossible to determine whether or not the tiara of the Cappadocian kings was subject to a formal development. That the drachm portrait is not of this youthful sovereign, however, should be well affirmed by the iconography. Moreover, the attribution of the glyptic portrait is entirely contingent upon the designation of the former, since it was fashioned in accordance to the same model that had served for the die type. In every detail of its form and enrichment, the tiara of the gem figure reflects that of the drachm portrait. The affinity is further reiterated in the specificity of the features: the nose stout and with a blunt pendent tip and a thick nostril, the lips thin, the lower one being distended, and the chin small and markedly receding. The contour of the cheek is high and prominent, the flesh slack and lined by a pronounced nasolabial fold. The personage portrayed here had evidently attained an advanced age. Ariarathes VI, however, was in his twenties when he fell victim to an assassin. The iconography thus admits not even the vaguest resemblance to his portraiture, a fact ignored by Simonetta.

It remains that the numismatic evidence directly refers the portrait type of the gem to an eminent predecessor of this ill-fated king, Ariarathes IV Eusebes (r. ca. 220-163). This is asserted on a correlation with the iconography of the tetradrachms, long assigned to Ariarathes III and now decisively reattributed to Ariarathes IV by Mørkholm (pl. 25, 11). Moreover, the affinity of the
drachm type to the glyptic piece, and of both to the portrait of Eusebes is
reinforced in the austere realism of the style.
Lit. Seyrig, 115-16, fig. 14. von Gall, 322, pl. 45.3. Plantzos, 1999, 57, cat. 94,
pl. 17: Ariarathes VI.

IV 24

Boston, Museum of Fine Arts. Inv. 27.716. Formerly in the Lau and the Lewes
House Collections. Reportedly found on the Upper Euphrates. Sard,
translucent. Level face, 20.0 by 14.0 mm. Fine state of preservation.
Portrait bust of an Anatolian monarch or dynast, presumably Ariobarzanes I
Philoromaioi of Kappadokia (r. 96-63), in profile to the left. He wears the
kyrbasia, a Persian bonnet having three lappets and a low conical peak. The side
lappets are bound over the forehead with the ends drawn back and tucked into
the folds; the third falls to the shoulder. Around his neck is a heavy gold
torque, the finials of which assume the form of a club.
The attribution to Ariobarzanes I, first proposed by K. Jenkins, should stand,
for the profile of the prominent heavy brow, the strongly aquiline and
distended nose, and the stout, raised chin is congruent with the distinctive
appearance of the aged monarch, as attested by the dominant portrait type in
his substantial coinage of drachms. Decisively, however, the high massive cheek
and the soft flesh that descends to form the pronounced jowls, in concert with
the conspicuous, flaring nostril lobe and the full protrusive lips, directly refer
the iconography to that of a later variant on the type, introduced in the twenty-
second year of the reign and retained until his abdication in 63 (pl. 26, 6).56
Although the kyrbaasia was not an attribute of sovereignty, as was the high tiara,
its presence here on a royal portrait is not without precedent. The coinage of
the first dynasty of Kappadokia affirms that the rulers on occasion donned
either the kyrbaasia or a lesser form of the tiara, unadorned with the diadem.57
Presumably, this act was in witness to their Iranian lineage and a gesture of
conciliation to the powerful landed nobility of the realm, which shared
the same ethnic descent.
Lit. Furtwängler II, 154, no. 23, pl. XXXI. Beazley, cat. 98, pl. 20. Lippold, pl.
LXX.8. Richter, 1968, 165, no. 662, with the citation of K. Jenkins. Plantzos,
1999, 59-60, cat. 139, pl. 25: royal status questioned.

IV 25

Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale. Inv. 2590168. Formerly in the Farnese
Collection and of an unattested provenance. Fragment of a cameo. Sardonyx
in layers of white and a medium honey-brown hue with a pronounced reddish
cast, shading to a black-brown in some areas. The white layer is reserved for the
diadem. Mounted on a modern opaque white glass base. Dim. of the base, 24.0
by 23.0 mm. The piece is well preserved, save for some minor damage to the
contours of the crown of the head and fractures that have removed a portion
of the chin and the base of the neck.
Portrait head of a dynast or a client ruler of Rome, of the first century, plausibly Ariobarzanes II Philopator of Kappadokia (r. 63-52), facing in profile to the left and adorned with a diadem.

The face, neck and the masses of the hair are virtually rendered in a single plane with merely the faintest nuances of depth being retained to designate the forms of the brow, the arc of the cheek and the locks that border the forehead. The articulation of the internal features and the locks, arrayed in schematic repetitions, is reserved in precise, shallow linear adjuncts. While the refined abstract style of the piece supresses much of the individuality of the personage, certain salient elements emerge in the iconography that warrant an attribution to Ariobarzanes II. The strong angular frame of the lower jaw, the broad expanse of the cheek, and the profile of the firm, narrow chin and the long aquiline nose, its tip distended and pointed, accord well with the features that distinguish the portrait type employed for the drachms minted in the seventh and eighth years of his reign (pl. 26, 7). A no less emphatic correlation may be discerned in the receding contour of the brow, the small, though full lips, and the pronouncedly orbicular form of the eye.


IV 26

Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Médailles. Hyacinth, the face level. Diam. 25.0 mm. A large, irregular fracture extends diagonally through the head to a point just above the ear and has removed nearly the entire upper third part of the stone; the upper right portion of the field is marred by a large chip.

Portrait bust of a king in Asia, of the later second or the first century, facing in profile to the left and adorned with a diadem, the ribbons of which fall to the shoulders. He wears a sleeved *khiton* and, fastened over the near shoulder, a *khlamys*.

The smooth and enamel-like quality of the surfaces, the simplicity of the features, being rendered in sharply engraved lines, and the mannered precision of the locks and the dense curls of the beard infuse the style of the portrait with a strong classicizing element. An assertion of the identity of the sitter, or even the dynastic affiliation, is at present impossible. Evidently it is not of a late Seleucid and, more certainly, none of the Roman client rulers who set their own portraits on the coinages may be brought into consideration. Conceivably, the work may portray Ariarathes X of Kappadokia (r. 42-36), whose countenance is similarly distinguished by a long aquiline nose (pl. 26, 9). The different manner in which his beard is styled, however, will not affirm the association. The piece, therefore, must be relegated to the class of anonymous portraits.

Lit. Seyrig, 118-120, fig. 18, who tentatively assigns the portrait to Ariobarzanes III of Kappadokia on the basis of a false attribution of the mintage of Ariarathes X to the former. Vollenweider, 1995, cat. 172, pl. 80: Akhaios. Plantzos, 1999, 54, cat. 72, pl. 12: Akhaios.
Saint Petersburg, State Collections of The Hermitage. Inv. Ž 613. Sardonyx intaglio in two layers, the white being reserved for the background. Ca. 41.0 by 38.0 mm. Fine state of preservation. Mounted in a modern gold frame. Portrait bust of a ruler or dynast in Asia Minor of the late Hellenistic period, plausibly Ariobarzanes III Eusebes of Kappadokia (r. 52-42). Armoured and adorned with a narrow diadem, knotted, the ribbons waving at the nape, he wears a corselet with two rows of "pteryges" at the shoulders, the "epomides" being ornamented with thunderbolts. Over it a "khamys" is fastened at each shoulder, the clasps of which are decorated with stars. His head, raised high, faces in profile to the left, the bust in an en face view.

The attribution to Mithradates Eupator, raised by Furtwängler and Maksimova, must be dismissed outright. It is impossible to defend on the appearance of the variant portrait types in his mintage. Further, valid parallels for the iconography of the intaglio are wanting in the numismatic portraiture of his successors in the Bosphoran realm, while the emissions of the client rulers of Rome in Anatolia as well are of no avail. The profile of the shallow receding forehead, the long, salient and slightly aquiline nose, and the narrow acute chin, however, is markedly congruent with that of Ariobarzanes III as borne on the silver drachms minted during the ninth and eleventh years of his reign (pl. 26, 8). Albeit the execution of the obverse die types is devoid of the assuredness and subtlety that distinguish the intaglio, the disparity still does not obscure the correlation of iconographic particulars, such as the attenuated, somewhat pendent end of the nose, the leanness of the flesh at the mouth, and the sparse growth of the beard, which reaches to beneath the chin. Further analogous is the rendering of the hair in dense, disheveled locks that fall to the nape in long loose curls and gather beneath the diadem to form a short wreath, the tufts being more prominent at the apex of the forehead.

Lit. Furtwängler II, 158, no. 17, pl. XXXII. Maksimova, 59, no. 7.5, pl. III.5; Richter, 1968, 163, no. 652; Möbius, 1985, 37-38. Plantzos, 1999, 61-62, cat. 148, pl. 27: late Hellenistic period, bust of Alexander the Great, perhaps derived from a model based upon the painting that the mosaic of Pompeii reproduces.

Formerly in Rome, the collection of Stanisław Count Poniatowski (d. 1833). A cast is in the Akademisches Kunstmuseum, Universität Bonn. Hyacinth, the face level. Dim. of the inner face of the cast, 12.8 by 10.5 mm. Evidently in a fine state of preservation. Portrait bust of an Anatolian sovereign or dynast, apparently of the second to the first century, his head turned to the right shoulder in a nearly en face view, the bust in an oblique view to the left. He is adorned with a narrow annular diadem, the ribbons of which wave to either side of his head.
ADDENDA


10. Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Médailles. Sardonyx in three layers, mounted in a modern gold frame. 16.0 by 15.0 mm. Portrait bust of king or dynast, jugate with that of his consort, probably of the late Hellenistic period. The style of the iconography and, specifically, the rendering of the hair and beard in disheveled locks, should assign the iconography to one of the courts in western Asia, Anatolia or to the Spartocid dynasty, as Vollenweider states. Lit. Vollenweider, 1995, cat. 204, pl. 95.


12. Formerly in Chatsworth, the Devonshire collection. Dark cornelian, level face. Portrait bust of a ruler, probably of the middle or late Hellenistic period, diademed and wearing a corselet. The iconography is not attested in the numismatic evidence. Lit. Furtwängler II, 153, no. 19, pl. XXXI. Lippold, pl. LXVIII.3.


14. Saint Petersburg, State Collections of The Hermitage. Inv. Ž 612. Cornelain, convex face; 25.0 by 20.0 mm. Portrait bust of a diademed king, probably Alexander. The iconography is related to that of the Neisos type. Lit Furtwängler II, 157, no. 1, pl. XXXII. Neverov, no. 61. Plantzos, 1999, 46, cat. 18, pl. 3.

15. Saint Petersburg, State Collections of The Hermitage Inv. Ž 671. Fragment of a garnet intaglio, convex face; 6.0 by 4.0 mm. as preserved. The fragment preserves only the face and a portion of the hair at the temple. The iconography is related to that of Prousios II. Lit. Plantzos, 1999, 57, cat. 93, pl. 16.
1. Nabis: Bieber, 1961, 88, 171, fig. 322; Franke, Hirmer, 127 no. 522, pl. 161; Richter, 1965, 258-59, fig. 1760; Boehringer, 137, pl. 14.2. Concerning the rarity of the wreath as an attribute in royal iconography, Smith, 43.


3. Ch. 3, n. 52.

4. Furtwängler II, 157-58, no. 11, pl. XXXII; Bieber, 1949, 384, fig. 26; W. Kaiser, *JdI* 77, 1962, 237, fig. 9; Richter, 1968, 153, no. 603; Neverov, no. 53; Pollitt, 23, fig. 10; Stewart, 199-201, figs. 66-67, pl. 8.a Plantzos, 1999, 67-68, cat. 164, pl. 29.

5. Zazoff, 321, note 102, pl. 95.6; Plantzos, 1999, 62, cat. 154, pl. 27.

6. While designated as a kausia by nearly all commentators, there are no precedents in the material evidence for this Macedonian article of attire bearing such elaborate decoration. The apparent rigidity of the object suggests that it is of metal. Moreover, it seems to be graced with a long plume fastened at the circular boss on the peak, being partly removed by the break in the field. The form, however, bears no direct correlation to any attested helmet type of the period.

7. For the iconographies of Philip V and Perseus, cf. ch. 2, I.

8. The literary and material evidence relating to the form and ornamentation of the diadem is conveniently summarized in Smith, 34-35. The ivy tendril decoration is an aberrance.


10. For the Philadelphos' assertion to this genealogy, A.D. Nock, *JHS* 48, 1928, 25-26; Fraser I, 202-03.


13. Ch. 1.

14. Ch. 2.1, n. 32. The reverse type of Philip is a club within a wreath of oak leaves, that of Perseus, an eagle bearing a thunderbolt with the same
framing device. A variant type of Perseus displays the club. Cf. Boehringer, 100, 103, 105.
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APPENDIX

DYNASTIC CHRONOLOGIES

THE ANTIGONID DYNASTY

Antigonos I Monophthalmos 306-301
Demetrios I Poliorcetes 306-283
Antigonos II Gonatas 283-239
Demetrios II 239-229
Antigonos III Doson 229-221
Philip V 221-179
Perseus 179-168

THE SELEUCID DYNASTY

Seleukos I Nikator 304-281
Antiokhos I Soter 281-261
Antiokhos II Theos 261-246
Seleukos II Kallinikos 246-226/5
Antiokhos Hierax, usurper, king in Asia Minor 241-226
Seleukos III (Keraunos) 226/5-223
Antiokhos III Megas 223-187
Seleukos IV Philopator 187-175
Antiokhos IV Theos Epiphanes Nikephoros 175-164
Antiokhos V Eupator 164-162
Demetrios I Soter 162-150
Alexander I Balas Theopator Euergetes Epiphanes Nikephoros 150-145
Demetrios II Nikator Theos Philadelphos 146/5-140
Antiokhos VI Epiphanes Dionysos 145-142/1 or 139/8
Diodotos Tryphon Autokrator 142-139/8
Antiokhos VII Megas Euergetes Kallinikos Soter (Sidetes) 138-129
Demetrios II, restored 129-126/5
Antiokhos VIII, ruled in Antiokhea 128
Alexander II Zabinas Epiphanes Nikephoros 128-128/3
Seleukos V, under the regency of Kleopatra Thea 125
Kleopatra Thea, ruled in Ake Ptolemais 126/5
Antiokhos VIII Epiphanes Philometor Kallinikos (Grypos) 126/5-96
with Kleopatra Thea 126/5-123
Antiokhos IX Philopator 114/13-95
Demetrios III Theos Philopator Philometor Euergetes
Soter Kallinikos (Eukairos), in Damascus,
subsequently in Antiokhea 96/5-88/7
Seleukos VI Epiphanes Nikator 95
Antiokhos X Eusebes Philopator 95-92
Antiokhos XI Epiphanes Philadelphos, in Kilikia, subsequently in Antiokheia 95
Philip I Epiphanes Philadelphos, in Kilikia, subsequently in Antiokheia 95-84/3
Antiokhos XII Dionysos Epiphanes Philopator Kallinikos, in Damascus 88/7-84
Interim reign of Tigranes II of Armenia 84/3-69
Antiokhos XIII Philadelphos Eusebes (Asiatikos) 69-68
Philip II (Barypous) 68-66/5
Antiokhos XIII, restored 66/5-64

THE ATTALID DYNASTY

Philetairos 283-263
Eumenes I 263-241
Attalos I (Soter) 241-197
Eumenes II Soter 197-159
Attalos II Philadelphos 159-138
Attalos III Philometor 138-133

REALM OF BITHYNIA

Zipoetes 298/7-280
Nikomedes I 280-250
Ziaël 250-230
Prousias I 230-182
Prousias II 182-149
Nikomedes II Epiphanes 149-127
Nikomedes III Euergetes 127-94
Nikomedes IV Philopator 94-74

REALM OF PONTIC KAPPADOKIA

Mithradates I 302-266
Ariobarzanes 266-250
Mithradates II 250-220
Mithradates III 220-196/5
Pharnakes I 196/5-162/1
Mithradates IV Philopator Philadelphos 162/1-150
Mithradates V Euergetes 150-120
Mithradates VI Eupator 120-63

REALM OF KAPPADOKIA

THE ARIARATHID DYNASTY
Ariarathes III, first dynast to assume the royal title 230-220
Ariarathes IV Eusebes 220-163
Ariarathes V Eusebes Philopator 163-130
Orophernes Nikephoros, brother and rival of Ariarathes V 159-157
Nysa, widow of Ariarathes V, with her son Ariarathes VI 130
Ariarathes VI Epiphanes Philopator 130-116
Ariarathes VII Philopator 116-101
Ariarathes VIII 101-99
Interim reign of Ariarathes IX, deposed and reinstated 99-87
Ariarathes VIII, restored 90-86

THE ARIOBARZANID DYNASTY
Ariobarzanes I Philorhomaios, reigned intermittently 96-63
Ariobarzanes II Philopator 63-52
Ariobarzanes III Eusebes Philorhomaios 52-42
Ariarathes X Eusebes Philadelphos 42-36
Arkhelaos Philopatris Ktistes, last client ruler, son of the Priest of Komana, installed by Marcus Antonius 36-A.D. 14

REALM OF THE KIMMERIAN BOSPHOROS
Pairisades V, last king of the Spartocid dynasty 125-109
Interim reign of Saumakos, a Scythian noble 109-107
Mithradates VI 107-63
Pharnakes II Megas 63-47
Asandros, archon, assumed the royal title in 41 46-16/15
Dynamis, daughter of Pharnakes II, widow of Asandros 16/15
Polemon I Eusebes 15-8
Dynamis, married to Polemon I 8-A.D. 8

THE ASPURGIAN DYNASTY
Aspourgos I, Sarmatian noble, widower of Dynamis 10/11-37/8
Gepaipyris, Thracian princess, married to Aspourgos I 37/8-39
Mithradates, son of Aspourgos and Dynamis 37/8-44/5
Kotys I, son of Aspourgos and Gepaipyris 44/5-67

THE PTOLEMAIC DYNASTY
Ptolemaios I Soter d. before 275
Berenike I Soteira 305/4-282
Ptolemaios II Philadelphos 282-246
Arsinoë II Philadelphos d. 268
Ptolemaios III Euergetes 246-222
Berenike II Euergetis, ruled in Kyrene 258-245 d. 220
Ptolemaios IV Philopator 222-204
Arsinoë III Philopator 217-204
Ptolemaios V Epiphanes Eukharistos 204-180
Kleopatra I Epiphanes, regent 180-176 d. 176
Ptolemaios VI Philometor 180-145
with Ptolemaios VIII and Kleopatra II 170-164
Ptolemaios VIII Euergetes II (Physkon) 164-163
Ptolemaios VI, Kleopatra II, restored 163-145
Kleopatra II, regent, with Ptolemaios VII Neos Philopator 145-144
Ptolemaios VIII, restored 145-116
Kleopatra II Thea Philometor Soteira, ruled in Alexandria 131-130
Kleopatra II, with Kleopatra III and Ptolemaios IX 116
Kleopatra III Thea Philometor Soteira, Ptolemaios IX 116-107
Kleopatra III, Ptolemaios X 107-101
Ptolemaios X Alexander I Philometor Soter (Physkon), Kleopatra Berenike III Thea Philadelphos 101-88
Ptolemaios IX Soter II Philometor Philadelphos (Physkon), restored, Kleopatra Berenike III 88-80
Kleopatra Berenike III, Ptolemaios XI Alexander II 80
Ptolemaios XII, Kleopatra V Tryphaina Theoi Philopatores Philadelphoi 80-58
Kleopatra Berenike IV, with Kleopatra V, and subsequently, Arkhelaos, high priest of Komana 58-55
Ptolemaios XII, restored 55-51
BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. ROYAL ICONOGRAPHY, GLYPHTICS, SIGILLOGRAPHY, AND NUMISMATICS.


Froehner, W. *La collection Tyszkiewicz.* Munich, 1892.


Newell, E. T. The Coinage of the Western Seleucid Mints from Seleucus I to Antiochus III. New York, 1941.


Stanwick, P.E. *Portraits of the Ptolemies.* Austin, 2002.


II. SECONDARY REFERENCES.


L’Orange, H.P. *Apotheosis in Ancient Portraiture.* Oslo, 1947.


PLATE 1

1. Cat. II 1

2. Cat. II 3

3. Cat. II 4

4. Cat. II 5
PLATE 2

1. Cat. II 6

2. Cat. II 6

3. (Apollonios)

4. (Apollonios)
PLATE 3

1. Cat. II 7

2. Cat. II 9

3. Cat. II 11

4. Cat. II 13
PLATE 4

1. Cat. II 14

2. Cat. III 2

3. Cat. III 3

4. Cat. III 4
PLATE 5

1. Cat. III 5

2. Cat. III 6

3. Cat. III 8

4. Cat. III 9
PLATE 6

1. Cat. III 10

2. Cat. III 11

3. Cat. III 14

4. Cat. III 17
PLATE 7

1. Cat. III 18
2. Cat. III 19
3. Cat. III 22
4. Cat. III 25
PLATE 8

1. Cat. III 26  
2. Cat. III 27  
3. Cat. III 28  
4. Cat. III 29
PLATE 9

1. Cat. III 33
2. Cat. III 34
3. Cat. III 35
4. Cat. III 36
PLATE 11

1. Cat. IV 7

2. Cat. IV 10

3. Cat. IV 11

4. Cat. IV 12
PLATE 12

1. Cat. IV 13

2. Cat. IV 14

3. Cat. IV 17

4. Cat. IV 19
PLATE 13

1. Cat. IV 20

2. Cat IV 21

3. Cat. IV 22

4. Cat. IV 23
PLATE 15

1 - 2. Cat. IV 27
PLATE 16

1 (Aspasios)  

2

3

4
PLATE 17

1 2 3

4 5 6

7 8 9

10 11 12
PLATE 19

1

2
PLATE 22

1  2  3

4  5  6

7  8  9

10  11  12
PLATE 24
PLATE 25

1 2 3

4 5 6

7 8 9

10 11 12
PLATE 26
PLATE 27
PLATE 28

1  2  3

4  5  6

7  8  9

10 11 12
Curriculum Vita

Robert Allen Gross

1968  
Northern Valley Regional Highschool, Demarest, NJ, Diploma.

1969 – 1971  
Bergen Community College, Paramus, NJ

1971 – 1973  
Upsala College, E. Orange, NJ  

1977  
Universita per Stranieri, Perugia, Italy  
Summer program in Art History and Italian.

1976 – 1978  
Montclair State University, Upper Montclair, NJ 1/76 to 6/78  
Post-baccalaureate study in German and Art History.

1978 – 2008  
Rutgers, The State University  
Graduate study in Art History and Greek with major concentration in Greek and Roman Art; secondary work in Early Christian Art. M.A., 1981  
Ph.D., 2008

1982 – 1984  
Rutgers, the State University, Summer sessions introductory survey in Art History.

1982 – 1988  
Conducted recitations in introductory survey in Art History.

1986 – 1987  
Cataloguing work, Zimmerli Art Museum.

1983  
Excavation work at Morgantina, Sicily.

1981  