Two Hellenistic Processions: A Matter of Self-Definition

F. W. Walbank

> Les folies des spectacles était une maladie de leurs très grandes villes, Rome, Alexandrie ou Antioche.
>
> P. Veyne, *Le Pain et le cirque,* 696

1.

A recent trend in Hellenistic studies has been to emphasise the importance of the indigenous peoples within the successor kingdoms to Alexander at the expense of the Greco-Macedonian element.[1] Within limits this is to be welcomed, for there can be no doubt that in the past, for a combination of reasons, native influence on the life and culture of those states has been underestimated. With the exception of Macedonia itself, all these Hellenistic kingdoms contained ancient, alien structures, which the new Macedonian rulers in Persia, Babylonia and Egypt could not afford to ignore. Relations with their more numerous non-Greek subjects were always a central problem and one which changed over the years. In Egypt, for instance, Egyptian influence in the army and administration, as well as in everyday life, grew steadily from the end of the third century onwards. How indeed these Macedonian kings — and their subject populations — saw themselves in this multicultural world must form a matter of central interest.

Despite this, however, it remains true that the cultural roots of the rulers and ruling castes, at any rate within the more important of the successor states, lay in a Hellenised Macedonia and that many of their institutions derived from Macedonia and the Greek *polis*. Ptolemy, Seleucus, Cassander, Antigonus, Lysimachus were all Macedonians. Their various kingdoms had been secured or successfully defended in a series of wars; and when they were not at war, they were actively engaged in numerous ways in what may perhaps be called self-validation — through cultural patronage, building programmes both at home and in friendly states, the institution of international festivals and the subsidising of movements abroad, which they hoped might embarrass their rivals.[2] In such ways as these they aimed at projecting favourable images of themselves

---

1 See especially *Hellenism in the East*, edd. A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White, 1987, and S. Sherwin-White and A. Kuhrt, *From Samarkhand to Sardis; a New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*, 1993.

2 For examples of this activity see G. Weber, 'Herrscher, Hof und Dichter: Aspekte der Legitimierung und Repräsentation hellenistischer Könige am Beispiel der ersten drei Antigoniden', *Historia* 44, 1995, 283-316 (with useful bibliography).

throughout the Greek world. In this paper I propose to look briefly at two famous processions, one in Egypt and the other in Syria, which throw a little light on that activity and also exemplify the way in which these kings reacted to each other — and later to Rome and Rome to them — in a peaceful context.

Processions form the most striking element in most ancient religious festivals and one common to the *polis*, the Macedonian state and Hellenistic kingdoms generally,[3] as well as being important to the indigenous religions existing there. In Macedonia, for example, we hear of the annual *Xanthika*, a spring purification march of the army between the two halves of a severed dog, which is associated with the assimilation of the new year's ephebes into the army;[4] and the assassination of Philip II occured at Aegeae during a procession bearing statues of the 'twelve gods'.[5] All ancient processions were basically religious. But in the fourth century the popular aspect had tended to grow at the expense of the 'cult' element' even within the *polis*.[6] In the classical *polis* the procession, accompanying either the god or goddess, or offerings made to him or her, was a ceremony in which the whole community, as well as the officiating priests or magistrates, was involved. The degree of elaboration varied according to the occasion. Rural ceremonies were simple affairs[7] at all times; but the great *polis* festivals drew in many people and took place, most likely, in all cities. Two examples are the bearing of the *peplos* to Apollo Hyacinthos from Sparta to Amyclae,[8] and the Panathenaea at Athens,[9] the procession of which is probably that depicted on the Parthenon frieze. This procession had, of course, a military aspect, and that is not unusual. But it is an aspect which necessarily grew more marked with Alexander, since while he was in Asia the Macedonian army was — for him — the equivalent of the Macedonian state; and repeatedly, at Ephesus, at Soli, at Tyre, at Memphis,[10] we find him marching in procession with the army.

Where the Hellenistic procession differed from that of the *polis* was in its direction from above and its conscious incorporation of theatrical elements. It

---

3 For a catalogue of Ptolemaic festivals see F. Perpillou-Thomas, *Fêtes d'Egypte ptolémaique et romaine d'après la documentation papyrologique grecque* (*Studia Hellenistica* 31), 1993; see also P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1972, 189-301.

4 Polyb.23.10.17; Livy 40.6.1-7; Curt. 10.9.12; cf. M.B. Hatzopoulos, *Cultes et rites de passage en Macédoine* (*Meletemata* 19), 1994, 89-90 with n. 6 on p. 89 for bibliography.

5 Cf. N.G.L. Hammond, *Philip of Macedon*, 1994, 176, 223 with nn. 33 and 34 (with bibliography).

6 See F. Bömer, *RE* s.v. 'pompa' col. 1894 (attributing the 'turning-point' to the Athenian Panathenaea).

7 On *komasiai* in Egypt see Perpillou-Thomas (n. 3), 145.

8 Bömer (n. 6), col. 1920 no. 32.

9 *Ibid.* col. 1928 no. 65; cf. L. Ziehen, *RE* s.v. 'Panathenaia' cols. 475-89; J. Neils, *Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*, 1992.

10 Arr. 1.18.2 (Ephesus), 2.5.8 (Soli), 2.24.6 (Tyre), 3.5.2 (Memphis).

was now less an expression of piety, gaiety and solemnity[11] by the whole community and more of a show put on by those above for general entertainment and instruction.[12] Yet this was not wholly new either. Xenophon[13] sees it as a prime duty of the hipparch to make processions *axiotheatous*, a pleasure to watch, a strictly non-religious aspect. Veyne,[14] who emphasises this 'theatrical world' in its contrast with everyday life, remarks that whereas we distinguish public and private affairs, the Greeks recognised public affairs, private affairs — and festivals.

2.

The first procession I propose to discuss is the great *pompe* described in Athenaeus, following Callixeinus,[15] and to be identified with the Ptolemaieia, the penteteric, isolympic festival set up by Ptolemy II Philadelphus in 279/8 in honour of his now-deified father and mother, and perhaps also of his grandfather Lagus and his wife.[16] Two recent studies by Rice and Dunand have greatly illu-

---

11 On this community atmosphere see P. Veyne, *Le Pain et le cirque: sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique*, 1976, 392; one might compare the English cup final, with its ritual singing of 'Abide with me'.

12 Like the one put on at Athens by Demetrius of Phalerum (Polyb. 12.13.11), with its large imitation snail, a feature typical of the ingredients of Hellenistic processions.

13 *Hipparch.* 3.1.

14 P. Veyne (n. 11), 725, quoting Polyb. 5.106.2. On the 'theatrical world' of the festival see F. Raphael, 'Esquisse d'une sociologie de la fête', *Contrepoint* 24, 1977, 109-30; and for a relevant discussion of 'art as public drama' under an autocratic regime see E. Hobsbawm's introduction to the catalogue of the exhibition 'Art as Power: Europe under the Dictators, 1930-1945' (Hayward Gallery, London, 1995).

15 Athen. 5.196D-203B = *FGH* 627 F 2.

16 The year the procession took place is controversial and its identity with the Ptolemaieia has been challenged; cf. P.M. Fraser (n. 3) I, 230-33; *BCH* 78, 1954, 57 n. 3; E.E. Rice, *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, 1983. In a review of the latter book in *LCM* 9, 1984, 50-54, I argued that the procession in Athenaeus must form part of the Ptolemaieia, that that festival was inaugurated in 279/8 and that the occasion described is likely to be the original performance of that year. One decisive factor, as Rice has shown, is that Arsinoe II cannot have been queen at the time of the procession, since she is nowhere referred to in the account of it; and she was probably married to Philadelphus by 275/4. My argument is accepted by J.-L. Ferrary, *Philhellénisme et impérialisme: aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique,* 1988, 502 n. 56. More recently V. Foertmeyer, *Historia* 37, 1988, 90-194, has argued that the reference to the Morning and Evening Star at the beginning and the end of the procession (Athen. 5.197D) implies that this must have taken place in a year in which the two appearances of Venus could actually have occurred to coincide with a dawn beginning and an evening conclusion of the procession. Since this was held in winter, the only relevant period fitting that requirement was December 275 - February 274; hence 275/4

minated this procession and its significance,[17] and I shall be drawing extensively on their work. As was increasingly true of such occasions in the Hellenistic period, Ptolemy's procession celebrated several gods;[18] but the selective account in Athenaeus concentrates on the section devoted to Dionysus, which was evidently a central feature. Dunand[19] draws attention to two aspects of the procession, which, she suggests, help to clarify the way in which the event was conceived. First, the procession was carefully structured and the groups taking part were clearly defined categories within the population of Alexandria, based on age and occupation. There were priests, members of religious organisations, adolescents, children, various female groups, and soldiers. This is true, but its importance should not be exaggerated, since it is hard to see how the non-military part of a large procession could have been organised differently. The question is really one of efficiency. Dunand's second point also needs qualification. Both the procession and the onlookers, she asserts, were restricted to the stadium. But this rests on a mistranslation of Athen. 5.197C,[20] which, as Rice has shown,[21] means that the procession 'was led through the city stadium'. There is in fact clear evidence in Athenaeus' narrative that it subsequently proceeded through parts of the city, where it will have been viewed by the very

---

must be the date of Athenaeus' procession. The argument is ingenious; but in fact Athenaeus 5.197D merely says that the procession began (ἄρχην εἶχεν ἡ πομπή) at the time when the Morning Star *appears* (φαίνεται) — not 'appeared'. He is making a general statement: the section devoted to the Morning Star comes first, because dawn is the time when that star appears. The section assigned to the Evening Star came at the end, τῆς ὥρας εἰς τοῦτο συναγούσης τὸν καιρόν, a difficult phrase which perhaps means 'when the season brought the time to that point'. 'The season' will be winter, perhaps implying an early nightfall. 'That point' is the moment in the day, twilight, when the Evening Star is wont to appear. The representation of the morning and evening star(s) can be paralleled by other personifications of natural opposites such as day and night in the procession at Daphne (Polyb. 30.25.15). There is thus no reason to suppose that these representations of the Morning and Evening Star are tied to any particular date when their appearance might coincide with their place in the procession.

17 Rice (n. 16), and F. Dunand, "Fête et propagande à Alexandrie sous les Lagides", *La Fête, pratique et discours*, ed. Dunand, 1981, 13-40.

18 Cf. Rice (n. 16), 21-7. The absence of Aphrodite, who was closely associated with Arsinoe II, confirms that the latter was not queen at the time.

19 F. Dunand (n. 17), 150.

20 The same error occurs in the Loeb translation of C.B. Gulick; cf. too Fraser (n. 3), i. 230.

21 Rice (n. 16), 31, observing (a) that a large crown of gold was in due course hung around the door of the shrine of Berenice, clearly outside the stadium; this is likely to have been done from the procession (Athen. 5.202D); (b) grape juice from freshly trodden grapes and wine were released to flow along the street, which implies an area outside the stadium (Athen. 5.197E); (c) the marshals dressed as Sileni would be required in the city streets rather than in the stadium before a sitting audience (Athen. 5.197E).

mixed population of Alexandria — as Ptolemy must have intended. Accessibility to such festivals was normal in the city. As we gather from Theocritus,[22] two Syracusan ladies resident in Alexandria have no problems, other than the usual bustling crowds, and encounter no controls in attending the Adonis festival held within the court area. Dunand seems in part to have exaggerated the significance of the structure of the Ptolemaic procession and to have underestimated the breadth of its audience.

At whom, then, was the procession directed? And what reactions was it intended to elicit? Clearly, for an event on such a scale with so many different components this question cannot expect a simple answer. But some elements, both in the presentation and among the spectators, can be identified. To take the latter first, the overwhelmingly Greco-Macedonian flavour of the event — the gods included, the symbolism in the tableaux, the mythology evoked, the emphasis on the Ptolemaic dynastic house and Alexander,[23] and the association of the latter with Dionysus — show that this procession was conceived primarily as a show put on in a Greeek *polis*.[24] The *main* audience, those accommodated in the stadium, were certainly Greek and included representatives of the administration and official guests from abroad (these were later feasted separately from the soldiers, *technitai*, — artisans or, more probably, Dionysiac artistes — and tourists).[25] But even if they are given no emphasis in our narrative, the procession contained themes to which Egyptians could easily attach their own cultural interpretations.[26] The cornucopia carried by 'Eniautos' (Athen. 5.198A), for example, and a second one which appears later in the procession (*ibid.* 202C) were symbols of fertility connected with Isis, Harpocrates and the Nile, as well as having Greek antecedents. Dionysus is a Greek god; but surely this is not too early in the Ptolemaic period for Egyptians to make a cross-reference to Osiris and/or Sarapis.[27] Egyptians must also have related this procession to those familiar to them from their everyday experience of the processions which formed an integral and important part of native Egyptian festivals, involving the movement of divine images from shrine to shrine, often by river transport on the Nile.[28] But it remains true that on this occasion Ptolemy's interest was focussed on his Greco-Macedonian subjects and on visiting Greeks and Macedonians from

22 *Id.* 15, 73-7.

23 On the Dionysus-Alexander connection see Rice (n. 16), 83-5.

24 *Ibid.* 29.

25 Athen. 5.196A.

26 On the cornucopia cf. Rice (n. 16), 202-5; on its Greek antecedents see Dunand (n. 17), 26. For conscious cross-cultural resonances as a basic characteristic of life in Ptolemaic Egypt see L. Koenen, 'The Ptolemaic king as a religious figure', *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*, ed. Bulloch et al., 1993, 25-115; also 'Die Adaptation aegyptischer Königsideologie am Ptolemäerhof', *Egypt and the Hellenistic World* (*Studia Hellenistica* 27), 1983, 143-90.

27 So Dunand (n. 17), 33.

28 Cf. Rice (n. 16), 180. The triumphalist and often blood-curdling processional scenes on temple walls would be less familiar, since they stood in the area closed to the public.

abroad; for an important element in this festival was the presence among the privileged spectators of *theoroi* from other Greek states (some of whom, of course, may have come from cities under Ptolemaic control).[29]

For these, as well as for the local spectators, Ptolemy's greatness is underlined by, *inter alia*, emphasis on imposing, over-life-size figures and objects, and the symbolism incorporated in those elements of the procession. Such symbolism, as Ehrenberg pointed out,[30] had to be broad and simple. Thus 'Corinth' will have stood for the Greek homeland generally.[31] It may also have been intended to suggest a Greek homeland where Ptolemy had a direct interest and might reasonably expect to exercise power, given the current chaos and confusion there, following the murder of Seleucus at Lysimacheia and the death of Ptolemy Ceraunus in Macedonia. But such hints, if they were there, are quite vague and certainly not stressed. For Corinth itself, at this time, was held by Antigonus Gonatas.

The real political emphasis was reserved, in fact, for the mighty military parade rounding off the procession, which was intended to impress both citizens and foreign guests. Dunand speaks of the latter being 'intimidated'. That is perhaps going a little too far, but certainly *theoroi* were expected to report back home on this march-past, which will have lasted several hours,[32] just as in the days of the Soviet Union ambassadors would report on the November parade in the Red Square in Moscow. Supported by some of the symbolism in the preceding sections of the procession — the Alexander theme, the Macedonian 'Mimallones', the Greek cities of Asia formerly subdued by the Persians, the Indian captives and the Ethiopian tribute-bearers, together with large numbers of exotic animals[33] — the procession may well have been designed to celebrate victories won or claimed,[34] as well as foreshadowing future conquests going far beyond reality.

---

29 For *theoroi* at the Ptolemaieia see *Syll.* 390 (Nesiotes); *ISE* ii. no. 75 (Amphipolis). From classical times the presence of *theoroi* was essential to a festival claiming international recognition and prestige; see Thucyd. 6.3; Plato, *Laws* 12.950D-E, 951A; Dem. 19.128; 21.115; Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 56.3.

30 V. Ehrenberg, *Alexander and the Greeks*, 1938, 3-4.

31 Athen. 5.201D; it has nothing to do with the 'League of Corinth' set up by Philip II (so Rice [n. 16], 102-3), for no such name for the league appears in ancient sources and appears to be a modern term. Dunand (n. 17) believes that Corinth 'certainly' stands for the Greek cities over which Ptolemy sought to exercise control and that there may be a hint at Ptolemy I's expedition of 308, after which he left garrisons in the Peloponnese. Anything so specific, and so long before the date of the procession, seems improbable.

32 Athen. 5.202F-203A. There were around 57,600 infantry and 23,200 cavalry. If, for example, they marched six abreast, at four m.p.h. it would have taken the infantry alone nearly three hours to pass a given point.

33 See Athen. 5.198E (Mimallones,), 201A (Indian captives and Ethiopian tribute-bearers), 201D (Alexander), 201D-E (Greek cities of Asia).

34 Both Dunand (n. 17), 21 and Ferrary (n. 16), 562 n. 36, believe that the procession celebrated a victory over Syria (but in different wars). See below, n. 47.

In addition, the procession contained items designed to entertain, including a mechanical statue of Nysa, and the visual effects of brightly coloured objects and much bronze, silver and gold, underlining the wealth, majesty and generosity of Ptolemy, who also provided gifts, perfumes and wine (for those in the stadium).[35] There were also the carnival 'reversals of normality' common to such processions at all times — children in adult roles, small girls clad as warriors;[36] and finally such symbols as the cornucopia, indicating fruitfulness and fertility.[37] Thus the Ptolemies (like the Pharaohs into whose shoes they had stepped) were presented as conquerors, benefactors and bringers of prosperity.

3.

Our second procession was held at Daphne near Antioch by Antiochus IV over a century later, when Rome was already predominant in the eastern Mediterranean. It too is recorded by Athenaeus (who here follows Polybius).[38] Like the Ptolemaic procession, this too has had its date discussed at length. There is, however, little doubt that it took place in summer 166 BC, though whether still in 01.153.2 (167/6) or in 01.153.3 (166/5) is uncertain.[39]

Its purpose, according to Polybius (30.25.1), was to outdo the games recently held at Amphipolis by L. Aemilius Paullus to celebrate his victory over Perseus

---

35 Dunand (n. 17), 27 supposes the wine and grape-juice mentioned as flowing in the street by Athen. 5.200B was for the spectators to taste; but if it flowed directly onto the street, this is hard to envisage.

36 Athen. 5.200F. 'Female impersonators' were a regular feature in the annual gala procession in my native Yorkshire town in the early decades of this century. On the 'renversement des moeurs' common to such carnival occasions see Raphael (n. 14), 115-19.

37 See above, n. 26.

38 Athen. 5.194C-195D = Polyb. 30.25.1-26.4; Diod. 31.16 (based on Polybius).

39 Polybius' account forms part of the Asian events of 01.153.2 = 167/6. The procession falls in 166, but since Polybius' olympiad year can include events of the following autumn, there is no summer cut-off date for the festival; indeed J.G. Bunge (*Chiron* 6, 1976, 53-71) dates it to Sept./Oct. of that year. See further my *Commentary on Polybius*, iii, 1979, 32-3. (Athenaeus' statement [10.439B] that Polybius described the Daphne festival in book 31 has been rightly rejected; it would involve an unparalleled range of contents for that book.) Attempts have been made to date the procession to 165; so B. Bar-Kochva, *Judas Maccabaeus*, 1989, who dismisses Polybius' linking of the festival with Aemilius Paullus' games at Amphipolis as an interpolation by Athenaeus. He has then to assume a dislocation in the order of the Polybian fragments in order to assign 30.25.1-26.9 (and 30.27.1-4, describing Ti. Gracchus' embassy to Syria just after the games) to 01.153.3 = 166/5. The arguments in support of this hypothesis are not convincing and this date for the procession (also implied in Broughton, *MRR* i.438 and adopted without discussion by S. Sherwin-White and A. Kuhrt, *From Samarkhand to Sardis* [n. 1], 220) is to be rejected.

of Macedonia.[40] The more decidedly military character of Antiochus' procession confirms the truth of this statement, although no military element is recorded for Aemilius' festival.[41] In celebrating his victory in Greece as well as in a Roman triumph, Aemilius was taking the opportunity to publicise Roman policy and Roman success in the Hellenistic mode, as we have already seen it operating in Philadelphus' *Ptolemaieia*. But he was not the first Roman general with an eye for the fruits of publicity to be gathered in Hellenistic capitals and Greek cities. To take one example, T. Quinctius Flamininus, who had already acted as *agonothetes* at the Nemean games,[42] when about to evacuate Greece, following his much vaunted grant of freedom at the Isthmian Games of 196, marched from the Acrocorinth amid — perhaps orchestrated — cries of 'Saviour and Liberator', a combination of cult titles (Σωτὴρ καὶ Ἐλευθέριος) especially associated with Zeus from the time of the Persian Wars.[43]

From what source Polybius drew his account of Antiochus' procession is unknown,[44] and his description is selective, though adequate to give a general impression of what took place. The procession, like Ptolemy's, was variegated and may well have had more than one aim. It seems probable, though not certain, that, held in summer 166 in the salubrious surroundings of Daphne, it was a special performance of the annual festival held there in honour of Apollo.[45] In attempting to rival Aemilius Paullus, Antiochus was clearly setting up a propagandist challenge to Rome, hoping thereby to repair any damage to his prestige brought about by his acceptance of the humiliating ultimatum presented to him by Popillius Laenas at Eleusis in Egypt.[46] Indeed it is tempting to see his procession (like Ptolemy's[47]) as a victory celebration, in this case over Egypt, whence Antiochus had brought back much plunder, which helped pay for

---

40 On these games, held in 167, see Livy 45.32.8-33.7; Plut. *Aem.* 28.3-5; Diod. 31.8.9; E. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*, 1992, 247; Ferrary (n. 16), 552. Gruen sees these games as expressing a Roman claim to Hellenistic culture, whereas to Ferrary they represent a typical Hellenistic victory-celebration. See also L.-M. Günther, 'L. Aemilius Paullus und sein Pfeilerdenkmal in Delphi', *Rom und der griechische Osten: Festschrift für Hatto H. Schmitt*, edd. Ch. Schubert and K. Brodersen, 1995, 83.

41 Ferrary (n. 16), 561, thinks that Aemilius Paullus' games must have involved a procession, omitted from our selective account of these events; this is possible.

42 Cf. Ferrary (n. 16), 562.

43 Livy 34.50.9; cf. Jensen, *RE* s.v. 'Eleutherios', cols. 2348-9.

44 A possibility, but no more, is Protagorides of Cyzicus, who is known to have written *On the festivals of Daphne* (Athen. 4.150CD, 176AB, 183F = *FGH* 853 F 1-2); nothing is known of him.

45 See O. Mørkholm, *Antiochus IV of Syria*, 1966, 98; Bar-Kochva (n. 39), 468, for other examples of this summer festival being used for special celebrations.

46 Polyb. 29.27.1-13; Livy 45.12.3-8; Diod. 31.2

47 See Ferrary (n. 16), 562, who argues that the procession of Ptolemy II celebrated the Ptolemaic victory in the Syrian War following Seleucus' death (cf. E. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique*^{2}, 1979, 139-41).

the procession.[48] Mørkholm queried this assumption as too much like a sham; but his premature death prevented his witnessing the spectacle of the decisively defeated dictator of a country lying within the boundaries of the former Seleucid kingdom celebrating the 'mother of battles' to considerable internal applause; and reliable information of distant events will have been far more difficult to obtain then than now. The forces taking part in the parade — there were 16,000 mercenaries, more than were fielded at either Raphia or Magnesia — must have been costly to raise and maintain;[49] so perhaps the event was also planned as a send-off, in the Macedonian manner, for Antiochus' eastern campaign, which probably set out in spring 165.[50]

The fact that this procession (unlike that of Ptolemy) *began* with the parade of troops indicates a shift in emphasis towards the military element. The march past of some 45,000 troops of various sorts[51] headed by 5,000 clad in Roman *loricae hamatae* was a significant and challenging gesture, which confirms Diodorus' statement (31.16) that Antiochus, unlike 'the other kings', flaunted his policy of confrontation' — a remark perhaps taken from Polybius, who was ill-disposed towards that king. Rank after rank of soldiers could have made a boring start to the celebrations, but this part of the procession was enlivened by the use of coloured shields in various metals — bronze, silver and perhaps gold[52] — gold trappings, purple tunics with gold-embroidered designs, and elephants and chariots. Elsewhere it was distinguished by features similar to those in the Alexandrian festival, *viz.* luxury items such as the parading of 800 ivory tusks, and vast quantities of gold and silver plate, with a stress on gold, the great symbol of wealth, throughout.

---

48 Polyb. 30.26.9. This passage speaks of robbery (ἐνόσφιτο) and treachery (παρασπονδήσας) toward Philometor, παιδίσκον ὄντα. This is bound to recall the attack planned by Philip V and Antiochus III on another boy-king of Egypt, Epiphanes, an incident which Polybius set at the heart of the structural plan of his *Histories*, interpreting Roman success as the instrument of the punishment inflicted by *Tyche* on the two bandit kings (see Walbank, 'Supernatural paraphernalia in Polybius' *Histories*', *Venture into Greek History*, ed. I. Worthington, 1994, 28-42).

49 For the figures see Polyb. 30.25.4-5; dependent on his source, they are of course subject to the doubts which surround most ancient statistics of troop numbers.

50 Cf. C. Habicht, *CAH* VIII[2], 1989, 345 n. 75. *Macc.* 3.37 puts his departure in *SE* 147, which, on the Macedonian reckoning, is aut.166-aut.165. A departure in spring would not (*pace* Bar-Kochva [n. 39], 468-9) have involved keeping the mercenaries under arms for too long a time after the procession.

51 For a tabular comparison of the forces at Daphne, Raphia and Magnesia see Bar-Kochva (n. 39), 34.

52 Cf. Polyb. 30.25.5; in my note *ad loc.* in the *Commentary* I rejected the inclusion of *chrysaspides*. But I was wrong to restrict mention of these to Pollux 1.1175. As a reviewer pointed out, the word also occurs in Plut. *Eum.* 14.5, in *Macc.* 6.39 and in Onasander 1.20.

Antiochus also incorporated almost 300 *theoroi* in the procession[53] instead of treating them merely as spectators and guests at the banquet (as Ptolemy had done). In that way he contributed to the picture of a realm lying at the centre of world interest — an impression which it was hoped they might carry back to their cities.[54] Their position in the procession, between the 1,000 sacrificial oxen and the 800 ivory tusks, is not perhaps as odd as it seemed to Schweighaeuser,[55] for it both provided variety and set them between two examples of Antiochus' wealth, prestige and magnificence. The procession also included a vast number of statues of divinities, *daimones* and likenesses (*eidola*) of heroes; the representations of the myths associated with the latter may have been pictures or tableaux (like the Dionysiac myths in the Alexandrian procession). Finally there were symbolic representations of such natural opposites as Night and Day, Earth and Heaven, Dawn and Midday, reminiscent of the Morning and Evening Stars at Alexandria.[56] Here too visual effects were supplemented by the sprinkling of perfume.[57]

The presence of 800 ephebes as a separate and distinctive unit in the later, non-military section of the procession shows that these youths had not yet been taken into the army. But whether, following Macedonian precedent,[58] the Seleucid kingdom preserved the *rites de passage*, which accompanied such incorporation in Macedonia, is not recorded. The organisation of ephebes as a special corps concerned with frontier protection and other 'Home Guard' duties is a development found at Athens and elsewhere well before the Hellenistic period.

Unlike Alexander, neither Ptolemy II nor Antiochus IV took part in the procession in person, evidently preferring to be seen as the power behind it. They were of course rulers of lands (temporarily) at peace, whereas Alexander was always very consciously leading an army on campaign and so naturally paraded with his troops. Antiochus' role is represented, rather absurdly, as that of a steward actually supervising the procession.[59] But Polybius' picture of Antiochus appears somewhat hostile, either because of his admiration for Aemilius Paullus or because his source dealing with that king was hostile — or indeed

---

53 Reading θεωρίαι at Polyb. 30.25.12 for the MS θεωρία; the words βραχὺ λείπουσαι τριακοσίων slightly favour this rather than Casaubon's θεωρίδες, since had individual attendants (of Bacchus or Apollo) been indicated, their number is likely to have been made up to 300. See my *Commentary* III, *ad loc.* for discussion.

54 Some no doubt came from Seleucid held cities; cf. Bunge (n. 39), 68-9.

55 One may assume a slight break in the procession to allow for cleaning operations following the passage of the 1,000 oxen.

56 Polyb. 30.25.15; and see above n. 16; for the Year and Hours in the Ptolemaic procession see Athen. 5.198A-B. Such cosmological personifications are not uncommon in Hellenistic times. The third-century relief showing the 'Apotheosis of Homer', found at Bovillae and now in the British Museum, identifies Ptolemy IV with *Chronos* and Arsinoe, his wife, with *Oikoumene*.

57 Polyb.30.25.17.

58 See n. 4.

59 Cf. Polyb. 30.26.4; Diod. 31.16.2; the marginally more favourable traits in Diodorus may go back to Polybius, and may have been omitted by Athenaeus.

because Athenaeus has been selective; the account in Diodorus is slightly more balanced.

4.

The two Hellenistic processions discussed above are exemplary of a highly intensive activity in the field of public relations and propaganda exercises continuously conducted by rulers of the Hellenistic kingdoms both before and after Rome appeared on the scene. The slant and emphasis of this activity necessarily changed with the political climate; though conforming to type, each manifestation was a response to a particular situation in a particular time and place. Both processions, though over a century apart and occurring in different kingdoms, were directed first and foremost towards the world of the Greek states and the Greco-Macedonian populations within the other kingdoms. (What exactly Greco-Macedonian had come to mean by the second century is a separate problem which cannot be considered here.) This does not mean that Ptolemies and Seleucids were blind to the importance of non-Greeks within their kingdoms, of Egyptians, spread all over Egypt, and of Persians, Babylonians and other peoples, living especially in the eastern parts of the Seleucid territories. The role of the Ptolemies in connection with native temples as both builders and sharers in their cult is well attested; and there is good evidence for the involvement of the Seleucids in Babylonian religious rituals.[60] The processions are, however, an indication that Greco-Macedonian affairs continued to be at the heart of royal concern. All the major Hellenistic powers were Mediterranean based. Antioch (not Babylon or Seleucia-on-the-Tigris) was where Antiochus chose to assert his undiminished power, his 'victory' and his forthcoming campaign in the east; and like Ptolemy, he did this in a Greek environment and linked it with the Greco-Macedonian pantheon. His personal image conformed to the Hellenistic concept of the ideal prince. As long as they survived, these intermarrying dynasties continued to present themselves proudly as Macedonian. A new and significant expression of this attitude in the third century BC is to be found in a recently discovered papyrus[61] containing a poem by the Macedonian Poseidippus, in which Ptolemy II is represented as taking pride in his origins in Eordaea and his use of the Macedonian tongue.

It was this shared Greco-Macedonian culture that the Romans confronted from the third century onwards and quickly realised that they must make their own. To win wars was not enough. They had also to engage successfully in traditional forms of peaceful rivalry, exploiting the opportunities for self-enhancing cultural patronage and religious celebration exemplified in the processions we have been considering. It was in this same Greco-Macedonian context that Rome claimed her place both as the avenger of Troy and as the

60 See, for Egypt, D.J. Thompson, *Memphis under the Ptolemies*, 1988, especially 106-54; and, for the Seleucids, A. Kuhrt in A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White, *Hellenism in the East* (n. 1), 52.

61 Information given in a lecture by G. Bastianini.

successor to Alexander's imperial power; and conquered Greece, in the person of the Greek historian Polybius, placed her firmly at the centre of the Hellenistic world, when he interpreted the Roman rise to ecumenical domination as the instrument employed by *Tyche* to avenge the wrongs inflicted on Egypt by kings of Macedonia and Seleucid Asia.[62]

Peterhouse, Cambridge

62 See n. 47.