

MONEY, POWER, AND GENDER:
EVIDENCE FOR INFLUENTIAL WOMEN REPRESENTED ON INSCRIBED BASES
AND SCULPTURE ON KOS

A Thesis presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by
NAOMI RUTH KALOUDIS

Dr. Susan Langdon, Thesis Supervisor

May 2007

© Copyright by Naomi Kaloudis 2007

All Rights Reserved

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the thesis entitled

MONEY, POWER, AND GENDER:
EVIDENCE FOR INFLUENTIAL WOMEN REPRESENTED ON INSCRIBED BASES
AND SCULPTURE ON KOS

presented by Naomi Kaloudis,

a candidate for the degree of Master of Arts,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Susan Langdon

Professor Kathleen Slane

Professor James McGlew

I would like to thank my mother, father, and brother for their support and willingness to listen to every word I had to say no matter how trivial for then, now, and the journey still to come....

In my couple years in graduate school I learned to appreciate Socrates' statement the: $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\omicron\iota\delta\alpha$ $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$ $\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\omicron\iota\delta\alpha$.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the professors in my thesis committee for all their help throughout this process. I would like to thank Professor Langdon for advising me over the past months. I would like to also thank Professor Slane for her knowledge and input on the Hellenistic period when I was stuck in my research. Finally, I want to thank Professor McGlew for his understanding while I was writing my thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	v
Chapter	
1. HISTORY OF KOS AND THE DODEKANESOS.....	1
Koan Women Benefactors: Assessing the Evidence.....	13
2. SURVEY OF INSCRIPTIONS AND SCULPTURE.....	19
Kos and the Dodekanesos.....	19
Koan Inscriptions.....	19
Koan Sculpture.....	26
Inscriptions of the Dodekanesos.....	37
Sculpture of the Dodekanesos.....	39
Comparanda.....	41
Delian Inscriptions.....	41
Delian Sculpture.....	43
Samothracian Inscriptions.....	45
Samothracian Sculpture.....	46
3. ROLES OF WOMEN IN THE HELLENISTIC EAST.....	48
Economic and Cultural Conditions of Private Women.....	48
Women in the Priesthood.....	55
The Role of Royal Benefactor.....	60
4. SCULPTURE AND INSCRIPTIONS: WHAT DO THEY MEAN?.....	66
Women in the Public Sphere on Kos as Priestesses of Demeter.....	66

Was there an Influence Coming from Egypt Concerning Women's Status?.....	71
Kos and Comparanda.....	76
Portrait Sculpture in Bronze.....	83
How is Kos Different?.....	89
CONCLUSION.....	94
APPENDIX	
1. CATALOGUE OF KOAN MATERIAL.....	98
2. INSCRIPTIONAL COMPARANDA.....	136
Dodekanesos.....	136
Delos.....	140
Samothrace.....	142
3. SCULPTURAL DEDICATIONS ARRANGED BY DATE.....	144
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	146

Chapter 1: History of Kos and the Dodekanesos

In the Hellenistic period females from different social classes, including women from the private sphere, priestesses, and queens, gained increased economic and social authority. These women had the luxury of making donations to the *demos* and to hold more religious authority. Through these networks, women were the objects and agents of honors and dedications. These awards were represented in sculpture and inscribed on sculpture bases. Kos, however, appears to be an anomaly in the Hellenistic world because of the extreme amount of power women appeared to wield, whether as wealthy women of the upper class, as priestesses to the large cults of the island, or as visiting queens from nearby Egypt or Caria. Circumstances happening during the transition into the Hellenistic world appeared to have opened up whole new avenues for female participation in the public sphere in the Greek East as a whole; however, in comparison to its regional brethren Kos stands out in the Dodekanesos for its claim to strong, independent female benefactors.

The island of Kos naturally is more hospitable than the other islands of the Dodekanesos. It is greener and more fertile with its natural springs than the surrounding islands that are browner and rockier. Kos has one natural harbor and also one artificial harbor that were built before its *synoecism* in 366 B.C. for the new capital. The natural harbor lies on the island's south coast at the city of Halasarna which sheltered ships from the northern winds during the sailing season by the island's mountain. There is also a landing point by Astypalaia at the bay of Kamares. Otherwise, the south coast is lined by

cliffs and not suitable for port.¹ The Koans chose Kos for their new capital as a location that provided the best trading point between Halikarnassos and the island, which was the main trading route of the time, and quickly built a harbor. The new agora was also built at this time and close to the harbor in order to facilitate commerce and trade.²

Additionally, the ancients quarried two types of marble on Kos. One type was a dark grey stone that came from a quarry near Kephalos. The other marble was white and was quarried from a spot on Prophitis Ilias near Kardamina. The white marble on Kos is much stronger than that which is found on Rhodes. By the Hellenistic period both Koan marbles were fully being exploited.³

Kos appears in history as an important bridge between Asia and Europe. It is one of the largest islands of the Dodekanesos at 286 square miles, only smaller in size than the two neighboring islands of Rhodes and Karpathos. However Kos was not alone; the whole of the Dodekanesos shared in this strategic positioning. These islands' good fortunes depended on their strategic, political, and economic relations between Asia and Europe. Its geographical location between Halikarnassos and Knidos at the entrance of the Ceramian gulf and its possession of a good harbor naturally provided Kos with close relations to both Rhodes and Egypt in political and economic aspects.⁴ Also, the Koans' intellectual vitality attracted favorable attention from great monarchs of the time, including Alexander the Great whose own court painter Apelles was born somewhere on the island.⁵

¹ Sherwin-White 1978, 52.

² Sherwin-White 1978, 68.

³ Sherwin-White 1978, 19-20.

⁴ Rostovtzeff 1967, 240.

⁵ Paton and Hicks 1990, xxxiii.

The economic conditions of Kos are better known than any other island of the Aegean.⁶ Literary works such as the *Mimes* of Theokritos and of Herondas describe many different features of Koan life. The island continued to be mainly an agricultural community. Its soil was fertile and the Koans were able to grow enough wheat and barley for its people. Kos also produced excellent wine, abundant timber and made considerable revenue from fishing and its silk manufacturing.⁷ The wine trade prospered and the harbor dues it established supplied the island with ready cash. The number of Koan stamped handles has been small in comparison to Rhodian and Knidian stamped handles from jars, although they appear in many different parts of the Eastern Mediterranean along the western and northern coasts of the Black Sea bear testimony to a wide area of export for Kos. Höghammar believes that the multitude and distribution of the stamped and unstamped Koan handles provides evidence indicating a continued prosperity on Kos, at least for those Koans “involved in the growing of grapes and the selling and export of wine.”⁸

Of all the islands of the Dodekanesos, Rhodes remained politically and economically the most prominent. Since the remaining islands were always under the supremacy of either Rhodes or Kos, they did not make a name for themselves as places of much wealth or economic authority. The goal of Rhodes was to prevent any one power from superseding another. The islanders did this for economic purposes. If there was no dominating state then Rhodes could remain one of the premier trading nations in the Hellenistic world without rivalry and the island could continue carrying products as far as

⁶ Rostovtzeff 1967, 236-7.

⁷ Rostovtzeff 1967, 240-1.

⁸ Höghammar 1993, 35-6.

Egypt and the Black Sea.⁹ Therefore, peace in the seas was extremely important to Rhodian commerce. The successful Rhodian trade is revealed in the number of stamped handles of Rhodian jars in various centers of the Greek world. The rapid coinage standard introduced by Rhodes soon after its *synoecism* in 408/7 was used by many of the islands and towns of Asia Minor, cities of the Hellespont and the Propontis and Thrace. Phoenician merchants used Rhodes as a port of transaction between northern territories and western both as a port and a clearinghouse.¹⁰

Not much is known about the history or development of Kos before its *synoecism* when a clear picture of its history can be understood.¹¹ Strabo mentions that the *synoecism* and foundation of Kos city was a result of *stasis*, although he does not give any reason for the civil strife, and not by the intervention of a ruling power like as what happened with Mausolos at Halikarnassos. Susan Sherwin-White therefore supplies three main causes for the *synoecism*. Her first suggestion relies on Epaminondas' attempt to form a Boiotian naval fleet against Athens by allying with members of the Second Athenian League and the Aegean islands. However, Epaminondas' fleet was not raised until 364 B.C., after Kos' *synoecism* and there is no evidence relating a Koan fleet with Thebes. Secondly, she sees a connection between Kos' *stasis* and the strife between pro-Athenian and pro-Spartan factions that loomed over the political climate since the end of the Knidian war. Lastly, Sherwin-White suggests that the cause of Kos' *synoecism* was a result of Mausolos' *synoecism* of Halikarnassos. Because the Koans feared the power of Mausolos, they decided to found a new city facing Halikarnassos in reaction to the Carian

⁹ Ager 1991, 10.

¹⁰ Rostovtzeff 1967, 227-9.

¹¹ Rostovtzeff 1967, 237.

satrap and they *synoecized* for protection.¹² I agree with Sherwin-White's conclusion and find the threat of Mausolos' power much more intriguing and plausible as a cause for Kos' *synoecism*. When one looks from Kos harbor towards Halikarnassos, the Carian city looms close by. Kos' visibility and proximity to Halikarnassos is understandably feared. However, she also describes a friendship, which formed between Kos and Mausolos when Caria supported Rhodes during the Social Wars (357-355) when it decided to revolt against Athens. She also shows Kos running to the protection of Caria by the end of the 360s with the Athenian invasion of Samos. Kos found Athens threatening and in fact welcomed and sympathized for the Samian exiles.¹³ It appears, however, that Mausolos' actions held a politically profound place in the *synoecism* of Kos.

The autonomy of Kos is uncertain around the time of its *synoecism*. In contrast to other Aegean communities (Samos, Thera, Crete, Delos and Halikarnassos) there is no evidence of Ptolemaic authority, such as governors and garrisons, and no taxes have yet been found in inscriptional evidence.¹⁴ In 364 both Kos and Rhodes fell under the supremacy of Caria. The democratic faction was moving fast to gain control on the island. However, the richer classes and the oligarchic party challenged the democrats with the help of Mausolos who wanted to encourage anti-Athenian sentiment. Mausolos found willing participants in the oligarchic powers of Chios, Kos, and Rhodes. From this coalition the Social Wars ensued. The war ultimately determined the high ranking of Kos in the Aegean.¹⁵ In 339 when Philip II of Macedonia besieged Byzantium, Chios, Kos

¹² Sherwin-White 1978, 64-5.

¹³ Sherwin-White 1978, 71.

¹⁴ Höghammar 1993, 20.

¹⁵ Paton and Hicks 1990, xxix.

and Rhodes responded to Byzantium's appeal since at the time the three islands were in league with Athens against the great Macedonian king. This strategic response suggests that the islands must have carried their own autonomy and independence. Koan history is more vague after its Macedonian capture in 332.¹⁶ Alexander the Great contracted for himself medical physicians from Kos on his campaigns through Asia and the Macedonian king even freed the island from the control of the Carian tyrants giving Kos a period of prosperity in the mid-fourth century.¹⁷

When Ptolemy I quit using the island as his base in 308 B.C. after an unsuccessful campaign in the Peloponnesos, Antigonos rolled in and gained naval supremacy. From 306-286 Kos was affiliated with the Antigonids, but it is unknown whether Kos remained independent during this period. However, it is known that the ruler could demand whatever he wanted from the Koans.¹⁸ The refusal of the Rhodians, who were in close relationship with Kos, in 306 to join Antigonos' expedition against Ptolemy demonstrated their determination to maintain friendly relations with Ptolemy and to preserve a growing trade between Rhodes and Alexandria. After a long sojourn on Kos, where Ptolemy I Soter and his wife Berenike enjoyed their retirement and received the best medical advice in 309/8, Berenike gave birth to Philadelphos.¹⁹ This event is recorded by Theokritos' seventeenth idyll.²⁰ Like many intellectuals, the Ptolemies spent summers holidaying on the island.²¹ Kallimachos' *Hymn to Delos* (271/0) and Theokritos' *Encomium to Ptolemaios* (276-272/1) refer to Philadelphos' sentimental ties to Kos as his birthplace.²²

¹⁶ Sherwin-White 1978, 85.

¹⁷ Rostovtzeff 1967, 237.

¹⁸ Höghammar 1993, 20.

¹⁹ Rostovtzeff 1967, 237.

²⁰ Paton and Hicks 1990, xxxii-iii; Sherwin-White 1979, 84.

²¹ Rostovtzeff 1967, 237.

²² Höghammar 1993, 20.

His birth here brought great honor to Kos and his relation brought the island much prosperous trade and its own autonomy.²³

Its close ties with Rhodes, its fine climate, and its proximity to Alexandria nurtured Kos to become one of “the most privileged ‘friends’ and ‘allied’ cities of Soter and Philadelphos” after a period of domination by Antigonos and Demetrios.²⁴ The “comparative looseness” of the Koan connection to Antigonos reflected Kos’ own independence at the end of the fourth century. In 286 Demetrios Poliorketes was defeated by Ptolemy I who then gained naval supremacy in the Aegean and the Nesiotic League, founded by Antigonos Gonatas around 314, became a major tool for Soter.²⁵ Whether it was Antigonos who restored Kos’ democracy and granted autonomy, or rather Ptolemy or Alexander, or the Koans themselves, is unclear.

The increased prosperity of Kos is shown in the building of the Asklepieion and it also seems that the Ptolemies left the island fiscally alone.²⁶ Kerstin Höghammar suggests that Temple B on the middle terrace was a dedication made by Philadelphos in addition to him constructing the entire sanctuary from 280 to 270.²⁷ Kos’ connection to the cult of Asklepios and the tradition of Hippokrates indeed helped the island to achieve an aspect of “holiness and medical wisdom” in the Hellenistic period²⁸ and won them high regard in the intellectual sphere and in court off Alexandria. The island was affluent during most of the Hellenistic period, as shown by the extensive building programs both in the Asklepieion and in the capital in the third and second centuries.²⁹ The Asklepieion

²³ Sherwin-White 1978, 84.

²⁴ Höghammar 1993, 20.

²⁵ Höghammar 1993, 20.

²⁶ Sherwin-White 1978, 96.

²⁷ Höghammar 1993, 21.

²⁸ Buraselis 2000, 1.

²⁹ Höghammar 1988, 195.

itself became an international sanctuary and festival site in 242.³⁰ Thus, the island thrived as a health resort and medical school due to the Asklepieion. Kos' contact with Egypt continued into the second century B.C. The annexation of Kalymnos into the Koan state under conditions of friendship and alliance with a Ptolemy should most likely be dated under the reign of Epiphanes, with the conception of the idea by Philopator.³¹ This relationship lasted supposedly until both islands became a part of the Roman province of Asia. Ptolemaic sovereigns continued to be economic benefactors to the island for several generations after Philadelphos. It is also interesting to note at this point that in 102, Kleopatra III is claimed to have deposited her treasure and grandchildren on Kos for safekeeping³² continuing a tradition of friendship and security between the Ptolemies and Kos.

After the Chremonidean War (265-60) when Macedonia was victorious over Athens, Antigonos Gonatas won a naval victory over Philadelphos off the shores of Kos around 258. Kos' island neighbor Rhodes derived much of its political power from the change in the political situation resulting from the decline of Ptolemaic power in the Aegean after 245 due to actions by Antigonos Gonatas, as reflected in certain Delian inscriptions. Gonatas never made an attempt to attract Rhodes into his political holdings. The ruler neglected his navy and allowed Rhodes to rule over the Aegean freely.³³ This action appears to have brought Kos closer to a political collaboration with Rhodes.³⁴ Since Rhodes was also a trading post with similar interests, Kos followed closely to the Rhodian foreign policy for the next fifty years. During the wars between the Diadochoi,

³⁰ Höghammar 1993, 21; Sherwin-White 1978, 111.

³¹ Buraselis 2000, 10.

³² Höghammar 1993, 28; Sherwin-White 1978, 135-7.

³³ Rostovtzeff 1967, 229.

³⁴ Buraselis 2000, 5.

Kos aligned itself with different coalitions, never sticking to one ally for strategic reasons. It is assumed that under Euergetes Kos and Egypt returned into close relations in 242.³⁵ At about 240 Kos sent embassies to the main rulers and especially to those with whom it was in close business contact, such as Euergetes I, Seleukos Kallinikos and Ziaelas of Bithynia, to ask for *asylia* of Kos' Asklepieion. In reply Ziaelas underlined the very close relations between Kos and Euergetes.³⁶

In the First Cretan War (205-201), Kos and Rhodes found themselves equally open to the assaults of Cretan pirates.³⁷ After the end of the First Macedonian War in 205, Philip V turned to the Aegean and Caria to manifest his holdings. His alliance with the Cretan pirates upset the waters. In 205/4 Philip encouraged a war between Crete and Rhodes, including its allies – Kos.³⁸ Diodorus (27.3) provides the only ancient account for the outbreak of the war: “With seven ships the Cretans began to engage in acts of piracy and plundered no small number of vessels. When as a result the merchants became dependent, the Rhodians made war on the Cretans recognizing that it was only a matter of time before the Cretans harmed them.”³⁹ An ancient inscription from Kos states that a certain Diogenes established a friendly relationship with the Ptolemies in Egypt and put his friendship into the service of his home city's (Kos) freedom during the First Cretan War.⁴⁰ During this time Kos found itself under repeated attacks from the pirates and needed support from Egypt.⁴¹ It seems as though Kos was able to survive the period up to around 200 B.C. without any serious stress to its local sovereignty before

³⁵ Höghammar 1993, 20-1.

³⁶ Rostovtzeff (1967, 240) cites inscription *Syll.3* 456, which states “...and because King Ptolemy, our friend and ally, is well disposed towards you.”

³⁷ Buraselis 2000, 5.

³⁸ Rostovtzeff 1967, 51.

³⁹ Perlman 1999, 132.

⁴⁰ Segre 1993, ED 229.

⁴¹ Buraselis 2000, 8.

Roman intrusion into the Eastern Mediterranean. This fact is due in large part to the island's early affinity with the dynasty of the Ptolemies. The result of the Cretan War was that Philip V was finally able to make an appearance in the Aegean with a strong fleet of ships which proved to be a match for both Rhodes and Pergamon.

The successors of the Ptolemaic dynasty were Rhodes and the Attalid kings of Pergamon because their main affiliation at the time was with Rome, which could offer economic aid through its political influences.⁴² During the Second Macedonian War (202/1-197), Philip V attacked Pergamene territory and some Aegean islands, including Kos, and this is the only known time in the Hellenistic period when enemy troops landed on Kos. In 200, Rhodes and Pergamon appealed to Rome for help in the Second Macedonian War in opposition to Philip V. The battle moved to the western Aegean and the mainland. Rome defeated Philip V by 197 while under the control of T. Quintus Flamininius.⁴³ A base was in fact found on Kos dedicated to Flamininius in the year of his consulship in 198 indicating the island's friendship with Rome after the war.⁴⁴ By 197, Rhodes' power grew including supremacy over Kaunos, Halikarnassos, Myndos and Samos under the rule of Antiochos III. The standing of Kos during this time was probably similar to Rhodes, but a smaller state. Therefore, it appears that Kos took a position to maneuver between the larger powers of the area in the same way Rhodes was doing between the Hellenistic kingdoms.⁴⁵ By 166 Rhodes lost most of its power and its navy was shrinking. By 164 the island secured an alliance with Rome.⁴⁶

⁴² Buraselis 2000, 6.

⁴³ Höghammar 1993, 28.

⁴⁴ Sherwin-White 1978, 131.

⁴⁵ Höghammar 1993, 21-3.

⁴⁶ Höghammar 1993, 26-7.

The Mithradatic Wars during the 80's B.C. had little impact on Kos. When Mithradates VI of Pontos tore apart western Asia Minor during the first skirmish with Rome (89-5) most of the Aegean islands and the Greek mainland suffered. However, Kos appears to have successfully prolonged their traditional policy of keeping peace with all parties.⁴⁷ When the celebratory Romans arrived at Kos they had no reason to punish the Koans and they in fact protected the Asklepieion when Mithradates later landed on the island. In the period from around 67 to 49 after Pompey the Great defeated the pirates in the Aegean and the civil wars began, Asia Minor and the islands saw a period of renewed prosperity. One source of this income was the reintroduction of the Italian *negotiatores*, who became the leading businessmen in the area. According to Kerstin Höghammar, "The fact that the major part of the information we have about Roman *negotiatores* both in terms of inscriptions and literary sources relate to the period from c. 80 to c. 30 B.C., seems to indicate their importance at this period."⁴⁸ The period after the civil wars from 49 to 31 saw a distinct change in rule with the beginnings of the Roman Principate. Even with the aid of Rome, during the civil war following Julius Caesar's death the Koans were hit hard because they supported the losing side. Kos, along with Egypt, Rhodes, Syria, Cilicia, Bithynia, Chios, Lesbos, Smyrna, Miletos, the Cyclades, Athens, Achaia, Byzantium and Corcyra fought with Pompey lending the general 500-600 ships in aid against Caesar.⁴⁹ Brutus and Cassius left Italy for the East in 43 to form an army and navy for the upcoming battle with the Second Triumvirate, Mark Antony, Octavian, and Lepidus. There is not much literary evidence about the state of Kos after this battle. However, since Nikias, a well-known intellectual from Kos, was a close

⁴⁷ Höghammar 1993, 28.

⁴⁸ Höghammar 1993, 30.

⁴⁹ Rostovtzeff 1967, 993.

personal friend with Brutus and Cassius, Höghammar thinks that it is possible that Kos escaped “the most severe requisitions.”⁵⁰

After the civil wars ended in 31 B.C., the people of Kos found themselves again acting as sympathizers with the losing side. According to Dio Cassius (51.2.1) Octavian “punished the cities by levying money and taking away the remnant of authority over their citizens that their assemblies still possessed.” Strabo (14.657) and Pliny (*NH* 35.91) mention that Octavian sent back 100 talents from the Koan tribute for a painting of Aphrodite Anadyomene done by Apelles. Höghammar believes that this affirms the comparative affluence of Kos in this difficult period for the Aegean communities. However, the Koans did pay tribute to Rome until A.D. 53. Asia was a senatorial province and ruled over by a proconsul and since Augustus was *princeps*, he held final say over all provinces. Kos remained under the supremacy of the Roman Empire until A.D. 79 when the island again became autonomous. However, Höghammar points out that “by then, liberty was more a formal favor than a political reality.”⁵¹ Therefore, Koan prosperity during the Augustan period was not altogether lost, but drastically reduced. A series of earthquakes in the last quarter of the 1st century B.C. made Kos’ position worse.⁵² Three earthquakes hit the island within twenty years of each other. From an inscription found at Olympia of Koan provenance,⁵³ Rudolph Herzog recounts one of these earthquakes.

It is important to understand the history of Kos in order to fully grasp the political and social situation that the women of Kos of whom I am studying lived and thrived in.

⁵⁰ Höghammar 1993, 31.

⁵¹ Höghammar 1993, 32.

⁵² Höghammar 1988, 195.

⁵³ The Olympian inscription can be located in *IvOl* no. 53, lines 6 and 13.

Kos' autonomy throughout the island's history comes and goes. It seems to fall under the supreme power of the time, whether Caria, Egypt, Rhodes, or Rome. However, Kos still always appears to keep its own laws and customs. The remaining islands of the Dodekanesos, except for Rhodes, are always incorporated into its sphere of control with Kos often providing aid and legislation. The island's economy always prospered because of its fertile land, flourishing silk industry, and trade. The citizens of Kos therefore were able to amass personal wealth in many areas of economic ventures. The overall outline of Koan history I think helps the reader understand the effect of Kos' alliance with certain Mediterranean powers. Caria certainly had an impact on the politics and might have caused the *synoecism* of Kos. The strong bond between Egypt and Kos supports the idea that its queens' actions and benefactions influenced the Koans. Also, it is interesting to trace the rise and fall of Koan independence with the arrival of the Romans in East. When examining the inscriptions especially, these facets of the history of Kos become apparent in the understanding of the women who were honored and the affluence they may have held.

Koan Women Benefactors: Assessing the Evidence

The natural advantage of Kos and its friendly relations with the neighboring powers granted the island a steady prosperity through very difficult times. The prominence of wealthy women appears as a natural outcome, but in fact may be unique. I wish to investigate the monuments that commemorate female contribution to public life in order to determine whether Kos shares such a female prominence with the other parts of the Greek East during the Hellenistic period. I want to use the ancient material to

consider the roles of women in the Greek East during the Hellenistic period and to see whether a social and economic independence for women on Kos is an anomaly in the Hellenistic period. To test my question I am studying the honorary and dedicatory sculpture and base inscriptions, which include females as either the agent of the dedication or the recipient of the honor. Much of the sculpture is now missing, but the person or god that was once depicted is made clear from the inscription. Many of the monuments I study here I have in fact seen during my visits to the island. I also know well the modern culture of the island and do see a strong sense of female authority still today.

I separate the women into three categories corresponding to their roles in life: private benefactors, priestesses, and queens. Almost all of the priestesses on Kos belong to the cult of Demeter. In the Hellenistic period a number of priestesses made dedications in their own name and most likely with their own money. I hope to see whether priestesses held more economic independence in the Hellenistic period in the whole of the Greek East or if this trend is specific to Kos. Second, I am looking at the dedications and honors of queens to see how strong their influence was on Kos by the number of inscriptions and sculpture. The third category of female I look at I generally label as private. These are the women that do not appear to have held any function in society other than as wealthy benefactors. I place Roman women under this category because the Romans were not considered as royalty as non-royal, wealthy elite who held power. Finally, I compare inscriptions and sculpture from elsewhere in the Dodekanesos that I have been able to find from Rhodes, Telos, Karpathos, and Nisyros to see if there is

a regional trend of influential women or if Kos stands alone among its neighboring islands.

The authors of the publications in which these inscriptions and sculptures are cited provide all the dates of the inscriptions. The publications are referenced within the catalogue in the appendix for Kos and those from the other areas. I also use to a great extent the table produced by Kerstin Höghammar in her 1993 publication. The dates for the inscriptional material included here range from the end of the Classical period into the early Augustan period. Most of the inscriptions are dated epigraphically, which accounts for the sometimes-wide span of time to which they are attributed. However, a more exact date is given when an actual person or event can be traced historically.

The catalogue for Kos provides both the ancient Greek and the English translation of each honorary and dedicatory inscription. The inscriptions and sculpture have been set up in chronological order in the catalogue in order to show a rise and continuation/ or decline of female affluence on Kos. In addition, important aspects of the inscription, including the provenance, findplace, measurements, and material, along with the personal names, are all presented in the catalogue with the text when provided. The order of each catalogue entry starts with its date, sculpture subject, and provenance since these pieces of information are most important for the reader to understand in my analysis of the inscriptions. The catalogue comprises inscriptions connected with Koan women who interacted in the public sphere, including private women, priestesses, and royalty. These inscriptions also provide information for the sculpture dedicated when the statue is no longer extant. Not all of the bases carry such informative inscriptions, but the foot holes on the top surface provide evidence for a lost sculpture. The statues without inscriptions

are identified and dated by their style, iconography, and findplace. A couple catalogue entries do not appear in the final chart I have produced to help clarify what information can be gathered from the honorary and dedicatory inscriptions. I include them in my catalogue still because I think their understanding is important to my thesis statement.

In addition to the material from the Dodekanesos, I include sculpture and sculptural inscriptions from Delos and Samothrace as two islands that provide a good comparable analysis. I hope, through a comparison to these two important Hellenistic centers, to support my thesis that women on Kos held a comparably, and unusually, large amount of social and economic power in the Hellenistic East. At the end of the second century, Delos began to transform from a religious city into a mercantile one. The city's importance in the Aegean grew exponentially after 130; however its greatest prosperity lies between 110 and 88.⁵⁴ The direct relations established between Italy and the East rendered Delian transit useless and commerce was abandoned on Delos bringing about its commercial decline in the mid-first century B.C. Public life diminished and this is when the last dedication was made.⁵⁵ I use Delos for comparanda because its history is similar in many ways to that of Kos. It flourished first as a free port and then under the patronage of Rome during the Hellenistic period. Much money circulated around the island and portrait sculpture became a form of high art for all people of the upper class. The Ptolemies as well were great benefactors of the island. Both islands flourished as great ports in trade, produced world-renowned artists, and benefactions from Hellenistic rulers. Likewise, Samothrace saw a great period of prosperity during the Hellenistic period as a great cult center with donations by the Ptolemies. I expected that the island's

⁵⁴ Déonna 1948, 15.

⁵⁵ Déonna 1948, 18-20.

cult center and the benefactions of the Ptolemies would provide a similar amount of data to Kos. I assume that priestesses had set up some votive sculptures to their gods or that the Egyptian queens would be honored especially because of the great benefaction Arsinoë II.

From this collected information I want to study female autonomy chronologically, to see if there was any fluctuation up or down and for what reason. Did females on Kos show a form of independence in all three categories persistently throughout the Hellenistic period? Or, did Delos and Samothrace show more female independence? I am also looking at the number of dedications in each category to see where female autonomy on Kos could have originated. The number of dedications in honor of strong Egyptian queens and the island's close relationship and proximity to Alexandria may have influenced Koan women. I am also looking at the cult of Demeter and its connection to women. Kos alone had nine sanctuaries that popped up around the time of its *synoecism*. I then consider whether these priestesses do in fact show some social and economic independence through the number of dedications they set up within the sanctuary in their own name and with their own money. Finally, most of the women of the Hellenistic period who had sculptural dedications hold no public office. I intend to examine for what reason these women receive their money and social position that allowed them to make dedications. During the Hellenistic period women began to be presented in inscriptions without their *kyrioi*. Inscriptions are extremely formulaic, and so I argue that even the relaxing of this standard means a change in how women were perceived in society during the Hellenistic period. Formerly, the *kyrios*' name was used as a patronymic to identify the female; the lack of named *kyrioi* may support my claim

that females were obtaining their own independence. Therefore, my ultimate goal is to show the rise of female autonomy on Kos during the Hellenistic period and to see if the female ability to act alone is a regional occurrence or seen throughout the whole of the Greek East by comparing Kos and the Dodekanesos to Delos and Samothrace.

In summary, I hope that my analysis of the honorary and dedicatory inscriptions from Kos, the Dodekanesos, Delos, and Samothrace will sufficiently help prove my hypothesis. I am suggesting that the amount of collected material explains why women in the Hellenistic period are made noticeable in the public sphere. I see them entering society in three ways: as a queen, as a priestess, and as a wealthy private woman. Different facets of these roles that I have assigned these women facilitate their emergence. Private women in this period accrued enough of their own wealth to make dedications and benefactions to the *demos*. The Koans needed the service of a religious leader, which helped increase the temple economy. Queens also carried over with them a sense of personal strength, and this mentality may have inspired the female population of Kos. Therefore, I am examining the sculpture and inscribed bases to see if the actions of the females named support my hypothesis or not. I wonder if independently acting females appeared alone on Kos, or if there is a regional trend around the whole of the Dodekanesos. Also, I want to look at the sites of Delos and Samothrace to see if this is an occurrence focused around Kos or if can we see a rise in female affluence throughout the Greek East.

Chapter 2: Survey of Inscriptions and Sculpture

Kos and the Dodekanesos

Koan Inscriptions:

On Kos, elite women of the Hellenistic period were made prominent to and by the *deme* and for the first time made noticeable in large numbers. These women can be identified from the inscriptions found on the island. The inscriptions I chose to study are honorary and dedicatory. These inscriptions were found in six towns on Kos: Kos town, Kyparissi, Halasarna, Hippias, Isthmos (ancient Astypalaia), and at the Asklepieion. In all I have twenty-eight sculptural inscriptions: sixteen are honorary and thirteen are dedicatory. There are both the inscriptions that honor prominent females as recipients of the dedications and the dedications that reflect women as the agents of dedications. The largest share of the honorary inscriptions, seven, come from Kos town, six inscriptions were found at the Asklepieion, two from Halasarna and one from Isthmos. Of the dedicatory inscriptions, again the larger number, five, come from Kos town, four from Kyparissi, two from the Asklepieion, and one from Hippias. Therefore, women on Kos appear more often as the recipients of an honor than as agents of a dedication. It is not surprising that most of the inscriptions overall originate from the capital of the island and a major health sanctuary of the ancient world. Many of these inscriptions include either Hellenistic queens or Italian women. The capital and the sanctuary are the places with the most wealth and highest potential for visibility.

The type of stone of the inscribed base may or may not tell much about the status of the patron. Many of the earlier publications did not record much about the material.⁵⁶ Kos had its own marble supply and quarry and so did not have to import stone, unless desired, and many of the bases are made from this local stone.⁵⁷ The nicer bases were composed of a fine crystalline white marble of high quality. This stone was probably used for the patrons willing to spend more money. A blue marble with white striations was also used for some statue bases. This latter marble may be similar to the much weaker, coarse dull blue-grey marble found in the quarries of Rhodes at Mount Lartos. Even though the marble was weak, the Hellenistic sculptors still preferred the local stone for bases on Rhodes;⁵⁸ a similar course of action can be assumed for Kos. Therefore, it appears that as long as the coarser stone was not used for the sculpture, then the material of the base is not necessarily representative of the expense and care of the sculptor and patron.

Likewise, one can assume a certain level of care and attention by the person who inscribed the stone. The inscriptions are mechanical in both formula and appearance according to their function. In some finds even the faint chisel of a line, much like notebook paper today, can still be perceived on the surface of the stone. Knowing this, one assumes that the inscriber of the stone would pay close attention to the spelling and spacing of each letter in the inscription. However, Renate Kabus-Preisshofen notes that the inscription for Aristagore's sculpture of Hades dedicated at the sanctuary of Demeter at Kyparissi to Demeter (Catalogue 4) carries a couple of mistakes. The sculptor makes a

⁵⁶ Most of my information comes from excavations at the turn of the 20th century and the youth of the field of study may be the cause for the lack of specifics.

⁵⁷ Sherwin-White 1978, 19, no. 47.

⁵⁸ For the type and use of stone on Rhodes see Merker 1973, 6.

spelling error in the second line. For the word θυγάτηρ he mistakenly leaves out the “η”, noted by the parentheses around the letter in the inscription. Also, within the second line of the inscription the inscriber puts an extra space in the middle of her husband’s name, marked in the catalogue by the colon, between the alpha and rho. These errors carry two possibilities: the person was either illiterate or careless in his markings.

Mistakes in inscriptions are common. However, an honorary or dedicatory sculpture set within a sanctuary setting should encourage attention to detail. The dedications in the sanctuary of Demeter from the third century made by Aristagore and Leirio (Catalogue 5) were archaizing. Kabus-Preisshofen finds archaizing in the letters and word forms. This form is very odd for the work and the date of its creation, but appears in this sanctuary as a trend.⁵⁹ These can be dated close together based on the same archaizing tendency common to the end of the third century B.C.

In the late third or early second century, an inscription list was carved that announces the donations given to Demeter by the women named (Catalogue 12).⁶⁰ Mario Segre gives a provenance for this inscription as Kos town. This subscription list shows the duty that women shared in maintaining the sanctuary and the amount of wealth they apparently possessed to give in their own name and city. The last part of the inscription is missing and so we cannot know for sure for whom or what the donation was intended. It is apparent that this inscription suggests the wealth and social standing that priestesses held beginning in the beginning of the Hellenistic period. However, priestesses are not mentioned only. A female choragos, Arkesila, was also named as donating an unknown

⁵⁹ Kabus-Preisshofen 1975, 57.

⁶⁰ Although the names are not always clearly female, my research found evidence for each of these names to have been used for women on Kos. I found these names in the onomastikon provided by Sherwin-White, 1978.

amount of money to the sanctuary. Her occupation is the only other that was recorded within the list. Her position as choragos must have either been recent, unusual, or she made a lasting impression on the city in this position. Therefore, even though not all of their job titles are mentioned, other prominent working females of the city or island may have contributed to this list of donators. With the formal organization of the Greek cities in the East, females were strongly expected to contribute financially to civic life, or at least have an active participation. When the budget was not able to fund all expenditures women stepped in with their own wealth to help.⁶¹ In public subscriptions such as this one the women's names are featured prominently and speak for their own economic independence and responsibilities to the city.

Another inscription was set up by a priestess Aischron to Demeter as Soteira, Poseidon, and Kore as a dedication (Catalogue 13). This inscription can be dated by its lettering to the late third or early second century B.C. This dedication is just one that I know of that provides evidence for the importance held in the secret rites of the cult of Demeter as a mystery cult. Within the inscription she records that the child of Kronos, either Poseidon or Demeter, both who were capable of making the earth tremble, shook the earth while she and others were performing the sacred rites of Demeter. Aischron calls upon Demeter and Kore to stop the earthquake and save the land. The priestess received the desired result from her appeals to the goddess and apparently during the act of the sacred rites the thunder and tremors ended. In this inscription we can therefore take a look into the sacred rites of the mysteries of Demeter. Women must have been gathered at night to perform these rites when they were interrupted by these tremors. In order to pacify the god, the priestess Aischron, because not all of the women

⁶¹ van Bremen 1996, 37.

involved were priestesses, made the dedication. According to Sherwin-White, the time when Aischron set this dedication up to Demeter as Soteira was after the gods answered her prayers to end the storm and tremors.⁶² The relationship that women had with the cult and mysteries of Demeter was very strong and the initiates must have had a great reverence and trust in the goddess. One then may wonder how the rest of the inhabitants of the island used this cult for their own use in a time of political uncertainty, either for safety or for abundant food, especially since nine cults to Demeter appeared on Kos around its *synoecism*, itself an unstable time.

The inscriptions are important in interpreting the sculpture since most of the statues are no longer extant. Those statues set up by decree of the council and people were privileged as acknowledged persons and by the Hellenistic period these were always dedicated with political undertones. A statue was the highest honor a *deme* could bestow upon an individual for his/her benefaction.⁶³ Of the two inscriptions provided in honor of a queen, one is dedicated by the *deme* (Catalogue 10). A second inscription reveals that an Alexandrian named Kallimachos set up a second sculpture to Arsinoë III (Catalogue 11) for her and her family's beneficence. In all, inscriptional evidence shows that sixteen private women were honored, only one in the third century and the others during the time of Roman expansion in the East. Furthermore, only five are females of Koan citizenship, the remaining women were Roman.

Therefore, it appears that the social strata of Kos changed in the first century B.C. and Augustan period. Of the eleven inscriptions from this time period, fewer than half mention Koan women. However, an astounding six inscriptions are placed in honor of

⁶² Sherwin-White 1978, 311.

⁶³ Smith 1988, 16.

private Italian women. Two in honor of Iunia, daughter of Decimus (Catalogue 22 and 23), one for Cornelia, wife of T. Statilius Taurus (Catalogue 24) and three in honor of Iulia, the wife of Marcus Agrippa and daughter of Augustus (Catalogue 25, 26 and 27). These dedications were also scattered throughout the island. Only the one image of Iunia (Catalogue 22) was found in Kos town. Two dedications, Iunia (Catalogue 23) and Cornelia (Catalogue 24) were found within the Asklepieion sanctuary. And lastly, the three sculptures of Iulia were found in the demes of Isthmos (Catalogue 25) and Halasarna (Catalogues 26 and 27). Interestingly enough, both Isthmos and Halasarna have known Demeter sanctuaries. Plus, only at Halasarna do we find references to an Italian woman being represented on the likeness of a goddess, either Artemis or Leto. The inscription (Catalogue 26) describes the bronze image of Iulia in the likeness of the goddess Artemis, herself an image of strength and chastity; and also the inscription (Catalogue 27) as Leto, the divine mother of Apollo and Artemis.⁶⁴ Each of these inscriptions dealing with the Romans accompanied a statue and marked the females' high social standing.

The Roman period inscriptions are also characterized by their formula. When a Greek wants to clarify that someone is the son or daughter of someone else, they employ the genitive case to show possession. However, in Roman inscriptions the full word for son or daughter is always written out in the inscription with the use of the genitive case. This formula is used in Latin and in Greek as seen on the island of Kos. Catalogue numbers 22, 23, 25, 26 and 31 portray this occurrence. Catalogue 22 is the most interesting case because Kerstin Höghammar was able to date it accurately with knowledge of Roman epigraphical tendencies. If this inscription was just read as a Greek

⁶⁴ See Smith (1988, 48) for the significance of depicting a human in the image of a god/dess.

would write it, then it reads as if Iunia is the wife of Publius Servilius who is the son of Publius Isauricus. With this translation the dating of this inscription is unsure. However, if we read it correctly in consideration of the Roman formula, then she is actually married to Publius Servilius Isauricus, the son of Publius. Now we can date her husband as consul in the year 48 B.C.⁶⁵ After his consulship, Julius Caesar bribed him to act in the general's best interests and P. Servilius Isauricus was made governor of Asia from 46 to 44, the exact years that Höghammar dates the Iunia inscriptions to.

The Servilii tried to make their family independent, to try and be the connecting point between both factions of the war, so as not to back the side. This P. Servilius Isauricus was both liked by Caesar and related to Brutus, Cassius, and Lepidus. Iunia, the female honored in inscription catalogue number 22, is the half-sister of M. Junius Brutus, the same Brutus who conspired against and helped assassinate Julius Caesar. Iunia and Brutus shared the same mother Servilia, but had different fathers and interestingly both sides of the family were intimately connected with M. Porcius Cato as well through marriage and descent.⁶⁶ Even though P. Servilius Isauricus was liked and honored by Caesar with a title, his family ties must have hovered over him. He ended up siding with Cicero against the will of Caesar.⁶⁷ He indeed backed the losing side. I also wonder if his family's relationship to Brutus caused the entire island of Kos to back the losing side in this civil war as well. Furthermore, with another poor choice by the citizens of Kos, they backed the losing side of the battle between Octavian and Mark Antony. However, this bad decision was probably caused more by Kos' close

⁶⁵ For this entry in a list of proconsuls see Syme 1960, 526.

⁶⁶ For a diagram of the kinsmen of Cato see Syme 1960, Table II.

⁶⁷ Syme 1960, 136-7.

longstanding relationship with the Ptolemies and less by any animosity towards the Julii family.

Koan Sculpture:

Coin identification of royalty provides much evidence for the likenesses of the Hellenistic kings and queens. However, this is not an exact science because in comparison to Roman portraits there is no “fixed physiognomical analysis” for the Hellenistic monarchy.⁶⁸ The Hellenistic royal portraits were sculpted from a variety of materials and the most important were those sculpted in the round.⁶⁹ The sculptures that are listed in this catalogue are mostly of bronze or marble. One sculpture, however, of Arsinoë III (Catalogue 11) was sculpted from a black Egyptian stone. Traditionally, throughout the Ptolemaic period the statues of their royals were intended for Egyptian temples were made of an Egyptian hard stone.⁷⁰ The hard Egyptian black stone of Arsinoë III (c. 215-05) found on Kos is a good example. However, if R.R.R. Smith is correct in stating that these sculptures of hard stone were produced for native temples, then one wonders how this sculpture found its resting place on Kos. It is likely that Egyptian craftsmen who knew how to work the marble must have produced the sculpture in Egypt. The Alexandrian Kallimachos dedicated the honorific statue in the name of the Queen’s parents as gods and *euergetae* and probably then shipped it to Kos. Therefore, I question if the intellectual and economic connection between the Egyptian city and Kos inspired the intentions behind this man’s dedication.

⁶⁸ Smith 1988, 3.

⁶⁹ Smith 1988, 9.

⁷⁰ Smith 1996, 205.

In 1929 the small Eleusinian sanctuary of Demeter at Kyparissi was excavated between the modern villages of Pyli and Asphendiou. This sanctuary provides an interesting example of reshaping a sanctuary to suit new female identities. The sanctuary had its acme between for a relatively short period between the fourth and third centuries. The sanctuary is modest, built only out of blocks of rocks without a foundation on a square bed of chalk.⁷¹ In all, eight statues, though one is now missing (see Catalogue 1), were set up within the sanctuary. These statues were placed in a small square building, which measured about 5.10 by 5.35 meters and was placed within a surrounding wall, or temenos. Also, *bothroi* were found within the temenos full of terracottas and pottery typical of the Demeter cult. The under life-size statues were set up against the back wall according to their size with the middle sculpture now missing. This middle sculpture that was set up by Delphis (Catalogue 1) may have been the first set up because of its prime location in front of the entrance against the back wall. They all were so lined up to face the entrance of the building. Kabus-Preisshofen suggests that this Demeter sanctuary may be the small personal sanctuary of a rural wealthy family because she sees a relationship in the names of the dedicators. She proposes that the only known male dedicator, Melikandras, founded the sanctuary and that it was then reorganized into a female cult by the priestesses of Demeter within the family.⁷²

However, I would like to add on to this proposal that indeed this sanctuary began as a family cult, but grew to involve more participants. The two pits provide evidence for a greater cult use than just one family. The large quantity of terracottas and pottery show repetitive use and so does the necessity for the two pits. Therefore, I believe that the

⁷¹ Sherwin-White 1979, 28.

⁷² Kabus-Preisshofen 1975, 31-2.

small, rural sanctuary founded by Melikandras at the end of the fifth century developed into a sanctuary that took a part in the economic transactions between it and all devotees. In fact, Sherwin-White also makes a brief note that this sanctuary was not at all a small, rural private sanctuary. She believes that this sanctuary at Kyparissi belonged to the *deme* of the Halentioi and was not tied at all to one family.⁷³ I like to consider both scholars to be somewhat correct. Not straying to one argument more than the other, I think that this sanctuary probably began as a private sanctuary that grew into a more popular public site.

Within the sanctuary of Demeter at Kyparissi two private women dedicated marble sculptures. The sculpture dedicated by Lykourgis (Catalogue 2) in the fourth century of the goddess Kore was made from a shimmery translucent white marble and eighty centimeters tall.⁷⁴ It reflects the graceful S-curve of the Praxitelean figure and a lively style in the face. The oval face reveals delicate lines. The statue's strong facial asymmetry shows in the flattening of the cheeks producing a low *sfumato* effect. A *taenia* wraps around her head twice, once just below the hairline on the forehead and a second time crossing the top of her head. Her hair is enclosed within a *kekryphalos* and her head inclines in a gesture of modesty. Her outstretched left hand carried no attribute, but held some folds of her mantle. Kabus-Preisshofen suggests that the right hand carried a torch, which is an attribute of Kore. This Kore can also be compared to types with the same veiling and hairstyle found at the sanctuary of Demeter at Knidos.⁷⁵ Therefore, Kabus-Preisshofen wonders if Lykourgis was not honoring a Kore type that originated on

⁷³ Sherwin-White 1978, 312.

⁷⁴ Kabus-Preisshofen 1975, 39, pl. 13-4, fig. 1; Laurenzi 1932, fig. 45.

⁷⁵ Kabus-Preisshofen 1975, 40, fig. 17-8.

Knidos.⁷⁶ I see his argument in the basic elements of the head of the sculptures. Both female sculptures have their hair pulled back under a *kekryphalos* and a ribbon that wraps around this. However, the Demeter from Knidos has a straight profile whereas, this Demeter turns her head slightly down. Also, the face of the Knidian Demeter is much more slender and feminine, while the Koan Demeter is more angular and masculine. So it seems to me that Lykourgis may have been looking to the Demeter at Knidos for some influence, but there is too much dissimilarity to prove that she definitely wanted to follow its type.

Her body is clothed in a chiton cinched by a belt and wears a himation, which is draped around her like a veil. The himation over the left shoulder turns inward towards the back and passes under the right shoulder following the course of the arm up to the wrist. It returns under the left shoulder and recedes back to wrap around the left arm. The turn of the pose is more masculine and not at all graceful. The work exerts an impression of heaviness that is only saved in the sweet incline of the head and the faint expression of her lips. Laurenzi compares the gentle rendering of her lips to Attic funerary stelai of the fourth century. This figure also represents the wind-swept look in the drapery seen in such sculpture as the Nike of Paionios and it carries the massive weight of the *chlamys* of the Praxitelean Hermes.⁷⁷ This figure, therefore, reflects works originally produced in the late fourth century B.C.

Aristagore dedicated an interesting marble statue of the god Hades to Demeter (Catalogue 4). The god (85.5 cm) can be identified by his appearance and his polos as either Hades-Pluto or the god Theos, a mate of Demeter. He is dressed in a chiton and

⁷⁶ Kabus-Preisshofen 1975, 62.

⁷⁷ Laurenzi 1932, 172.

himation, which is doubled over in the front. Laurenzi believes that this sculpture held a *phiale* in his left hand this now missing and the other a scepter on which he leaned. He wears sandals that were painted in red. The paint is not easily seen on the black and white provided, but can be when viewed in person. The back part of the figure was left rough and unworked. Plus, a small pillar is pressed against the left foot, which probably stabilized the small sculpture. Both Laurenzi and Kabus-Preisshofen believe that the “Mantelstatuen im Typus des Maussollos” resembles this Koan figure.⁷⁸ Laurenzi continues the two sculptures’ similarities in its rigidity and in flexing the left leg, inverting the weight of the statue. The himation is rendered with harsh and angular folds also like the Mausolos figure. The body is comparable to the scheme of Mausolos, although the head follows a conventional type of severe Hellenistic chthonic god characterized by the ample mass of hair in the beard. The figure reveals its Hellenistic date by the disposition of the himation, in the falling movement of the folds that put into relief the richness of the colors, and more precisely the *contrapposto* and the effects of light in the folds much like that used in the Mausolos. Altogether, these features were meant to strike fear into its on-lookers, although the small stature of this figure makes this statement sound silly to a Modern audience.⁷⁹

Furthermore, this is an original sculptural depiction of Hades from the Late Classical period. As brother of Demeter and husband of Kore he is intimately connected with the cult. On the one hand Hades is connected to the two Eleusinian goddesses intimately by family, and on the other he characterizes the duality of death and life as the god of the Underworld and by being so connected with the vegetative goddesses. Kabus-

⁷⁸ For a picture of the Mausolos sculpture see Burn 2004, 20; Kabus-Preisshofen 1975, 59.

⁷⁹ Laurenzi 1932, 186-9.

Preisshofen suggests that this god once carried a donation bowl in his hand that is now missing and that this symbolizes his role as a donor of wealth; primarily grain. Demeter and Kore on numerous vase paintings and honorary reliefs of the Classical period surround a heavily bearded Hades with a donation bowl in one hand and a scepter in the other. This type also appears on an honorary relief in Chalkis from the mid-fourth century. On this relief Hades stands between Dionysos and the Eleusinian goddesses.⁸⁰ It appears, once again, that the patron of a sculpture from this small Demeter sanctuary commissioned a sculptural form from a known and famous sanctuary overseas.

Two other sculptures were found fallen one right next to the other with the Demetereion. This sculptural pair dedicated by Leirio (Catalogue 5 and 6) was made of white marble with small grains. Both were knocked off their base and broken, and the heads were found further away; the forearms were never recovered. The inscribed base dedicated by Leirio coincides with the youthful goddess Kore (50.5 cm) who is dressed in a chiton and himation. The arms may have fallen off easily because they were attached with hinges. Both dowel holes on each elbow run downward, which may suggest that both the lower parts of the arms were raised. This positioning suggests the same theme as the larger Lykourgis sculpture which holds one torch or a pair of torches in the hands.⁸¹ The hair is parted down the middle and folds over the temples with two large clumps of hair that are pulled back to the end of the ears, meeting in the back and enclosed by *kekryphalos*, like the Lykourgis Kore sculpture. The himation part of her right side covers the breast above the chiton and then passes at a sharp angle on the left shoulder across the back and returns below the right elbow across the left shoulder. This

⁸⁰ Kabus-Preisshofen 1975, 58.

⁸¹ Kabus-Preisshofen 1975, pl. 16-8, fig. 5; 51; Laurenzi 1932, fig. 53-4.

gives the himation the function of a small mantle.⁸² Her hair and body posture resembles the Kore dedicated by Lykourgis. The hair is similarly tied up in a knot behind her head and the layers of clothes hang off her body in the same way. The only striking difference is the more masculine characteristics of the Kore sculpture set up by Lykourgis.

The second statue (54.7 cm) dedicated by the priestess Leirio depicts Demeter (Catalogue 6).⁸³ She is clothed in a peplos and wears a polos on her head. Her hair is somewhat long and falls down the back of her head in the image of a goddess. However, it appears to be tied back behind her head as well. This hairstyle may represent her position as a matronly figure since she is the mother of Persephone. The lines were treated with care and are detailed and delicate, in contrast to her Kore partner that is larger by a few centimeters. The contours of the eyes stretch out and deepen creating a slight *sfumato* effect. The cheeks are smooth and pronounced and thin towards the chin making her face elongated and oval-shaped. She no longer holds a scepter, but Laurenzi believes that her left hand is so raised to hold up a long object.⁸⁴ A scepter is the most obvious suggestion and I agree with him. The S-curve of her body is so rendered that the area of her shoulders appear to be resting on a long, sturdy object that would have been in her left hand. Additionally, the folds of her drapery form naturally into thick wool. The heaviness of the material is revealed through the doubling of the large folds on the overfold of the peplos.

This statue and its Kore partner replicate the figures of Demeter and Kore represented in a votive relief from Eleusis from the fourth century now in the Louvre.⁸⁵

⁸² Laurenzi 1932, 179-83.

⁸³ Laurenzi 1932, fig. 52.

⁸⁴ Laurenzi 1932, 184.

⁸⁵ Laurenzi 1932, fig. 55.

Although these sculptures represent Late Classical types, they have characteristically Hellenistic proportioning with the small, hidden breasts and very delicate heads on long necks. Their long and oval faces and the glance of their heavy, half-closed eyelids give the faces taut noses and pursed lips. These appear to be individual characteristics that corresponded to the Alexandrian tastes of the third century B.C.⁸⁶ One marble head of a Kore sculpture (Catalogue 14) dedicated by the priestess Pythias to Demeter also carries the same individual characteristics common of the Hellenistic period and a slight *sfumato* in the delicate portrayal of her face.

In the first century B.C., the priestess Are commissioned the sculptor Philiskos from Thasos to create a sculpture of Demeter (197 cm) and she set this up within the limits of Kos town (Catalogue 20).⁸⁷ This statue represents a Hellenistic female dressed in a rich chiton with her right hand grasping her mantle. Her arms are covered beneath the drapery while the left hand grasps the folds of her mantle. She wears a veil that hangs down behind her head and her hair is parted down the center and tied back in a knot in the back of the head, an apparently common style for the Eleusinian goddesses during this century. The artist covers the figure with a thin veil and fines silks, probably the very expensive *Coae vestes*. Philiskos produced the sculpture in the “Little Herculaneum” type seen on Delos. According to Laurenzi, this example is of a Demeter type that began in the Hellenistic period, and its small, pursed lips and oval portrait-like face imitate the Praxitelean tradition.⁸⁸ I am unaware of any Demeter sanctuary within Kos town itself, but there may have been an open forum for which cult sculptures like these were set up.

⁸⁶ Kabus-Preisshofen 1975, 54.

⁸⁷ Laurenzi 1932, pl. 9, fig. 21.

⁸⁸ Laurenzi 1932, 115-6.

This sculpture at first glance easily resembles a sculpture of a wealthy female on Delos, for example the Kleopatra sculpture found within the House of Kleopatra. She carries the same *pudicitia* pose that we see in the “Little Herculaneum” type and a pulled back matronly hairstyle. The features are indeed very individualistic and could easily represent a once living woman. Therefore, it makes sense that Laurenzi also suggests that this sculpture may represent a Muse instead. In my opinion this suggestion carries more weight. Muses appear in forms similar to humans in art. I do not think that this is a sculpture of Demeter because of a few overwhelming factors. Her hair is more representative of the other Kore figures found in the sanctuary at Kyparissi than the Demeter sculpture dedicated by Leirio. Also, she does not hold any attributes of the goddess Demeter, or even of any goddess figure. Additionally, the lack of any Archaizing or Classicizing tendencies in this sculpture dedicated by Are makes me skeptical that it is a goddess. In the Hellenistic period, and later, there was a tradition to produce sculptures that look back to earlier art forms. Her comparison to the very Hellenistic Kleopatra is too close to persuade me of her Demeter identity, and so I think that Laurenzi’s second suggestion of a Muse is the closest identification.

This sculpture, however, provides another problem because it was found broken in two pieces a little distance from each other and reattached by conservation. Kabus-Preisshofen observes that the head of the sculpture (23.5 cm), detached from her body, looks like either Arsinoë or Kleopatra II or III (Catalogue 18) based on the personal characteristics of the face.⁸⁹ Therefore, this head could be meant to be separate from the body used in catalogue 20 and therefore representing a queen rather than Demeter as proposed by Laurenzi. I am keeping the two possibilities for the pieces of sculpture

⁸⁹ Kabus-Preisshofen 1989, 155.

separated into two catalogue numbers because their attachment and identity is uncertain. Also, the dating is thrown off by the two different suggestions. As previously stated, if this sculpture is connected to Are and the sculptor Philiskos of Thasos, then she is dated to the first century B.C. On the other hand, if this sculpture depicts one of the queens, then the head separately is dated to the end of the second century B.C. Like the Kore sculpture dedicated by the priestess Pythias (Catalogue 14), the head of Arsinoë or Kleopatra II or III carries the same individual characteristics and *sfumato* affect common of portraits of the Hellenistic period.

The queens will also often, but not always, wear a veil over the top or back of the head, like Ada (Catalogue 3), in place of a *stephane*, or diadem.⁹⁰ The Ada, larger than life (202.5 cm), is left almost fully intact except for a clean break through her lap line. She wears a veil that appears to be a himation that she has draped across her front from her right shoulder to below her left arm and then up over the back of her left shoulder. The extra drapery is then pulled over the back of her head to cover the top of her head. As is the use of a *kolpos* veil, she uses the overhanging above her chest to cover the lower part of her face.⁹¹ The schematic linearity and the rich *sfumato* effect is characteristic of the Hellenistic period.⁹² She carries the Praxitelean S-curve faintly noticeable under the folds of her drapery. Her left leg is the weight-bearing leg and her right leg extends effortlessly to the side sticking out from beneath the chiton. Likewise, her right arm is strained as it reaches up leaving her left arm pulled close to her frame holding the excess of her himation.

⁹⁰ Smith 1988, 89.

⁹¹ For a description of the *kolpos* veil, which originated in the 5th century, see Llewellyn-Jones 2003, 59.

⁹² Laurenzi 1932, 130.

Kabus-Preisshofen has identified the sculpture as Queen Ada of Caria on the basis of coin representations. This makes sense given the political situation at the time. More than a generation passed between the *synoecism* of Kos (366 B.C.) and the liberation of the island under Alexander the Great when Kos was under the protection of the Carian dynasty. Numismatic material shows that Mausolos already established a relationship with Kos by the end of the 360s.⁹³ Kos produced coins with the image of Mausolos in a lion's skin in the image of Herakles on the obverse. Eventually, females of the Carian dynasty, starting with Artemisia, began to appear on coinage alongside Mausolos sporting the typical "curly-knob" hairstyle of the Carian dynasty.⁹⁴ The appearance of Mausolos on the coins produced on Kos shows his importance to and his authority over the island. Mausolos took over the satrapy of Caria in 377/6 and ruled until his death in 353/2. After the Social Wars, Caria annexed Kos and Rhodes into its sphere of influence. His intent was to transform the satrapy of Caria into an empire incorporating the Greek cities along the coast of Asia Minor and the neighboring islands making a power to rival such large Greek cities as Miletos.⁹⁵ Therefore, the Carian dynasty must have held some sway for the Koan citizens and the large sculpture of Ada provides some evidence for Caria's continuing power after the death of Mausolos. She either performed some great act of beneficence for the citizens or was looked upon with such a great admiration that she very well may have influenced the female population on Kos.

Towards the end of the third century a likeness of Queen Arsinoë II (22 cm) was set up in Kos town (Catalogue 7). Kabus-Preisshofen believes that this sculpture is the earliest and closest known likeness of the queen represented in sculpture on Kos. There

⁹³ Sherwin-White 1978, 71.

⁹⁴ Kabus-Preisshofen 1989, 84-5.

⁹⁵ Sherwin-White 1978, 68-9.

is no doubt that it is Arsinoë II because her physiognomy is unmistakable from images on coins. Another portrait head of Arsinoë II that is similar to the Koan sculpture has been found at Pergamon within the Temple of Demeter that dates to the first third of the third century B.C.⁹⁶ The only physical discrepancy is in the more ideal characteristics of the Pergamene head. The Koan Arsinoë II carries much stronger and drier features and actually bears closer resemblance to the bronze image of the Goddess from the Sea⁹⁷ in her very flat construction and strong but simple features. The play of the cheek muscles and rough construction of the front of the hair and the drapery folds are also comparable. However, its comparison to the physical characteristics depicted on coinage of the Egyptian queen makes this sculpture Arsinoë II. As presented in the sculptural remains of just Ptolemaic queens on Kos, the beneficence of the Ptolemies in general cannot be doubted. These honorary sculptures represent their long and friendly relationship with the island of Kos.

Inscriptions of the Dodekanesos:

Of the Dodekanesos, Rhodes supplies the largest number of female honorary and dedicatory inscriptions.⁹⁸ These range from the very end of the fifth century through the Augustan period. These inscriptions are inscribed on blocks mined from the quarry at Mount Lartos, with one exception. One base for Iulia, the daughter of Caesar (9-6 B.C.), was composed of a brilliant white marble with blue veins.⁹⁹ The fact that Iulia is from a prominent Roman family could account for the pricey import. Of the seventeen honorary

⁹⁶ Schober 1951, 50, ill. 10.

⁹⁷ Kabus-Preisshofen 1989, pl. 20.2.

⁹⁸ For a translation and citation of these inscriptions see Appendix II Dodekanesos catalogue.

⁹⁹ See Appendix II Dodekanesos Catalogue 7.

and dedicatory Rhodian inscriptions, I recorded only two Roman female elites and one Ptolemaic queen, in this case Arsinoë III.¹⁰⁰ It is important that Roman women are mentioned because in the last decade of the first century B.C., I only record four dedications being made including females. Two dedications were set up in honor of Livia and Iulia. Plus, two dedications, which include the priestess Nikassa Myonideus, were both made in her honor.¹⁰¹ The lack of Ptolemaic dedications contrasts greatly with Kos. The close relationship carried between Kos and Alexandria was never shared to the same intimate extent with Rhodes.

Furthermore, among the dedications I only find three females who were definitely priestesses, twelve private women and two Roman women. I also want to include in this thesis a subscription list composed entirely of female contributors from the first century B.C.¹⁰² Some women in the list are named with their *kyrios* and some without. In all, it enumerates eight or nine Rhodian citizen women and twelve foreigners from Asia Minor and the Near East. The list shows that these citizen women contributed thirty-six drachmas and the foreigners an average of 8.75 drachmas. These contributions most likely had a cultic purpose. The fact that some women were named without their *kyrios* shows a degree of independence from the male members of the family in actions of an economic nature.¹⁰³

The remaining islands of the Dodekanesos reveal very few female honorary and dedicatory inscriptions in comparison to Kos and Rhodes. Their dependence on the two islands may account for this. Throughout Greek history, Kos or Rhodes seems to have

¹⁰⁰ The dedication including Queen Arsinoë III is found in Dyggve and Poulsen 1960, no. 161.

¹⁰¹ These four dedications can be located in Appendix II Dodekanesos Catalogue nos. 7-10.

¹⁰² See Appendix II Dodekanesos Catalogue 13.

¹⁰³ Pleket et. al. 1996, 170.

always held supremacy over the other twelve islands because of their wealth, which was produced from their excellent trading ports. The other islands never seemed to gain the same amount of supremacy. Their position between Greece and Asia Minor did not offer good trading ports and the islands did not produce exports like Kos and Rhodes. The inscriptions I found range from the fourth century to the Augustan period.¹⁰⁴ Among these islands I came across three inscriptions from Astypalaia ranging from the fourth to third centuries. One inscription shows a private woman making a dedication to a minor god and two show a priestess making two dedications, one to Athena and the other to Hera. The island of Telos only offers one inscription by a family honoring their mother in the second century and Karpathos provides one example of a female honored as a citizen of Karpathos, which means she probably contributed to the economy of the island in some form. The tiny island of Nisyros offered one dedication made in honor of Kallithemis, who was a Rhodian, in the third century.

Sculpture of the Dodekanesos:

The main body of sculpture from Rhodes has the same composition as the sculpture from Kos. The island also preferred a Praxitelean form, which was a great influence on early Hellenistic art. The soft and sweet features, the languid body, the grace of the curves all fall into this type.¹⁰⁵ The Praxitelean motif dates these images to the early part of the third century when the school of Praxiteles was active on Kos and

¹⁰⁴ See Appendix II Dodekanesos catalogue for the inscriptions from the islands of Astypalaia, Telos, Karpathos, and Nisyros.

¹⁰⁵ Bieber 1967, 16.

Rhodes.¹⁰⁶ Andrew Stewart mentions that Praxiteles “and his sons were much in demand for a range of statues from divine images to portraits of priestesses and upper-class women, and by 330 the family was one of the richest in Athens.”¹⁰⁷ Praxiteles’ and his descendants’ interest in the production of female portraiture for business may have carried into the later Hellenistic period. Female dedications were pricey and the sinuous curves of Praxitelean style conform well to the body type of a female. A portrait of a Rhodian woman follows these criteria. Made of white marble she is preserved down to the neck. Her eyes are deeply drilled into the sockets and her hair is parted down the middle and swept back to either side. The style appears Hellenistic, but this is difficult to determine because of its poor state of preservation. The commentator of the sculptures from Lindos, Vagn Poulsen, believes this to be a portrait head analogous to the statue of Baebia of Magnesia.¹⁰⁸ In addition, Laurenzi comments that many Egyptians moved to Rhodes in the Hellenistic period. He uses a marble portrait of an Egyptian female as evidence to support his assertion. The firm planes on the face, the rigidity in the treatment of the hair and the moderate use of *sfumato* places this sculpture in the Classicizing phase in the first century B.C. These Egyptians were beginning to have their portraits sculpted by local artists during this period on Rhodes.¹⁰⁹

Sadly, the portraits, according to Merker, were for the most part bronze and are only known of today from their inscribed bases. The manufacturing of bronze portrait sculpture lasted from the fourth century B.C. through the first century A.D., and in the third century B.C. Merker concludes that we see a two-fold increase in honorary portrait

¹⁰⁶ Bieber 1967, 125.

¹⁰⁷ Stewart 1990, 64.

¹⁰⁸ Dyggve and Poulsen 1960, 547-8; for the location of the portrait see Appendix II Dodekanesos R14.

¹⁰⁹ Laurenzi 1932, 54-5, fig. 34.

production in general. This influx goes along with the increased trade and economic prosperity of the island.¹¹⁰ The cuttings for feet on the stone let archeologists know the relative size of the statue, and most appear to have been life-size.¹¹¹ No bronzes remain on the island, but analyses of bronzes from elsewhere suggest that the bronzes were pieced together from separate parts. The complexity of bronze manufacturing makes the inscriptions on Rhodes different from the ones on Kos. On Rhodes, both the sculptor of the image and the caster of the bronze signed the bases.¹¹²

Comparanda:

Delian Inscriptions:

I found eleven inscriptions that illuminate the autonomy of females on Delos (See Appendix II). Ten inscriptions include wealthy females in the private sphere while a queen dedicated one sculpture.¹¹³ This inscription, which was found among the debris of the cella of the Temple of Apollo, dates to the end of the second century and honors Kleopatra the daughter of Ptolemy. She honored an Athenian Himeros Zenonos as a dedication to Apollo, Artemis and Leto. Many other inscriptions include the names of Ptolemaic queens, but they all include their male family members and the queen is named as second. I do not consider these to reflect the nature of my argument since the queens share the honor with a male not making their actions independently.

¹¹⁰ Merker 1973, 17.

¹¹¹ Merker 1973, 7.

¹¹² Merker 1973, 9.

¹¹³ For the translation of Kleopatra's inscription see Appendix II Delos Catalogue 10.

Of the ten remaining inscriptions, seven were dedications made by wealthy females. Their economic independence is even more underlined since the majority of the inscriptions show that a female was the main agent of the dedication. Of these seven inscriptions, six were dedicated to the gods, perhaps in honor of a family member, and one was made to a family member. Only one inscription dates to the period before 166 B.C. when Delos was turned into a free port. A woman named Archippe dedicated this inscription in the second half of the fourth century to Artemis.¹¹⁴ Artemis was an important goddess of the island without a doubt, but it is interesting that females did not take an active position in public life in the form of dedications to their divinities until the later Hellenistic period. The new cosmopolitanism of the island that naturally occurred with trade and new peoples visiting must have played a large role in their newfound autonomy.

There was one sculptural dedication made by a wife to her husband. The Kleopatra base was found in the House of Kleopatra in the Theater Quarter.¹¹⁵ This inscription portrays the individual wealth of an Athenian female, Kleopatra, on Delos who dedicated a sculptural group in honor of her husband Dioskourides for giving three tripods of silver to the Temple of Apollo. The inscription can be dated to 138/7 B.C. accurately by the mention of the archon Timarchos. This kind of honorific inscription is found often in the private domain. Dedications set up within the household promoted the same public purpose as one dedicated in the sanctuary to honor a benefactor.¹¹⁶ The Athenian magistrate, Timarchos, is named because Delos went under Athenian control and since

¹¹⁴ For this early inscription see Appendix II Delos Catalogue 1.

¹¹⁵ Roussel and Launey 1937, no. 1987.

¹¹⁶ Hermary et al. 1996, 208.

both persons were from the Attic *deme* of Myrrhinous on the mainland.¹¹⁷ Kleopatra is indicative of a female with personal wealth on Delos who with her money makes her stamp in the community.

Delian Sculpture:

The sculptures on Delos can be categorized as portraying rich female elites of the new merchant class. I found four sculptures in all from Delos of women dedicated to or in honor of women. I was hoping to find more extant sculptures, but just as on Kos and Rhodes, the images in bronze, especially of kings and queens of Egypt, set up in the Delian sanctuary have been lost to us. These we can infer from the bases and by epigraphic mentions.¹¹⁸ Two of these sculptures were inspired by the *pudicitia* type. One, of Diodora, was set up on the north edge of the street running by Serapeion C in a niche. The woman was Athenian and the daughter of Hephaistion and dedicated to the traditional Alexandrian deities of Sarapis, Isis, Anubis and Harpokrates. Headless, she is 1.57 m tall. Her appearance is more plastic and the effects of the transparency of her clothes are similar to that of the Rhodian workshops. The adoption of the *Coae vestes* for the sculpture places its production in the late third to second centuries.¹¹⁹

The sculpture group of Kleopatra and her husband Dioskourides was meant to be viewed from the entrance and is protected in the courtyard of the House of Kleopatra in the Theater Quarter by shutters that form a little chapel. The couple is thought to be of great importance because of the state of preservation. These sculptures were preserved to

¹¹⁷ Ridgway 2000, 144-5.

¹¹⁸ Marcadé 1969, 425.

¹¹⁹ Hermary et al. 1996, 210.

a great extent throughout each pirate invasion and following generations never removed their images. They are life-size and comparable to honorary statues set up at public expense in the Greek East, such as Kos.¹²⁰ These private statues were set up in a private setting on axis to the entrance so visitors from outside could see them.¹²¹ The Kleopatra sculpture is surely the focus since it was sculpted slightly taller. She is amply draped in a chiton and himation with the dignity of a matron. The fringes of her clothing fall heavily to the left side giving her image an imposing stature. The rendering of her drapery evokes the image of the *Coae vestes* just like Diodora.¹²² She also reflects a different artistic time period than her husband in that her hips and narrow shoulders date her stylistically to the second century B.C. proportions and trends of the *pudicitia* type.¹²³ The scheme of her husband looks back to an earlier period in depicting him as a distinguished man of letters. The scheme of Kleopatra has been attributed to the work of Athenodoros I, the father or grandfather of Agesandros and Athenodoros of the Laokoon group, who was known for creating portraits of noble women.¹²⁴

A bust of a Roman woman (c. 100-75) was found in the House of the Diadoumenos. Her traits are harsh, lips cramped and face emaciated with projecting cheekbones, although she is still feminine. Her severe treatment is meant to match the severity of her male counterparts and hold the same level of *gravitas*. This private portrait was meant to be displayed in the home as an imposing image. This positioning is common in Delos and Rome among social elites, and much like the Kleopatra group.¹²⁵

¹²⁰ Ridgway 2000, 145.

¹²¹ Kreeb 1988, 67.

¹²² Hermary et. al. 1996, 208.

¹²³ Ridgway 2000, 145.

¹²⁴ Bieber 1967, 132.

¹²⁵ Hermary et al. 1996, 214.

The female figure is thought to be about 50 or 60 years old, but highly idealized because she does not bear many wrinkles.¹²⁶ Michalowski without doubt dates this bust to the period of Augustus, but Marcadé questions his analysis. He also questions whether this bust is Roman based on its Egyptianizing coiffure. He also notes, however, that the trend for women in the elite position of Delian society was to wear their hair in such a way that was inspired by Egypt in the beginning of the first century B.C.¹²⁷

Finally, an image of Arsinoë from the second century was discovered in the sanctuary in honor of Arsinoë II Philadelphie Agathe Tyche on the western slope of Mt. Cynthos. In the Hellenistic period on Mt. Cynthos, an area that received many foreign cults, a little temple was built for Agathe Tyche. In the period of Independence, the Athenians assimilated this sanctuary into the Philadelphieion in honor of Arsinoë II. Within this sanctuary archaeologists came upon this *agalma* in the form of a statue of Agathe Tyche as Arsinoë II assimilated after her death into the goddess of Good Fortune.¹²⁸

Samothracian Inscriptions:

Samothrace did not produce the typical dedicatory inscriptions which include the name of the dedicator.¹²⁹ Therefore, many dedications that may have been made by a female cannot be recognized. However, this observation by Karl Lehmann does not necessarily imply that females were not making dedications or being honored on the island with sculpture. Queen Arsinoë II was a big patron at Samothrace. However, she

¹²⁶ Michalowski 1932, 46-7, pl. XXXIII-XXXV, fig. 32.

¹²⁷ Marcadé 1969, 423-4.

¹²⁸ Marcadé 1969, 444; Plassart 1928, 311.

¹²⁹ Lehmann 1960, 20.

made her dedications in the form of a building, the Rotunda of Arsinoë II, and architectural inscriptions.¹³⁰ Other queens also made contributions. A base was found honoring two Pergamene queens.¹³¹ On side A Queen Stratonike was honored for her *eunoia*. It was then reused and side B honored Queen Apollonis. Both these dedications may or may not have been set up at the same time, but both were dedicated by the *mystai*. I found one more inscription from a statue base honoring a woman. In the one the *demos* of Samothrace honored Pythokle; it was found in the ancient town and dates to after the third century.¹³²

Samothracian Sculpture:

The Hall of Votive Gifts provides two marble portraits. The first is a head of a female statuette made perhaps of Pentelic marble. Broken off at the neck, the head tilts slightly to the right, like statues of the Venus Pudica type. Her hair is parted down the center and depicted in soft waves pulled back to the sides. A shallow groove on the upper part of her head was most likely for the placement of a queen's diadem. The delicate features and soft modeling, close set eyes and small proportioning links this head to the school of Pergamon. The date and diadem of this sculpture make it probably an image of Arsinoë III.¹³³ Her sculpture provides evidence for the continued patronage of the Ptolemies through the third century.¹³⁴ Another portrait was found of Thasian marble

¹³⁰ For more on this building and its architectural inscriptions see *Samothrace*, Vol. 7, *The Rotunda of Arsinoë II* (1992).

¹³¹ This dual inscription can be located in Appendix II Samothrace Catalogue 1 and 5.

¹³² For the last inscription see Appendix II Samothrace Catalogue 3.

¹³³ Lehmann and Lehmann 1962, 174; Lehmann 1975, 106.

¹³⁴ Lehmann and Lehmann 1962, 100.

within the Temenos.¹³⁵ The head tilts up to the right and her flesh is softly modeled and rounded. The excavator Karl Lehmann explains that she represents a motif common to the second century seen in the veiled woman in the Louvre in the form of her veil, which is closely laid against her head and just exposes her ear and a narrow band of hair.¹³⁶

¹³⁵ Lehmann and Spittle 1982, 399.

¹³⁶ The veiled woman in the Louvre is mentioned in Bieber 1961, 132, fig. 524.

Chapter 3: Roles of Women in the Hellenistic East

Economic and Cultural Conditions of Private Women:

According to Riet van Bremen, “in cities of the Greek East, during the Hellenistic and Roman periods, female members of local ruling elites played a prominent visible role in public life. Before this time it had only been in the religious sphere, as priestesses and worshippers, that women had any part to play in the formal ritual of the Greek city.”

These women increasingly emerged to appear as benefactors using their private wealth for civic purposes.¹³⁷ In the Archaic period the office of the priestess already began to show a more prominent and independent role for women in the public sphere than previously. These priestesses had the ability to control money coming in and out of the sanctuary and some sanctuaries could operate without the jurisdiction of the *deme*. The economic freedom of the priestess in the Archaic period expanded to other classes of women in the Hellenistic period. During this period the state was no longer able to demand tribute from the wealthy class, and certainly not from the Romans. Because of the difficult circumstances of the environment, including the continuous conflicts and changing powers, the state relied more on the willingness of the private class to help.¹³⁸ These women were patrons to such acts of public display as games and festivals, buildings, public feasts and distribution of food, wine and money.

The social standing of a woman went hand in hand with the increased economic prosperity of females in general.¹³⁹ Uta Kron concludes that “Not only the number of

¹³⁷ van Bremen 1996, 1.

¹³⁸ Höghammar 1997, 195.

¹³⁹ Höghammar 1997, 193.

costly female dedications increased in the Hellenistic period, but they also showed a new quality, called by convention *euergetism*; i.e. public benefactions.”¹⁴⁰ For women these forms of *euergetism* often aimed at beautifying the city and pleasing its citizens.¹⁴¹ However, *euergetism* was nothing new to the Greeks of this time period. The form *euergetism* took in the Greek East was largely determined by the traditions and assumptions of the Classical Greek city.¹⁴² The word itself originates from the Greek system of *leitourgiai*, which are public services enacted by private persons at their own expense.¹⁴³ It appears with the new tradition of *euergetism* in the Hellenistic period that the role of women crept from the private sphere into the public one. Upon a benefaction a statue would be set up in return by the city in the person’s honor to commemorate her virtue.¹⁴⁴ This honor equaled those given to men. In inscriptions we see women also receiving crowns, front seats in theaters or public games, annual proclamation of their names and honorific decrees along with statues.¹⁴⁵ M. Porcius Cato complained, “in the provinces, statues were erected to women.” However, Riet van Bremen points out that the statues that offended Cato so were most likely the private rather than public ones. It was only after the death of the very persuasive Cato that it became universally acceptable for women to be honored alongside men.¹⁴⁶ Many female dedications in the Hellenistic period were in fact “private.” A private dedication, according to Uta Kron, meant that persons offered them in the interest of themselves or their family. The other category of “public” dedications honored donations that came about because of public services

¹⁴⁰ Kron 1996, 171.

¹⁴¹ van Bremen 1996, 13.

¹⁴² van Bremen 1996, 163.

¹⁴³ Kron 1996, 171.

¹⁴⁴ Höghammar 1997, 195.

¹⁴⁵ van Bremen 1996, 1.

¹⁴⁶ van Bremen 1996, 88.

provided by wealthy citizens.¹⁴⁷ From the Classical into the Hellenistic period, large-scale dedications made by women increased in expense.¹⁴⁸

It is known for a fact that in the Hellenistic period women possessed more control over their own economic funds than earlier in history.¹⁴⁹ The growing wealth and changing situation of females in the Greek world help explain this occurrence. In Athenian law property belonged to the *kyrios*, including the land, wife and children. According to Sarah Pomeroy a responsible father in Classical Athens would not raise a daughter unless he arranged a marriage for her before she reached maturity. The size of the dowry he was able to offer burdened a girl because if her father could not offer a large enough dowry, her fate most likely would be exposure. The size of this dowry marked the level of the father's economic status.¹⁵⁰ Likewise, the Classical Athenian woman did not carry any political power because all influence was connected to money which belonged to her *kyrios*, unless she was named the *epikleros* upon the death of her *kyrios*, but still the money only remained tied to her until her next marriage or until a kinsman could take hold of the property. It appears that the political roles in Classical Athens had to be considered in terms of duties rather than rights. The principal duty of citizen women toward the *polis* was the production of heirs to the *oikoi* making up the citizen class. Thus, the interest of the family in the Classical period, and number one role of the female, was to see that individual families did not die out.¹⁵¹

By contrast, the Hellenistic period shows a decline in the role of the *kyrios* in relation to a female member of the family's life. The role of the father in giving away his

¹⁴⁷ Kron 1996, 178.

¹⁴⁸ Kron 1996, 182.

¹⁴⁹ Höghammar 1997, 191.

¹⁵⁰ Pomeroy, 1995, 62.

¹⁵¹ Pomeroy 1995, 60.

daughter decreased as well. It remained common for the father to be present at the marriage of his daughter, but only as a formal guardian. Reasons for marriage changed as well. According to Sue Blundell:

‘Love and marriage’ is a scenario which is largely absent from the imaginative literature of the Classical period. Yet, in the early Hellenistic Age, the comic playwright Menander wrote plays in which young men fell in love and were anxious to marry the objects of their affection.¹⁵²

This must be a new theme in the theater and indicative of the growing acceptability of personal wants. Likewise, contracts were drawn between man and woman in which they agree to share a life together.¹⁵³ This change poses a great difference in the independence of the public woman and shows a new advance in the equalizing status of women’s rights. A contract from 311 B.C. between a Greek man, Heraklides, and woman, Demetria of Kos living in Egypt, shows married women’s new rights. This contract displays the typical exchange of female and dowry from father to husband plus the promise that Heraklides will provide and care for Demetria. However, the most interesting parts recognize marital behavior. Neither partner can disgrace the other in the marriage and any allegations were left to the interpretation of peers, showing that social and moral obligations are of weighty importance. Plus, each partner is meant to keep a personal copy of this contract in case one should raise a case against the other.¹⁵⁴

Marriage contracts developed to protect a woman’s interests in the absence of family and as a result allowed her more independence and mobility.¹⁵⁵ This contract is evidence for

¹⁵² Blundell 1998, 122.

¹⁵³ Pomeroy 1995, 129.

¹⁵⁴ Pomeroy 1995, 127-8.

¹⁵⁵ Burton 1995, 41.

the vanishing role of the *kyrios* in the life of the females in a family and the ability to document a life “shared” with a man presents women as holding more autonomy in the Hellenistic period.

Respectable women were active in economic ventures. Delos provides evidence for the economic activity of women. On Delos, records of female *hieropoioi*, those who managed the temple property and who submitted the annual accounting, show that seven women acted without a *kyrios* when dealing with numbers amounting to five to twenty-five drachmas.¹⁵⁶ Although this is not a large sum of money, a growing independence is emerging. Also on the island, married women borrowed money, although assisted by their male guardians, attesting that the women and not their husbands were responsible for their own debts. Wives of borrowers are even inscribed as “agreeing to” loans made by their husbands.¹⁵⁷ Occasionally in the Hellenistic period married couples made joint benefactions and married couples likewise received joint honors. Both honorary and dedicatory epigraphic examples appear in the Greek East as early as the second century B.C. and in these women most often operated alone.¹⁵⁸ It was not until the first century A.D. that these joint benefactions became more frequent as evidenced in inscriptions documenting gifts made to cities¹⁵⁹ and no indications have been found that men tried to make the women subordinate to them in the inscription.¹⁶⁰ The growing economic status of women went hand in hand with the mounting independence and publicly renowned respect of females as individuals.

¹⁵⁶ Schaps 1979, 803.

¹⁵⁷ Pomeroy 1995, 130.

¹⁵⁸ van Bremen 1996, 115.

¹⁵⁹ van Bremen 1996, 116.

¹⁶⁰ van Bremen 1996, 274.

Dowries are a common custom in Greek and Roman society. However, it was not until around the second century B.C. that the dowry developed from a transfer of household stuff or land to major economic resources for women to use as tools in society.¹⁶¹ The relative under-representation of female civic generosity on the whole might be connected with the woman's "capacity to inherit, acquire, or generate the wealth necessary to achieve civic prominence."¹⁶² Therefore, the distribution of wealth within an elite family became very important in determining whether a female had an influential role in the society. Dowries were passed on in proportion to a woman's status. As large as this gift may have been, it was not the daughter's total share of her parent's fortune. Once the dowry was settled upon, this money would follow the female around whatever *kyrios* she might end up under the guardianship of. However, as Elaine Fantham suggests, in the Hellenistic period "a new current of autonomy and assertiveness is detected even in letters and petitions of ordinary women who are widowed or seem to live in households without men."¹⁶³ Likewise, status and political power were based on wealth, mostly landed wealth, for the Romans. Thus, the Romans gave great importance to the female's means to forge the transmission of wealth and property. Women could also gain wealth from their male relatives through wills from fathers and by becoming widowed and inheriting their husbands' fortunes.¹⁶⁴

Beginning in the second century there was an increased individuality as noblemen composed their own autobiographies in Greek or Latin and noblewomen earned the privilege of a public eulogy at funerals. Catullus began this practice with the eulogy for

¹⁶¹ Fantham et. al. 1994, 262.

¹⁶² van Bremen 1996, 196.

¹⁶³ Fantham et. al. 1994, 159.

¹⁶⁴ van Bremen 1996, 242.

his mother (Cicero *De Oratorie* 2.44), which Caesar used for self-advertisement. It follows:

My aunt Julia's family was descended from kings on her mother's side, and her father's is related to the gods. For the Marcii Reges, whose name her mother bore, descend from Ancus Marcius. The Julii, the clan from which my family comes, descend from Venus herself.¹⁶⁵

The example of this eulogy clearly expresses the politicians' need and respect for the female representatives in their family. In the Empire men's own political conditions would lead the women of their family to have to share in the public and political burdens.¹⁶⁶ Likewise, female presence was felt in religious ceremonies that became equivalent in importance for women as military parades were for men. The extravagance of the religious ceremonies became a competition between women and also reflected on the husband.¹⁶⁷

Additionally, there was an important change in the position of females in the family during the years of Augustus' rule.¹⁶⁸ In 18 B.C., Augustus attempted to propose a marriage law using his power as tribune. This law was known as the *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus*. This law was strict and affected celibates above a certain age who had not married and all widowers below a certain age who had not remarried. If these people remained out of wedlock, then Augustus ordered that they are barred from all inheritances, legacies (except for the very close relationships), and from appearing at public games. These penalties also imposed upon those men and women who were

¹⁶⁵ Excerpt from Suetonius, *Caesar* 6.2 translated by Elaine Fantham.

¹⁶⁶ Fantham et al. 1994, 271.

¹⁶⁷ Fantham et al. 1994, 262.

¹⁶⁸ Fantham et al. 1994, 212.

married but had no children. However, families with children, especially three or more, were offered career advancements. In 9 B.C. the unpopularity of this law forced Augustus to appoint his consuls M. Papius and Q. Poppaeus to modify the code. Additionally, in A.D. 18 the *lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis* was enacted making adultery a crime and public offence. This law stated that if a man divorced a wife suspected of adultery, he had sixty days to bring her and her lover up before a jury for prosecution. If not done within the sixty days limit, then any person could bring the accused to trial. Sometimes the husband was able to kill his wife for her adultery. In other cases, the wife was banished to a small island. Most of these cases brought the wives to trial; however, accused husbands received similar penalties. Even husbands who were only caught planning to commit adultery received these penalties. Now, Augustus' marriage code was by no means a success. However, it was an attempt at strengthening the family unit and securing a pure bloodline.¹⁶⁹ The law against adultery especially shows a certain respect for females within the family and their appearance in the public sphere. Therefore, by the time of Augustus justice for females took form and the prominence of women in the public sphere expanded from its more private roots centuries earlier.

Women in the Priesthood:

During the Classical period religious authority controlled much power in the Greek world. The major sphere of public life in which women participated was

¹⁶⁹ Cary 1975, 328.

religion.¹⁷⁰ As Robert Garland states, religious power is “the ability to manipulate and control individual and collective behavior through an authority which is invested primarily in a religious office or function.”¹⁷¹ Not only money aided the priesthood in its quest for newfound power, but also the fear that a citizen can be charged with impiety.¹⁷² According to Uta Kron, “from Archaic to Hellenistic the sphere of religion and cult were the only major part of public life women could participate.”¹⁷³ Their niche in this field originated because according to the law, custom and tradition, a woman could participate in religious activities. The woman’s presence became vital to the religious life and existence of the city. From this position as priestesses, women began to appear as dedicators and benefactors in the public sphere.¹⁷⁴

However, male organizations shaped the overall structure of female *euergetism* because they chose the offices and liturgies for women. These decisions were politically and family motivated.¹⁷⁵ After all, the offices of priesthoods were extremely influential. Priestesses and women in other minor religious functions performing religious services received the most numerous honors.¹⁷⁶ The Panathenaia is one example of a festival which was celebrated annually, and on a larger scale every four years, the birth of Athena Polias, patron goddess of the city. Although both men and women participated in the Panathenaia, the main feature of this celebration was both the sacrifice and the procession performed by women. The young girls, who carried the sacred baskets in the procession, or *kanephoroi*, are of particular importance. The *kanephoroi* were all virgins chosen

¹⁷⁰ Pomeroy 1995, 75.

¹⁷¹ Garland 1996, 91.

¹⁷² Garland 1996, 94-5.

¹⁷³ Kron 1996, 139.

¹⁷⁴ Kron 1996, 139.

¹⁷⁵ van Bremen 1996, 301.

¹⁷⁶ Pomeroy 1995, 125.

from noble families and their virginity was an important factor in securing the use of the sacred offerings and sacrificial instruments carried within their baskets.¹⁷⁷ This is just one of many duties by which a few elite females of all ages could gain prestige for themselves. Literary and epigraphic evidence and vase paintings record the crowning in honor of historical persons as early as the fifth century B.C. During the Hellenistic period this practice multiplied quickly. Besides these public monuments, other dedications could be made by a member of the priestess' family or by herself. A stipulation always remained though that the dedication could only be made upon permission of the *deme*.¹⁷⁸

In the Greek East women enjoyed a better legal and social status in large part because of their role as priestesses and epigraphical evidence supports this new opportunity.¹⁷⁹ Temples and shrines were centers of influence and much wealth as the donations of various Hellenistic monarchs to these institutions attest. The queens at Pergamon are a fine example of Hellenistic monarchs participating in the life of the sanctuary and inscriptions set up in conspicuous locations on the sanctuary of Demeter record their activity. According to Susan Cole, "a survey of her cult sites will show that the perceived character of the goddess and the demands of ritual [as a whole] always exerted a considerable influence."¹⁸⁰ The Thesmophoria, which was associated with grain production and agricultural concerns throughout the Mediterranean, made Demeter's worship prominent. Therefore, it is not surprising that commercial areas and

¹⁷⁷ Pomeroy 1995, 75.

¹⁷⁸ Kron 1996, 141-3.

¹⁷⁹ Kron 1996, 141.

¹⁸⁰ Cole 1994, 201.

large cities often grow up around great temple centers.¹⁸¹ In the religious context of the sanctuary and temple individual statues were initially placed as dedications, or *anathemata*, to the deities.¹⁸² The inscriptions recovered from Lindos on Rhodes show the earliest statuary from the fourth century B.C. set up as dedications mostly by priestesses to Athena Lindia. The inscriptions occurred in accompaniment with the sculptural dedications depicting Athena.¹⁸³

Priesthoods were most often gained by heredity and passed down through aristocratic families. However, some ‘new blood’ could acquire a priesthood because of cultic need and their own ability to perform well with the necessary qualifications. Beginning in the fourth century B.C., priesthoods could be bought and sold to the highest bidder,¹⁸⁴ expanding the opportunity for other families. Public language and imagery were both largely defined by the political and communal relationships between elite families and the *deme*.¹⁸⁵ After the incorporation of the Greek East into the Roman Empire, the Italian equestrian and senatorial families derived most of their power and prestige from the holding of provincial offices and from the offices of high priesthoods.¹⁸⁶ The Romans also carried on the tradition of placing women of high social and economic standing in positions of authority to make their family look better in the public eye. However, the range of offices and liturgies taken on by women at any point between the late second or early first century and the third century A.D. is narrow,¹⁸⁷ which displays the great importance of the individual priestess who held an office.

¹⁸¹ Rostovtzeff 1967, 65-6.

¹⁸² van Bremen 1996, 176.

¹⁸³ van Bremen 1996, 177.

¹⁸⁴ Kron 1996, 140; Paton and Hicks 1990, xxx.

¹⁸⁵ van Bremen 1996, 163.

¹⁸⁶ van Bremen 1996, 197.

¹⁸⁷ Garland 1996, 91.

According to Mikhail Rostovtzeff, the “main income of priests derived from sacrifices and certain sacrifices were compulsory for particular groups of inhabitants taking active part in economic life of the city.”¹⁸⁸

Those priesthoods held by women appear only as those whose definition was predominantly religious and ceremonial. These offices have been described as “liturgically burdened” meaning that women who held them had financial obligations to the city.¹⁸⁹ If the term for a priestess was for life, then the woman received a measure of civic authority in matters concerning the deity which she served.¹⁹⁰ When more money was needed to sustain the *polis*, the democratic economists turned their attention towards the public priesthoods.¹⁹¹ This allowed the priesthoods to hold a new sense of respect and responsibility to the prosperity of the *deme*. The *deme*, in return, had little interest in regulating religious matters except when security and public order was compromised.¹⁹² The civic roles of the citizens were not exclusively the outcome of economic obligations. Riet van Bremen states, “family tradition, the preservation of status, political ambitions, and even ideological developments all played a part of women’s civic activities – in offices, liturgies or benefactions.”¹⁹³ She thus points out that religious offices were an important venue for women to gain and use their wealth for generous purposes.

¹⁸⁸ These acts can be located in *Syll.3* 1000; Rostovtzeff 1967, 241.

¹⁸⁹ van Bremen 1996, 55.

¹⁹⁰ van Bremen 1996, 86.

¹⁹¹ Paton and Hicks 1990, xxx.

¹⁹² Garland 1996, 91.

¹⁹³ van Bremen 1996, 299.

The Role as Royal Benefactor:

In the Hellenistic period, the ruler would perform acts of great beneficence in order to demonstrate his/her own wealth and power. Great benefactions were displayed in rich offerings on a temple and in lavish festivals. In order to be a public benefactor one had to have much wealth, power and status. Hellenistic queens easily fell into this category.¹⁹⁴ These women enjoyed a lavish lifestyle accompanied by much economic and political affluence and their donations would only secure their overall power and control. These acts of beneficence were not made, however, purely as an empathetic act of generosity. Reciprocation was always necessary, whether in the form of debt or in the guise of an honorific sculpture. Around this transaction, an appearance of a wealthy and powerful and generous patron would emerge.

The history of honorific portrait statues parallels that of the political figures at the time. The *polis* was often the major dedicator because of the city's significant dependence on the royal for protection and money outside of its own resources. This type of honorific statue was virtually unknown in the fifth and fourth centuries, but became very common beginning in the third century B.C. Extant inscriptions give great insight into the number of statues set up and the procedure. The council and people would vote on a statue, following a generous benefaction of economic and/or political value to the city. Such benefactions are characterized as terms of *arete* and *eunoia*.¹⁹⁵ Once erected, the honorific statue remains as a visual symbol of the relationship between royal benefactor and city.

¹⁹⁴ Kron 1996, 171.

¹⁹⁵ Smith 1988, 16-7.

Additionally, the rise in wealth after the conquests of Alexander the Great in the East produced a reliance on mercenary soldiers in the fourth century B.C. Greek males freed for themselves time to find an identity in the realm of public political life, and as male political life faded, the sphere of female public life expanded.¹⁹⁶ Theokritos' urban mimes raise numerous issues related to mobility, ethnicity and migration in the Hellenistic period and his poetry offers examples of issues of contemporary importance.¹⁹⁷ For Theokritos, male power in the Greek world was closely linked with the ideal of the citizen-soldier; however, in the mobile Hellenistic world male citizenship was losing its appeal as a measure of male power. Ptolemy Philadelphos and Arsinoë II provide an example of this mobility. Philadelphos relied upon his sister for her intelligence in war strategy. Women were offered fewer models of power to look up to since they were often viewed as the weaker sex. Unlike men they were excluded from politics and military life. The Hellenistic queens portray the mobility that Theokritos describes in his poetry.

For Egypt one can track the diminishing political life of men and the growing influence of women in the Ptolemaic court. It can be argued that Arsinoë II's prominence, before and after her death, helped set a new standard of public visibility in the highest levels of Greek society for women.¹⁹⁸ The union of Arsinoë II and Philadelphos was the first marriage between brother and sister in the Ptolemaic dynasty. Both also were officially worshipped as divine while alive. Arsinoë II was also the first queen to be depicted along with her husband on coinage. The queen took part in affairs concerning more than just the household and children. The period in which Arsinoë II

¹⁹⁶ Burton 1995, 41.

¹⁹⁷ Burton 1995, 9.

¹⁹⁸ Burton 1995, 125.

lived and ruled is characterized by an improvement in military and political power within Egypt and she was responsible for the expansion of Egyptian sea power.¹⁹⁹ Her reach embraced both the political and military circles, which were before the Hellenistic period left only to the business of men. It appears as though the actions of female royalty played a role, if not the solitary influence, in forging the transition into more public female independence.

Grace Harriet Macurdy asserts that Arsinoë II “was more like the men of her line in her power of planning and the definiteness of her political aims.”²⁰⁰ Her beauty is famed by the numismatists, a face of “Greek type, pensive, remote, and austere.” Her father Ptolemy Soter married Arsinoë as a teenager at 15 or 16 years to the king of Thrace, Lysimachos, because he was looking for profit. She spent much of her time abroad where she acquired much of her wealth and she learned to use this money to her advantage.²⁰¹ The *Philippic*, written in 346 by Isokrates, addressed the problem of unemployment in Greece and in it he suggests conquering Asia Minor, and founding new cities along the coast, and settling the jobless there.²⁰² Of the eight settlements in the Propontis, Aegean and Mediterranean, six are named Arsinoë after her. Her name placed upon these new settlements is a reflection of the early strength of the Ptolemaic thalassocracy and the influence of Queen Arsinoë II. Settlements named Arsinoë are also found on Crete, Keos and on the mainland Methana in the Argolid.²⁰³ Her first husband Lysimachos even changed the name of the great city of Ephesos to Arsinoea in her

¹⁹⁹ Pomeroy 1995, 124.

²⁰⁰ Macurdy 1935, 111-2.

²⁰¹ Burton 1995, 124.

²⁰² Cohen 1995, 15.

²⁰³ Cohen 1995, 34-5.

honor.²⁰⁴ Basically anywhere that was fruitful to the Ptolemies received her name in her honor.

She was married a second time to her brother Philadelphos (276/5) for only about five years until she died either in 270 or 269 B.C. Macurdy believes that “Arsinoë was, of course, absolutely a managing woman; she was the directing power in the government after she married him [Philadelphos], not so much because she stepped into the shoes of a long line of queens who had held sway in old Egypt, but rather because of her character and that of her husband,”²⁰⁵ whom she married for political reasons more than for love. Her brother Philadelphos was intent on marrying her so she could help him turn the tides of battle in the Syrian War (276-4).²⁰⁶ Because of her first marriage to Lysimachos, she was able to bring in a Thracian army to aid her brother. She is credited for influencing Philadelphos’ policy of liberating the Greek cities, thus depicting an environment where as public political life of men was fading, royal women at the Ptolemaic court was flourishing.²⁰⁷ She appears to have had great beauty, charm and high intellect.

The Ptolemies were unusual as they gave great prominence to their queens in royal ceremony, cult, and public documents. For instance the Ptolemaic queens appeared more regularly on coinage and in their sculpture than any other kingdom.²⁰⁸ The largest group of coins from Ptolemaic Egypt depicts images of Arsinoë II. She was depicted on these coins wearing a metal crown and a mantle pulled over the back of her head displaying her renowned beauty and strong mouth and chin.²⁰⁹ Her iconography emits a

²⁰⁴ Macurdy 1935, 114.

²⁰⁵ Macurdy 1935, 118.

²⁰⁶ Macurdy 1935, 120.

²⁰⁷ Burton 1995, 125.

²⁰⁸ Smith 1996, 204.

²⁰⁹ Richter 1984, 232.

sense of strength and intelligence. Lucilla Burn points out images of queens on a series of faience jugs from Alexandria.²¹⁰ The jug she presents depicts an image of Arsinoë II (280-70) and has many iconographic implications. The faces are not usually well rendered, but the hairstyle and dress are carefully created. The queens carry a double cornucopia holding the fruits of Egypt and pour a libation from a *phiale*. This particular jug cited depicts Arsinoë II standing “between an altar and a garlanded cylindrical pillar” which marks the interior of a sanctuary.²¹¹ Additionally, a head of Queen Arsinoë III was found at Pergamon showing the importance of females, especially of the Ptolemaic queens, overseas still after the death of the very strong Arsinoë II.²¹² According to Sarah Pomeroy, “These queens [Ptolemies], in fact, played the same role as kings. Enjoying equal status with males in the eyes of their subjects, they eliminated gender hierarchy for a brief period in Classical antiquity.”²¹³

The Carian queens Artemisia and Ada also held much influential power beginning in the fourth century. They ruled according to Carian tradition. According to this custom the queen ruled alongside her brother-husband, not unlike many Egyptian royal couples. The female royalty of Caria carried much influence in politics and *euergetism*. When Alexander the Great reached the shores of Asia Minor he was so impressed with the strength of the Carian queen Ada that he proclaimed her his mother in Asia and he allowed her to keep all her possessions as queen and appointed her as satrap of Caria.²¹⁴ Examples from Pergamon of powerful women also show no sign of female subordination

²¹⁰ Burn 2004, 67.

²¹¹ For an image of the octadrachm (284-46 B.C.) with Ptolemy I and Berenike I on the obverse and Philadelphos and Arsinoë on the reverse see Burn 2004, fig. 32; for an image of the jug see Burn 2004, fig. 33.

²¹² Lawrence 1969, 21, pl. 36.

²¹³ Pomeroy 1990, xix.

²¹⁴ Worthington 2004, 84-5.

and thus present a good role model. The sons Philetairos and Eumenes erected the temple and altar of the Demeter sanctuary on behalf of their mother Boa. Queen Apollonis herself gave the propylon of the sanctuary making an architectural dedication on it to Demeter and Kore.²¹⁵ In these examples from Hellenistic Pergamon the women are the focus of the dedication either as the honoree or as the agent of the dedication. The queens of the Hellenistic world, it appears, held much sway in their own kingdoms and abroad furthering a cultural acceptance of women. Strong queens set new levels of visibility for Hellenistic women.

²¹⁵ These inscriptions range from the 3rd-2nd centuries, see Koester 1988, 284-6.

Chapter 4: Sculpture and Inscriptions: What do they mean?

Women in the Public Sphere on Kos as Priestesses of Demeter:

With my thesis I hope to question whether the women on Kos held a larger role in public life than in other areas of the Greek East during this time. I am testing this query by looking at the number of honorary and dedicatory sculpture and base inscriptions found on the island where either the female was the agent of the dedication or the recipient of one. In a study undertaken by Kerstin Höghammar the difference between the number of male honorary and dedicatory statues and female counterparts is less than half, a 24:15 ratio.²¹⁶ This ratio shows a marked difference in the amount of male and female honorary statues being made on Kos, but the production does not range over such a large area as one may have previously assumed. With this number I argue that the physical representation of women on Kos depicts a scene of influential women. Höghammar's article expressly details how the number of female dedications was rising on Kos when the Hellenistic period began. Several roles for females on Hellenistic Kos may have led to their increasing public presence.

The expanding authority of priestesses can be traced through dedications. Sarah Pomeroy states, "Religion had always been the one public arena in which Greek women played a role that was regarded by the whole of society as valuable and essential." Their role in religion can be traced down through the centuries beginning very early on with the formation of religious traditions. Pomeroy continues suggesting that their religious role appears to increase in the Hellenistic period with the formation of ruler cults. These cults

²¹⁶ Höghammar 1988, 191.

involved women as both goddesses and priestesses.²¹⁷ The formation of Hellenistic ruler cults augmented an old area of female worship to be reshaped by a new more independent form of ritual. Thus, it appears, that Sarah Pomeroy is stating that the introduction of ruler cults provided more leeway to women as priestesses in cult on the whole. As a female cult I believe that the Demeter cult and its ubiquity on Kos provided an outlet for these females to flourish on the island in the Hellenistic period. This cult perhaps provided more opportunity to women as a result of the flourishing ruler cults, which are devoted to both kings and queens both jointly and separately. Women in all dedicated nine inscriptions to either Demeter or Kore on Kos (Catalogue 1-6, 13, 14, 20). All the priestesses presented in this survey made a dedication to either Demeter or Kore and all contributed at least one statue with the dedication, except for one (Catalogue 13), showing the importance of this cult to the island.

The Kyparissi sanctuary was just one of nine Demeter sanctuaries that grew up in a rural setting around the area of Kos town after its *synoecism* in 366.²¹⁸ Agriculture most likely was a concern for the family that established the Kyparissi sanctuary and for the other families living around the Demeter sites. Terracotta animals found by the excavators in nearby pits provide evidence for the worship of these goddesses as chthonic deities along with Hades at the Thesmophoria. According to Susan Cole the Thesmophoria was one of the most popular festivals observed. The great interest in her cult throughout the Mediterranean derived from the association of sowing grain to the Thesmophoria.²¹⁹ Historical concerns like the founding of a new city, such as Kos, affect the placement of her shrines along with such geological factors as proximity to a

²¹⁷ Pomeroy 1990, xviii.

²¹⁸ Cole 1994, 206.

²¹⁹ Cole 1994, 201-2.

spring.²²⁰ The difficult political situation in the 360s on Kos caused by the outbreak of *stasis* in 366/5 may have been a cause for the founding of so many Demeter sanctuaries around the same time period within such a small area. This revolution resulted in an important and life altering event in Koan history, the foundation of the new capital of Kos on the island's northeast coast.²²¹ The inscription dedicated by the priestess Aischron (Catalogue 13) attests to the power of the mystery cult to pacify a large group of people. Sarah Pomeroy contends that the increased popularity of mystery religions, which were less hierarchical than the Olympian cults in general, welcomed women as both worshippers and religious personnel,²²² such as Aischron and the Demeter devotees taking part in the mysteries. I would like to see a connection between the *stasis*, which happened at the time of Kos' *synoecism*, with the formation of the Demeter cults around the island. This priestess had the power to pacify with prayer. Other Koan citizens may have also found peace or a sense of stability with the Demeter mysteries during the time of *stasis*. Therefore, Aischron sets the stage for important priestesses with the power of a religious position to affect the comfort of those around her and the money to make dedications marking their achievement.

The *lex sacra* of Kos, which entails the regulations for the disposal of priesthoods and their lists their duties and prerequisites, stated that the priesthoods were acquired by sale as a change from loosely specified elections.²²³ These priestesses held more power and more money in the Hellenistic period than in previous centuries, which meant that they could make public dedications displaying their autonomy. Daniele Foraboschi

²²⁰ Cole 1994, 206.

²²¹ Sherwin-White 1978, 43.

²²² Pomeroy 1990, xviii.

²²³ Sherwin-White 1978, 306.

explains that in the Hellenistic period the temple economy developed a level of independence, almost like a “temple state.” Although under the control of the public, temples enjoyed “fiscal autonomy” allowing them to develop their own economy. This economy could be split up into three sectors (agricultural, craft production, and trade) in which the sacred slaves (see Catalogue 33) tended to.²²⁴ The *hierodoulos* is a term that describes a person who is the property of the god and who lives on the land owned by the temple. These slaves are there to serve the god by means as a gift or because of a civic decree. There are different nuances of this office and it could be achieved either by birth or through personal ambition.²²⁵ The amount of money spent on festivals, votive offerings, sacrifices, temple construction, and similar acts of benefaction are probable results. Foraboschi notes, “during religious festivals temples became the sites for fairs and markets of religious importance...and on these occasions, during the *panegyreis*, the public authorities could grant the temple a share of the fiscal revenues.”²²⁶ In Athens, for example, one of the most lucrative priesthoods was the cult of Demeter. Inscriptions provide evidence that these priestesses received a payment of 500 drachmas, or one *obol*, from each initiate at the Greater and Lesser Eleusinian Mysteries. After their term in office, the priestesses also received the special privilege of eponomy.²²⁷ Therefore, priestesses during the Hellenistic period were able to make money off the rising ritual demands and to use this cash flow for public recognition.

²²⁴ Foraboschi 2000, 40-1.

²²⁵ Hornblower and Spawforth 2003, 705; Occasionally this is a term used to express the devotion one has to a god, for this interpretation see Hornblower and Spawforth 2003, 705.

²²⁶ Foraboschi 2000, 41.

²²⁷ Kron 1996, 141.

The first motive for donating so much wealth was the desire to show piety to the gods since humans are completely dependant on their sympathies.²²⁸ Ritual and public sacrifice intentionally aimed to give pleasure and to appease the gods. Once again, priestesses would be looked upon to fulfill this need for others. *Agalmata* were set up to honor the person represented or as a dedication to a particular god or goddess. On Kos, three private women (Catalogue 1, 2 and 4) made a dedication to the Eleusinian gods, three priestesses (Catalogue 5 and 6, 14 and 20) and one temple-slave (Catalogue 33), a woman who is an important part of the running of the sanctuary but not actually a priestess. These sanctuaries started from very little as small rural sanctuaries to grow into important cult sites for a changing Koan society. This small sample from Kos displays women acting either out of great wealth or high social standing. Particular combinations of offices and liturgies varied from city to city. This was affected by the city's proximity to an important sanctuary that determined the pattern of office holding in the local elite families.²²⁹ The Demeter cults grew up around the capital of the island providing the priestesses of this cult more opportunity to work. Thus, the female role in public life was determined by the demands of the city.

Each female religious association had its separate meeting place and regular cultic activities, such as banquets. Women from important families often led these organizations and priesthoods. Therefore, just as men were honored with statues in the *gymnasia* and elsewhere, their husbands, sons and often the *demos* honored women with statues set up in their sanctuaries.²³⁰ On Kos, I have found women being honored or making dedications at the sanctuaries of Demeter and at the Asklepieion. The priestess

²²⁸ Linders 1996, 121-2.

²²⁹ van Bremen 1996, 82-3.

²³⁰ van Bremen 1996, 150.

Kallistrate (Catalogue 17), who was honored by her whole family, was given a statue in her likeness on terrace II of the Asklepieion (190-60 B.C.). She is a fine example of a female who worked her way into the respect of the public sphere. By the time she reached the age of being a grandmother, she was priestess in several prominent state cults: Asklepios, Hygieia, Epione, Apollo Dalios, Leto and King Eumenes. Her honor also shows the growth of the Pergamene kingdom on Kos. After Attalos I (247-197) joined the Rhodians against Philip I in 201 to 200, there was a festival established in the Koan gymnasium in Attalos' honor. Additionally, Eumenes II invited Kos, among other states, to the Nikephoria of 182/1 B.C., thus the reason for Kos to establish a state cult in devotion to him.²³¹ Kallistrate used religion as a tool to enter the public eye. If she were not a priestess, then she would not have received a prominent honorary sculpture in the sanctuary. Female religious associations formed the counterparts to the preexisting male organizations. The most profound difference between female and male organizations, like the *gerousia* and *ephebeia*, was that these males were integrated into civic life and female organizations remained on the outskirts²³² and appeared separate from civic life, although, still important to civic prosperity.

Was there an influence coming from Egypt concerning women's status?

According to Sarah Pomeroy, "The principal reason for the high status of women in Ptolemaic Egypt is the reduction in the polarity between the sexes. This new balance is apparent in both literature and life. While the causes of historical change are always

²³¹ Sherwin-White 1978, 132-3.

²³² van Bremen 1996, 150.

complex...it is sufficient to point to monarchy as the cause of change.”²³³ By the first half of the third century B.C., Kos experienced a golden age as a result of its close attachment to the Ptolemaic dynasty.²³⁴ The island’s freedom from economic exploitation by the Ptolemies greatly helped its circumstances. Its prosperity is witnessed in the increase in material culture on Kos in the third century.²³⁵ Two examples of inscriptions, which were originally accompanied with sculpture, remain from the late third century B.C. Both inscriptions were set up in honor of Queen Arsinoë III. One was dedicated by the *damos* (Catalogue 10) at the Asklepieion and the other by an Alexandrian Kallimachos (Catalogue 11) in Kos town. In the inscription she and her parents Ptolemy and Berenike are remembered as *euergetae*. The inscriptions are important in interpreting the sculpture because those statues set up by decree of the council and people were acknowledged as persons of great beneficence and social standing. These public sculptures also always had political undertones by the Hellenistic period. The desire to keep a close and friendly relationship with the Ptolemies might have led the Koans to dedicate a statue, as it was the highest honor a *deme* could bestow upon an individual for his/her benefaction.²³⁶

The Hellenistic queens were active in the traditionally male spheres of government and warfare. They appear physically in what earlier Greek societies had designated as male space, which is not typically for the use of respectable women. In the Classical period, the primary function of female citizens was to produce heirs intended to be Athenian citizens. The goals of state and *oikoi* conspired to make female infanticide an acceptable practice. On the contrary, Ptolemaic Egypt lacked a concept of the *oikos*.

²³³ Pomeroy 1990, xvii-xviii.

²³⁴ Sherwin-White 1979, 90.

²³⁵ Sherwin-White 1979, 96.

²³⁶ Smith 1988, 16.

Sarah Pomeroy states, “a shared life, rather than reproduction, was the purpose of marriage.”²³⁷ The Macedonian queens can be recognized as the forerunners to queenly power. The Macedonian queens may have even produced their own title. Grace Macurdy believes that either in Olympias’s time, herself an image of strength and authority, or a little earlier, the term *basilissa* appeared as a title for “queen” and seems to have thus originated in the Macedonian language. *Basilissa* evolved out of the earlier terms *anassa*, *basileia* and *basilis* during the course of the fourth century B.C.²³⁸ It would perhaps be a stretch to state that their power affected the etymology of the word form, but the timing is curious. The Egyptian queen Arsinoë II modeled herself on strong women of the Macedonian court. Alexandrian poets attest to Arsinoë’s high visibility in the cultural world and at court. Theokritos’ *Idyll 15* celebrates her sponsorship of the worship of Aphrodite and Adonis. She followed in the footsteps of her influential mother Berenike and the tradition of combative Macedonian women to achieve her will.²³⁹ One and possibly two sculptures were found without inscription depicting the image of Arsinoë II on Kos (Catalogue 7 and 18). These sculptures again are representative of the island’s appreciation of the Ptolemies and the beneficence of their queens in particular.

Hellenistic royalty influenced much of the social understanding between males and females in the Greek world. The queens appear to have held a certain amount of their own money and political ambition that resonates through the Hellenistic period into the Roman influencing the Roman elite as well. Egyptian laws and customs provided an important model for Hellenistic women of “sexual egalitarianism” for the Greeks, and in the economic, political and social spheres, there was less of a distinction between genders

²³⁷ Pomeroy 1990, xviii.

²³⁸ Carney 1991, 156.

²³⁹ Burton 1995, 124.

in Ptolemaic Egypt than there was, for example, in Athens or in earlier Greek society in general.²⁴⁰ Hellenistic queens, as wives and civic benefactors, were often modeled on an image of modesty, domesticity, and virtue as a wife in inscriptions.²⁴¹ This image is upheld, but queens have the independence to act without a male representative. In the Classical period the role of the *kyrios* and his authority fit both the “socio-economic structure of the *oikos* and the general perception of women’s inferiority and need for protection.”²⁴² However, in view of the Hellenistic queens, the women of elite social standing accrued much of their own wealth and control over their actions. In the Hellenistic period the role of the *kyrios* decreased into more of a formality. If this is so then Kos appears to be a prime example of independent female autonomy. These queens indeed influenced politics and exercised legitimate power.²⁴³

In all five private women, five queens, and only one priestess, and an astounding six Roman women were honored from the fourth century to the time of Roman expansion in the East (see Appendix III). The first subjects of honor were queens and a private woman was not honored until 225 B.C. and then the remaining private women were not subjects of praise until the Augustan period. It is interesting to notice that in this time period only four women are Koan and, with six dedications, the more honorees were Roman. The female prominence in general has some bearing on the respectability that females continued to hold at least through the Augustan period on Kos, as seen here, and that the *eunoia*, which began with the Hellenistic queens, continued into Roman “royalty.” These inscriptions even use the popular queenly formula for inscriptions

²⁴⁰ Burton 1995, 42.

²⁴¹ van Bremen 1996, 140.

²⁴² van Bremen 1996, 217.

²⁴³ Kron 1996, 182.

honoring women. In general, both the Greek and Roman women will be honored for their ἀρετή and σωφροσύνη (Catalogue 30, 31, 32, 34). Koan individuality appears to have made a sharp decline in the Augustan period; neither male nor female individuality persists epigraphically. The reach of the Romans appears to have extended over the economic and political life of the Greek inhabitants as well.

At first, Greek sculpture in the round was utilitarian; either for religious or civic purposes, and the location was chosen for how important it would appear to the citizens.²⁴⁴ In the public context, these statues were employed as tools in the process of negotiation between the city and the benefactor.²⁴⁵ A statue was set up in gratitude and repayment for an act of good will towards a *deme* or individual. The person who this sculpture depicts would appreciate the public recognition. Toward the end of the fourth century B.C., public sculpture became more and more spectacular. A loosening of civic and religious functions gave way to a more decorative style. According to Ridgway, the “aspect of ‘art for art’s sake’ was exploited during the Hellenistic period when the formation of the Eastern monarchies and the creation of large private estates provided incentive and funds.”²⁴⁶ The agora and theater were civic areas where portraits of poets and dramatists were set up. Their dedication was apparently more for educational purposes than for decoration. This practice was established in the fourth century and was sustained throughout the Hellenistic period.²⁴⁷

²⁴⁴ Ridgway 1971, 337.

²⁴⁵ van Bremen 1996, 172.

²⁴⁶ Ridgway 1971, 337.

²⁴⁷ Ridgway 1971, 343.

The evidence of poets, such as Delphis (Catalogue 8), being honored for their achievements attest to their growing visibility.²⁴⁸ Delphis was honored at the Asklepieion for her talent as a poet. In the late third century, this woman achieved as much status as a male counterpart in having an eloquent poem dedicated in her honor. I wonder if her prominence as a poet is not related to Kos' proximity to Alexandria? The generosity of Ptolemaic patronage attracted poets, scientists, and scholars from all regions under Ptolemaic influence, such as Kos, to Alexandria. Philadelphos treated Kos more favorably than other areas under his supremacy, such as Halikarnassos, Samos and Thera. He retained some sympathies for Kos as the place of his birth.²⁴⁹ The intellectual exchange witnessed between Kos and Alexandria came about because of the two areas' interest in educational practices. Kos was able to contribute a tradition of great literary and medical ideas to the development of Alexandrian science and literature.²⁵⁰ Philadelphos and his sister Arsinoë II were even tutored as children by the poet Philitas of Kos.²⁵¹ Although the poets and dramatists did not offer any economic benefaction on the whole, their images provided intellectual stimulus and the proximity of Kos to Alexandria may account for their erection.

Kos and its Comparanda:

During the Hellenistic period, each of the islands that I studied with a larger amount of honorary and dedicatory data appeared to have its own particular economic development. Kos had its health resort, medical school, and silk production; Rhodes was

²⁴⁸ Burton 1995, 41.

²⁴⁹ Sherwin-White 1979, 97.

²⁵⁰ Sherwin-White 1979, 102.

²⁵¹ Burton 1995, 123-4.

a great trading city and a flourishing agricultural center, while Delos had an important cult to Apollo and a growing commercial business.²⁵² Samothrace had its own cult center to the Great Gods. Samothrace saw a building boom in the third century in part because of Ptolemaic contributions by Philadelphos and Arsinoë II.²⁵³ Because of this prosperity, there was an increase in dedications both private and public. As a result the numerous inscriptions tell tales of the islands' wealth. In particular, through the Delian inscriptions we can read how Delos showed an interest in the rights of women during the Hellenistic period. For instance, when a father died the heir would take over all his obligations if he died in office. Most of the time this law only referred to sons. However, in one instance an inscription shows that the duty fell upon a daughter who took over her father's duties with just the help of her two *kyrioi*, while all responsibility ultimately lied with her.²⁵⁴ Delos in this instance put an enormous amount of responsibility on the female and in her name. In comparison to Kos' thirty-two inscribed bases and sculptures, Delos does not even reach half as many with thirteen inscribed bases and sculpture (See Appendix II). However, Delos' shorter commercial life can be the reason for the difference in material evidence. Kos' prosperity allowed for increased female advancement into the public sphere. Kos was always an important stopping port for trade between the East and West. Delos, on the other hand, did not reach the height of its prosperity until 166 when Athens turned it into a free port. The business provided by the Italians passing through provided a boom for its market economy, especially noticeable in the many sculptures of Romans.

Those portrait statues and busts set up in the private sphere carry two functions, both on Delos and in other parts of the Hellenistic world. The sculptures add to the

²⁵² Schaps 1979, 221.

²⁵³ Ridgway 1990, 359.

²⁵⁴ van Bremen 1996, 17.

decorative function of the building, but also are meant to represent that person who is depicted. Therefore, the function of the portrait in a private house lies somewhere between decoration and dedication. For instance, the Athenian Kleopatra set up a group of her husband and herself in direct line of sight from the entrance of her house for each visitor or passerby to see. This group was meant to be honorific as if the statue group was placed in the public sphere.²⁵⁵ However, Kleopatra intentionally set up her pair in her courtyard in view to the outside world also for propagandistic reasons. The inscription reads that her husband set up two bronze tripods to either side of the door of the Temple of Apollo. His benefaction was undoubtedly pricey and she had full intentions of letting the rest of Delos know. The most interesting aspect of this group however may be that the Kleopatra sculpture is a little taller and carries more of a presence than her accompanying husband who appears as less authoritative than his wife. With the exhibition of the portrait statues a part of the public sphere intrudes onto the private world.²⁵⁶

The formula of Kleopatra's stance, the *pudicitia*, displays the modesty and near surrendering of a proper housewife to her husband. Her pose most likely was copied from the queens' portraits that likewise intended to portray the values of good domestic housewives. During the Hellenistic period, a variety of veils distinguish the many types of female statues. The female involved held civic or priestly roles and her aristocratic family would use the girl's position to help the family's status. However, it was the quality of the cloth that transcended the women's social classes. In particular the Egyptian linen and *Coae vestes* were available only to the upper classes. During this

²⁵⁵ Kreeb 1988, 67-70.

²⁵⁶ Kreeb 1988, 80.

period the *pharos*-veil is most often draped in such a way to show off the body. The dress folds beneath the veil are often rendered as longer and simpler to run counter to the pull of the veil draped across.²⁵⁷ The *pudicitia* pose uses these Greek veiling gestures. This particular pose encompasses the closed posture of a defensive body language with the reserved veiling gesture of modesty. Llewellyn-Jones captures the all-encompassing idea of the *pudicitia* pose in sculpture as that pose “for Greek women who are open to the common gaze and that the viewers want to see the female body, but wish to be assured of the respectability of the model.”²⁵⁸ Images of women in this pose are indeed found on both Delos and Kos. The Delian woman Diodora was honored with one statue and two inscriptions, but only one of these inscriptions belongs to a statue base, by her sons. Being nearly contemporaries, both the Kleopatra and Diodora statues are similar in style and both sculptures’ drapery were sculpted to look like the expensive *Coae vestes*. The flashy material means that these women were of a very high social standing.

Samothrace, on the contrary, did not show a large amount of honorary and dedicatory sculpture with only five entries. It was a thriving cult spot during the Hellenistic period and did benefit from the Ptolemies, but the dedications on Samothrace came mostly in a different form. Buildings were built and architectural dedications made, but relatively few sculptures were set up. Arsinoë II constructed the Arsinoeion, which probably served a cult function for the Great Gods some time between 289 and 281 when she was married to Lysimachos. This structure was dated on the basis of the architrave inscription she left.²⁵⁹ However, if the people of Samothrace dedicated honorific bronze works without inscriptions it would be impossible to know now. The

²⁵⁷ Llewellyn-Jones 2003, 146-7.

²⁵⁸ Llewellyn-Jones 2003, 172.

²⁵⁹ Ridgway 1990, 169-70.

majority of the dedications made on Samothrace, three in all, was to a queen, either Egyptian or Pergamene, and set up from the third to second centuries. Two dedications were made in honor of private women in the same time period. During this same time period Kos produced six sculptures in honor of women. Kos, therefore, honored more women with sculpture and were acting as agents in dedications in honor of family members or as votive offerings to the gods than Samothrace since on Samothrace women do not make dedications at all. This shows a participating female culture on Kos that Samothrace appears to lack. It is no mystery that Samothrace prospered much from foreign royalty in the Hellenistic period, especially in the construction of the sanctuary there by Arsinoë II and Philadelphos, but it is surprising that I found no priestesses being honored in this way. The role of the priestess might not have been as strong on Samothrace as in the Dodekanesos. Delos as well did not show any priestess representation in sculpture. However, I believe that commercialism was the focus of wealth on Delos in the Hellenistic period and therefore provided capital to produce large sculptural projects. Samothrace, however, did not have the same kind of history and perhaps financial means. Once again, I will suggest that the priestesses probably made their dedications differently in the form of more minor objects probably set up in the Hall of Votive Gifts.

When all the sculptural and inscriptional dedications collected here (see Appendix III) are broken down by century from the beginning of the fourth century to the first century B.C., one can track the rise and fall of female contribution and autonomy chronologically and regionally. Kos provides the most honorary and dedicatory inscriptions in each century except for the second when Delos flourished as a commercial

trading center. A combined total from every island studied, eighteen private women were honored, three priestesses, eleven Roman women, and nine royalty with inscription and/or sculpture. The abundance of private women being honored suggests that women in the Hellenistic period were beginning to be held in higher regard than previous generations and that they were shown respect as both contributing members and figureheads of the family. This also means that many of the women gave some sort of benefaction to the city because a portrait image would not have been set up in the public sphere without reason.

The Roman women who were honored in the later Hellenistic period attest to Roman benefaction in the East. When discussing the affect Roman expansion had on the East, it is interesting to sort these entries by the type of location in which they were found. Sculptures continuously appeared in both public and sanctuary settings from the beginning of my research up through the Augustan period. However, beginning in the late second century B.C. a public setting becomes more common for the site of both honorary sculpture and dedications. These dedications are most often set up for family members and women of high social standing, such as aristocratic Romans. I think that this change in setting, which appears more drastic in the first century and Augustan period, may show a shift in social dynamics. The citizens of Kos are no longer relying as much on religion for concord, but on the actions of real people. With the advent of the Romans in the Aegean waters many crises were averted, especially seen with the disintegration of piracy by Pompey. Sanctuaries were still being used to honor these Roman women, but less often and probably only as a site of constant traffic because these sculptures are never dedicated to the gods, but are only honorary.

In all, twenty-two private women made dedications, eight priestesses, and one queen. The fact that so many women are the agents of these dedications even more proves that women in the Hellenistic period could make economic decisions because a sculptural dedication was not inexpensive. Also, out of the eight priestesses (that I know of) who made dedications, six came from Kos and only one priestess from both Astypalaia and Rhodes. This evidence does not seem like much in comparison to the twenty-two private women making dedications and the priestess dedications are made earlier in the proposed chronology. However, the preponderance of priestesses acting in their own capacity on Kos might have something to do with the importance of the cult of Demeter on Kos from the Late Classical to Early Hellenistic period and the uncertain political atmosphere of the time.

The islands of the Dodekanesos are an interesting case study. Most of them are little known in the Hellenistic period. Kos and Rhodes have always appeared to have more of an economic advantage and to have held supremacy. This may account for the relatively few dedications I did find that would contribute to my study. Out of all the Dodekanesos I found sculptural inscriptions on four islands other than Kos and Rhodes; Telos, Astypalaia, Nisyros, and Karpathos. It is also interesting to note that all the dedications were made in honor of a woman except for Astypalaia. The island of Astypalaia has both private women and priestesses making dedications to goddesses. Rhodes, however, with nineteen sculptural inscriptions, produced the second most in my study. Although Rhodes' main contribution from the female world occurred in the first century B.C., they are still represented throughout the Hellenistic period. As far as my research can take me, it appears that Rhodes did not honor a Hellenistic queen with a

sculptural dedication, which is its one major difference from Kos. Again, the close relationship formed between Alexandria and Kos as far back as Ptolemy I may be responsible for this. The relationship between the Roman women and Rhodes is also less represented here than on Kos, and not at all on any other island in the Dodekanesos. Roman women were honored seven times on Kos in comparison to only two times on Rhodes. It is unclear why Kos honored them, but the island must have benefited from them much more than Rhodes. However, it does seem clear that the islands in the Dodekanesos, with the best ports and most economic productivity, had the most wealth and the most opportunity for females to rise up in the public sphere.

Portrait Sculpture in Bronze?

The messages of honorific statues were meant to be read clearly and without difficulty by all viewers regardless of language barriers.²⁶⁰ The royal statue was used to symbolize a whole range of social, political and religious interests. In the Hellenistic period, if a royal donated a gift of grain, for example, and the city could not repay the royal, then it would set up a statue in appreciation and this compromise made both sides content.²⁶¹ The image of the Imperial and royal couple was so pronounced that it became mirrored in that of the high priest and priestess and also influenced the image of local families.²⁶² The private paratactic sculpture group of Kleopatra and Dioskourides on Delos portrays the great influence that royalty held over elite families who wanted to be viewed as nothing less than grand and superior. On display in direct view from the

²⁶⁰ Ridgway 2000, 281.

²⁶¹ Smith 1988, 15-6.

²⁶² van Bremen 1996, 136-7.

entrance of their house, the wife chose them to be depicted in the best dress of the time and larger than life, much like the image of a royal couple. The dedication set up by Aischron (Catalogue 15) might also be an example of a woman setting up a sculptural dedication of both her and her husband. Half of the inscription is missing and so there is the possibility that Aischron set up a second sculpture of herself next to her husband. If this were true then we can imagine a display much like the Kleopatra and Dioskourides pair on Delos, except that Aischron made her dedication within a major sanctuary, the Asklepieion, for every visitor to the sanctuary to see. The inscription honored her husband alone just like Kleopatra did, but Aischron's inscription doubles as a votive offering to the gods whereas Kleopatra set up purely an honorary monument.

The portrait-like representations of royalty spread through the medium of coinage. Philip II and Alexander the Great maintained the Greek practice to not put images on coins of living persons for reasons of divine pretension. The Diadochoi also did not place the royal image of Alexander on their coinage right away. The earliest to use any royal image was Ptolemy I who placed a posthumous bust of Alexander on his coinage some time before 318 B.C. After this the Diadochoi gave way to placing images of their own busts on the coinage after 306/5 when the idea of a unified empire was finally lost. Ptolemy I used Alexander's image on his coinage after his death for political reasons, to show his dynastic *pietas* towards the dead Macedonian king. Even the coinage that Ptolemy I used was different from the Attic weight standard used by the Seleukids and Antigonids. The difference in metal was probably for propaganda purposes to define the Ptolemaic political and economic control over the seas. Besides the regular silver coinage, the Ptolemies also occasionally issued large gold coins in the

third century. These gold coins depicted the finely worked portraits of the kings and queens. The gold coins' purpose was for use in royal bounties and to facilitate the transition of power to the new king or queen.²⁶³

The Hellenistic royal portraits were sculpted from a variety of materials and the most important were those sculpted in the round.²⁶⁴ There is no literary evidence for the meaning of the different hairstyles that the royalty wore, but only the extant monuments. R.R.R. Smith points out that scholars in the past have ascribed too specific a meaning for longer royal hairstyles. This definition has led other scholars to completely deny the importance of hairstyle at all. However, a comparison between divine, mortal, and royal images shows a certain importance to the hairstyles. In the Hellenistic period, most gods wore long hair in varying arrangements, but always long enough to cover the ears and back of the neck. On the contrary, mortals wore their hair very short. Therefore, one can assume that if gods generally wear their hair long, then a mortal wearing the long hairstyle depicts a divine status.²⁶⁵ It became fashionable to depict queens in the guise of goddesses and later the Romans followed suit. The island of Kos offers two examples of a Roman woman being honored in the guise of an important goddess (Catalogue 26 and 27).

According to Smith, the female portrait image has fewer definite characteristics in comparison to the male. This generalization may be due to the tradition of making important females idealized carrying certain ideal features of goddesses because the first purpose of a royal portrait is to portray a real king or queen, and second a real person. Such images took on this divine sense with such inspiring features as divine attributes,

²⁶³ Smith 1988, 12-4.

²⁶⁴ Smith 1988, 9.

²⁶⁵ Smith 1988, 47.

scale, and a privileged context like a temple. The divinized queenly portraits appear to usually take on the identity of only two goddesses, the majority of Aphrodite and also of Artemis.²⁶⁶ Images of queens can be recognized apart from private women on the basis of three criteria. There will be the presence of a sure royal insignia or she will be paired with a king. Lastly, the similarity to a known coin type aids in identifying royal portraits.²⁶⁷ Aristocratic Romans of the Republic adopted the portrait image as a reaction to the royal style of Hellenistic kings with whom they came into contact with for the first time.²⁶⁸ The many honorific statues of the Roman elite females support this statement. Iunia, Iulia and Cornelia were honored with statues for their benefactions towards Kos, a couple with more than one statue. Iulia was even honored with two statues of herself in the likeness of goddesses, one as Leto and the other as Artemis. Sculpture of Kos is of great artistic value. They are a good depiction of the stylistic and iconographic artistic trends that prevailed in the city.²⁶⁹

By the first century A.D., the initial distinction between privately and publicly erected statues and monuments largely disappeared. “The ‘statuary habit,’” as Riet van Bremen refers to this tradition, “caught on and decreeing statues came to be used as an increasingly sophisticated tool in the reciprocal system of bestowing and receiving benefactions.”²⁷⁰ Bronze became more common after about 500 B.C. for sculpture in the round.²⁷¹ To our loss, the main body of honorific Hellenistic sculpture, like that seen at Rhodes, was produced in bronze. Evidence for these bronzes are only left in the

²⁶⁶ Smith 1988, 48.

²⁶⁷ Smith 1988, 89.

²⁶⁸ Smith 1988, 128.

²⁶⁹ Rostovtzeff 1967, 681.

²⁷⁰ van Bremen 1996, 187.

²⁷¹ Stewart 1990, 36.

testimony to their existence in the inscriptions and by the footprints remaining on the surface of base. The importance of the bronze sculptures is noticed in the signatures of both the sculptor and the caster at the end of the inscriptions.²⁷² Gloria Merker assumes that for each commission a torso type was selected for the subject. The portrait head would have been modeled in clay most likely and this would have been the one contribution by the sculptor. After these first couple steps were accomplished, then the casting process would begin. The caster would take the molds of the head and torso and cast them in bronze and assemble them piece-by-piece resulting in a system that resembles the mass production of a factory line. The Hellenistic period also brought forth the use of molded clay to create freer forms to sculpt with.²⁷³ The way in which bronze is used to form a statue more easily originates with the idea of wax casting. With a mold the caster would simply pour the bronze liquid into a “special jacket”, or investment, forming the final metal image. He would simply chip open the clay jacket to reveal the finished product.²⁷⁴

According to Andrew Stewart, “Choices [of material] were conditioned by factors ranging from the state of skill (*techne*), to cost, availability of materials, appropriateness to context or subject...”²⁷⁵ Bronze making in general was more costly to keep up. A marble workshop could run sufficiently with only a father and son and perhaps a slave to help. On the contrary, a bronze workshop required more skilled labor.²⁷⁶ The degree of complexity of the assemblage and molding would have depended on the intricacy of the fashion of the drapery. Merker also suggests that the more complicated creations would

²⁷² Merker 1973, 9.

²⁷³ Stewart 1990, 37.

²⁷⁴ See Stewart (1990, 38-9) for a complete explanation of the casting process.

²⁷⁵ Stewart 1990, 36.

²⁷⁶ Stewart 1990, 33.

earn a caster's signature along with the inscription.²⁷⁷ I also suggest that the more complicated a sculpture, the more costly its process. The addition of inlays such as lips and eyelashes and teeth elaborate the sculpture and so costs more at least for materials. The reason why bronze might be used over marble may be as simple as the nature of the material. If a good marble quarry was not easily accessible, then bronze may likely have been the material of choice.

It is impossible for me to tell for what purpose sculptors chose to move from marble to more bronze use for portraits of the Hellenistic period, but skill, technique, and cost were factors. The Hellenistic desire to produce more individualistic and fluid works may also contribute to the shift in material. The freer form of bronze allows more liberty in sculpting individual details when a hard marble stone might not be so easily rendered. The portraits of the fourth century differ from those of the Classical period. The Hellenistic portraits are less idealized and more recognizable as individuals. These characteristics can be changed to look more like the individual on the wax molding before the sculpture is actually formed.²⁷⁸ The sculptors could have been following suit, what was popular at the time. The Hellenistic portrait type appears to have evolved out of the Alexander images created by Lysippos. Therefore, could not bronze sculpture also have emerged from the same origin? Carol Mattusch comments that the images Lysippos created of Alexander were made from bronze in order to create the truest renderings of his individual features. Lysippos also worked in bronze with many other portraits, such as Sokrates and the twenty-five portraits of the Granikos monument.²⁷⁹

²⁷⁷ Merker 1973, 10.

²⁷⁸ Mattusch 1996, 71.

²⁷⁹ Mattusch 1996, 70.

How is Kos different?

Koan women were portrayed and honored by other citizens in sanctuaries and perhaps in other public spaces. The state counted on their contributions when needed. A woman may have even attended one public meeting in the agora in her lifetime on Kos if there was an emergency situation. According to Kerstin Höghammar, “The Koan citizen women in the middle Hellenistic period were present in the public sphere, both in the form of portraits and in reality, taking part, at least to a certain extent, in civic life.”²⁸⁰ The elite class of private women in the Greek East provided a new source of funding for the *deme*. If collected through a *prika*, a dowry, or an inheritance, the wealthy female made an entrance into the public view stepping out of the shadows of the *oikos*. No longer trapped behind the image and voice of her *kyrios*, the female made her own name known, and her affluence through acts of beneficence and dedications. The male is often named in the inscription for women; however this does not mean a lesser status. Dynastic ambition in later centuries, either aristocratic or royal, had a great impact on the definition of gender roles, giving much more significance to wives, daughters, and their roles of marrying and childbearing. This tradition does not necessarily mean the greater personal freedom for women, but the importance of a family tie through blood, which could only be made by the daughter through reproduction. This importance offered daughters a sense of power even though the idea of being named by the male still lingers.²⁸¹ On Kos, we can see an example of this as the elite women of the Hellenistic period were made prominent to and by the *deme* and for the first time made noticeable in large numbers.

²⁸⁰ Höghammar 1997, 131-2.

²⁸¹ Wikander 1996, 185.

Sometimes women made dedications with their husbands and were memorialized as equal partners within the inscription. Nikkesippe made a dedication along with her husband, Eutyichidas, on behalf of their son Kyros to the gods at the Asklepieion (Catalogue 9). Nikkesippe is not an example of a woman of the Hellenistic period with her own wealth and independence able to make dedications on her own, but I include her as an example of someone who is a testament to a woman put on display in the public sphere on par with her husband. She may not have the personal wealth of her husband, but she now has a known name. On the contrary, in the second century Kos records females acting on their own making dedications to their husbands for a change. Two inscriptions were found in Kos town and one at the Asklepieion. The two inscriptions that I find particularly interesting were dedicated by Aischron on the Asklepieion (Catalogue 15) and by the daughter of Nikomedes in Kos town (Catalogue 19). Aischron dedicated a likeness of her husband Hermias, and possibly of herself too. The second female dedicated an image of her husband for the way he treated her with praiseworthy vocabulary common to this type of inscriptional formula, with *arete* and *eunoia*. Not only does she erect a statue in his honor, but she also does so “affectionately” (φιλοστόργως). The last inscription I find most interesting because it is not made to the gods and I think that this especially displays that Hellenistic sense of individualism and theatricality in the emotion of a wife in gratitude towards her husband.

Around 46 B.C. very few Koan women were being honored on Kos. Instead a new female social class appeared with the Romans. This change can be attributed to the Koans’ loss of independence both politically and economically when they were incorporated into the Roman government and as a result Koan individuality and personal

ambition deteriorated.²⁸² The dedicators for the most part are ambiguous, such as the *demos*, or not mentioned at all. Of the ten inscriptions from this time period, less than half mention Koan women. However, an astounding six inscriptions are placed in honor of Roman women. Two in honor of Iunia, daughter of Decimus (Catalogue 22 and 23), one for Cornelia, wife of T. Statilius Taurus (Catalogue 24) and three in honor of Iulia, the wife of Marcus Agrippa and daughter of Augustus (Catalogue 25, 26 and 27). Each of these inscriptions dealing with the Romans came with a statue and marked the females' high social standing. Although the Roman women were not recorded as making acts of beneficence in their own name, they are being honored for their relationship to well-known and powerful Roman men. In this way the Roman women are less advanced than the Greek women and queens in acting within the public sphere. However, these inscriptions provide evidence for the Romans' economic and social expansion into the Eastern world of what will become the Roman Empire. Like the benefactions of the Hellenistic kings and queens before, Romans provided for those Greek cities with whom they were friendly.

The language used in these inscriptions that describe the sculpture is also interesting to note. The inscription describes the image of Iulia (Catalogue 26) in the likeness of the goddess Artemis, herself an image of strength and chastity, and also as Leto, the sacred mother of Apollo and Artemis, in another inscription (Catalogue 27). I assume that the Koans decided to honor Iulia in the image of goddesses as a way of flattering both Iulia and the men of her family. Agrippa and Augustus would no doubt be very important men to want to please, especially since the island backed Mark Antony during the last civil war. The female would also prefer this style since the Hellenistic

²⁸² Höghammar 1997, 129.

queens also often portrayed themselves in the guise of goddesses to show their divine nature. Additionally, one inscription that provides evidence for the cultural exchange and intermarriage during this time can be found in a dedication to Paula Euphrania (Catalogue 30). Her inscription was found on the Asklepieion and set up by the *damos*. It is interesting that her father has a Roman first name, Marcus, although transliterated into the Greek language, and that he is married to a Greek woman and the son of a Greek man. The *damos* honored her on behalf of her *arete* and *sophrosyne*, Greek terms, as a dedication to show their loyalty to the emperor because she herself is named φιλοκαίσαρος. Still, the woman is recognized in her appearance as a female of exceptional class, like the Hellenistic queens, worthy enough to be dedicated to the emperor. Inscriptions like this one prove to be great evidence for the mixture of cultures, economies and politics during the Hellenistic period.

One assumes that if a female commissioned a statue to be set up then it means that they had the money to spend.²⁸³ The Hellenistic world changed the face of male and female relationships in private and public life. Loss of political autonomy on Kos and the rest of Greece changed men's political relationships to their cities and to each other. As a result, the female's position in the family and in society was affected. The resulting effect that this had on an individual woman depended on her social class and where she lived.²⁸⁴ Koan women, I think, benefited a great deal from the circumstances and location of their island. The numerous cults of Demeter and the growing need for priestesses both as tools for ritual and for the family provided women with an inlet into civic affairs. The mystery aspect that surrounds the Demeter cult no doubt contributed to

²⁸³ Höghammar 1997, 127.

²⁸⁴ Pomeroy 1995, 120.

the political atmosphere of the island as a way of easing the tension that arose out of the *synoecism* of Kos. Likewise, the island's proximity to Egypt may have influenced women as well. The Hellenistic queens were not ones known for their passivity but in fact their strength and visibility. Their model continued not only for private Greek women but also for Roman women who towards the end of the first century B.C. gave many benefactions as attested to in the many public honorary dedications to them on Kos. However, I call into question if these Roman women were indeed beneficent or if they were just being honored for the sake of a "statuary habit" that Riet van Bremen mentions occurring in the Hellenistic period. The Roman females' important ties to very strong and influential men of the Roman Republic express an importance to try and flatter them perhaps with the honoring of a related female. I have mentioned the relation between Cato and Brutus to Iunia and the tie between Agrippa and Augustus to Iulia. In addition Cornelia was the wife of Titus Statilius Taurus who is mentioned in the inscription as an important patron of the city (Catalogue 24). However, the Roman women, much like the Hellenistic queens, had a vast amount of expendable wealth. Their generosity may have permitted these Roman women to exercise their own leadership in the absence of their male counterparts while they were away on military duty for long periods of time.²⁸⁵

²⁸⁵ Pomeroy 1995, 199.

Conclusion:

According to Elaine Fantham, “The Hellenistic is the only period in Greek and Roman history defined by the reign of women.”²⁸⁶ The question I propose is whether Kos appears as an anomaly in the Hellenistic Greek East in giving an unusual amount of economic and social authority and independence to its women. I tackled this question by examining the honorary and dedicatory inscriptions and sculpture dealing with women either as the agent or the receiver of a dedication on Kos. I distinguish these women by three categories; those women of the private sphere, who through inheritance or some other form had their own money, priestesses, and royalty. In order to receive an honorary sculpture in the public one had to perform a great act of beneficence for that city. One also had to have much of one's own wealth in order to set up an honorary or votive statue. Both types of uses for sculptural dedications I think reflect female autonomy. One setback is that this type of dedication is only one way in which to evaluate female financial independence and authority. There are other forms of dedications, such as vases, terracottas, tripods and architectural inscriptions. These, however, I do not include in order to keep a uniformity of data.

From the material I collected here it appears that female autonomy in the Hellenistic period in the Greek East was a regional occurrence. Delos had a strong commercial business from the second to first centuries. With this flourishing, there was more money on the island to spend. Delos provides us with many examples of portraits being set up both in public and private context. However, the women on Delos did not

²⁸⁶ Fantham et al. 1994, 136.

show as great an output of material as Kos and Rhodes did. These women were strong, as captured in the *gravitas* of the woman from the House of the Diadoumenos and the authority of Kleopatra, but still not as active as Kos. Likewise, Samothrace, although it was an important cult center and benefited from the Ptolemies, did not make dedications in the form of sculpture to the extent that the other islands provided within my thesis had. Samothrace is an interesting case for me. I am very surprised that I could not find more sculptural dedications and honorary portraits. This sculptural tradition, however, may not have had the same popularity on Samothrace as elsewhere. Kos indeed does have the most women being honored and dedicating with sculpture.

Rhodes has many dedications in this form, although still not as many as Kos. Perhaps this means that there was a regional trend in the Hellenistic period that the women caught on to. Rhodes is well known for its school of sculpture and this might have contributed to the abundance in this region. The problem with Rhodes is that much of their life-size sculpture was done in bronze. The poor state of their marble might be the reason for the use of bronze. However, the Rhodians, as well as the Koans, may have also been following the trends of the time. In order to make a more realistic portrait, bronze may have been the preferable material to use. Although the remaining islands in the Dodekanesos do not provide any support for my understanding that female autonomy in the Hellenistic period was a regional occurrence, this fact may be rectified because either Rhodes or Kos always held economic and political supremacy over the other islands.

Kos, however, did have a closer relationship with the Ptolemies than Rhodes. The queens made more of an appearance on Kos than Rhodes, as seen as evidence in the lack

of sculptural dedications on Rhodes to queens. Priestesses also did not offer many dedications. I state with caution that Kos does, at least in the area of sculpture that I am examining, seem to allow the appearance of women in the public sphere more so than the other places I have studied in the Greek East. The presence of strong queens on the island advanced a sense of female autonomy. The close connection with Alexandria and the intellectual trade between the two places cultivated independent women in the literary field as the Alexandrian tradition influenced the sculpture on Kos. Also, the tradition of women as benefactors came from a long tradition of independently wealthy queens acting in their own accord. Likewise, priestesses made a much larger presence on Kos than on any of the other islands that I was looking at. I suggest that the importance of the cult of Demeter on the island provided these women with an outlet to accept and give money. The sanctuary provided women with an opportunity to make the temple its own money separate from the *deme*. Since the cult of Demeter is a gynocentric cult and since the worship of Demeter is tied closely to agriculture, the Koans must have worshipped her especially for their prosperity. The sanctuaries were set up around the time of the *synoecism* of Kos and close by to the new capital as a sense of security for the Koans during a time of new order.

I also understand the apparent weaknesses in my study, such as that female participation in the public sphere can be evaluated on many forms other than sculptural dedications, but I do think that these sculptures are an important enough novelty in the Hellenistic period to consider as a major contributor to this study. It is also difficult to know exactly the role of a female in society because we cannot assume that their job is always stated within the inscription. Therefore, the categories I use to evaluate the roles

of females in Hellenistic society may not always be accurately represented. It would be interesting to look to other sites and other forms of dedications and inscriptions to evaluate the presence of women as well. I find it interesting to look at the chronology of female autonomy, to see its rise and fall as well. Another aspect to look into is the relationship between Kos, or even the whole of the Greek East, and the Romans. Did Greek individuality that made itself so present in the Hellenistic period fade away behind the onslaught of the Romans? Also, did the tradition of portraiture that began with Lysippos and Alexander the Great make honorary sculptural dedication more *in vogue*? With the ability and the wish to depict a person more accurately, would not sculptural dedications make more sense once portrait images were being created? This study has brought up some insecurity in my thesis as well as other questions to be asked about the representation of the role of females in the public sphere in the Greek East. Kos' connection to Egypt and its association with the cult of Demeter both lead me to believe that women had more outlets to work through within the categories that I have presented them and therefore more available resources to gain that autonomy from men on Kos.

Appendix I: Catalogue of Koan Material

Catalogue no. 1

Date: 4th c. B.C.

Statue of: unknown (missing)

Provenance: Kyparissi

Findplace: Sanctuary of Demeter

Measurements: H. 60 L. 51 W. 50

Material of block:

Material of statue:

TEXT

Δελφίς ἄγαλμα, γυνὴ Νέβρου, Κούρηι με ἀνέθεκεν,
Δορκάδος ἐγ μητρός· Μνησιάναξ δὲ πατήρ

Delphis, wife of Nebros, dedicated me the *agalma* to Kore,
(bore) from mother Dorkas and father Mnesianax.

Type of Inscription: Dedicatory and votive

Dedicated to: Kore

Erected by:

Erected in honor of:

Erected to: Kore

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality:

occupation:

sex:

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex: female

PUBLISHED

Text: Segre 1993, EV 235; Laurenzi 1932, 157-8; Höghammar 1997, no. 64

Photo: Segre 1993, pl. 125

Drawing: Laurenzi 1932, 158

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar. I have seen this base and noticed that there are traces visible for a sculpture to have once stood on top.

Catalogue no. 2

Date: c. 350-300

Statue of: Kore (Figure 1)

Provenance: Kyparissi

Findplace: Sanctuary of Demeter

Measurements: H. 67 (of inscription) L. 46.7 W. 36.5
H. 80 (of sculpture) L. W.

Material of block: square block of limestone

Material of statue: marble

TEXT

Κόραι

Λυκούργις

To Kore.

Lykourgis (dedicated a statue).

Type of Inscription: Dedicatory and votive

Dedicated to: Kore

Erected by: Lykourgis

Erected in honor of:

Erected to: Kore

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality:

occupation:

sex:

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex: female

PUBLISHED

Text: Laurenzi 1932, 169-72; Höghammar 1993, no. 84; Kabus-Preisshofen 1975, 39; Segre 1993, EV 269

Photo: Kabus-Preisshofen 1975, pl. 13, fig. 1; Segre 1993, pl. 132; Laurenzi 1932, fig. 44-7

Drawing:

Commentary: I have seen this sculpture and its base in the Kos Museum and it is indeed very small and therefore impossible to be a cult statue.

Catalogue no. 3

Date: end of 4th c.

Statue of: Ada (Figure 2)

Provenance: Kos town

Findplace: Odeion, Room B

Measurements: H. 202.5 (of figure) L. W. 50.5 (shoulders)

Material of block:

Material of statue: local marble

TEXT

None.

Type of Inscription: Honorary

Dedicated to:

Erected by:

Erected in honor of: Ada

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Carian

occupation: queen

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex:

PUBLISHED

Text: Kabus-Preisshofen 1989, no. 51, 85-90; Kos Museum no. 13; Laurenzi 1932, 126-30

Photo: Kabus-Preisshofen 1989, pl. 19, 1.2; 20,1; Laurenzi 1932, pl. 12-3, fig. 24-5

Drawing:

Commentary:

Catalogue no. 4
Statue of: Hades (Figure 3)

Date: c. 250-200

Provenance: Kyparissi
Findplace: Sanctuary of Demeter
Measurements: H. 10.5 (of inscription) L. 41.7 W. 34.5
H. 85.5 (of sculpture) L. W.
Material of block: square block of marble (or limestone)
Material of statue: marble

TEXT

Δήμητρι 'ανέθηκεν; 'Αρισταγόρη
'Ερίσιος; θυγάτ(η)ρ Εύα ; ράτο(υ) (δ)ε γυνή

To Demeter. Aristagore, daughter of Erisis, wife
of Euaratos, dedicated (the statue).

Type of Inscription: Dedicatory and votive
Dedicated to: Demeter
Erected by: Aristagore
Erected in honor of:
Erected to: to Demeter

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality:
occupation:
sex:

Dedicator; nationality: Koan
occupation:
sex: female

PUBLISHED

Text: Laurenzi 1932, 186-89; Kabus-Preisshofen 1975, 57; Segre 1993, EV 271;
Höghammar 1993, no. 86

Photo: Kabus-Preisshofen 1975, fig. 3; Segre 1993, 133

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar. I have seen this sculpture in the Kos Museum. Indeed traces of red paint are found on his shoes as Laurenzi stated.

Catalogue no. 5
Statue of: Kore (Figure 4)

Date: c. 250-200

Provenance: Kyparissi
Findplace: Sanctuary of Demeter
Measurements: H. 7 L. 18.7 W. 15
H. 50.5 (of sculpture) L. W.
Material of block: square block of limestone or tufa
Material of statue: marble

TEXT

Λειριῶ; Ἑκατωνύμου
ἱαρή; Κούραι
ἀνέθηκεν

Leirio, daughter of Hekatonymous,
priestess, dedicated (the statue) to
Kore.

Type of Inscription: Dedicatory and votive
Dedicated to: Kore
Erected by: Leirio
Erected in honor of:
Erected to: Kore

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality:
occupation:
sex:

Dedicator; nationality: Koan
occupation: priestess
sex: female

PUBLISHED

Text: Laurenzi 1932, 179-83; Kabus-Preisshofen 1975, 50; Höghammar 1993, no. 85;
Segre 1993, EV 272

Photo: Kabus-Preisshofen 1975, fig. 4; Segre 1993, pl. 133

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 6
Statue of: Demeter (Figure 5)

Date: c. 250-200

Provenance: Kyparissi
Findplace: found in SE corner of the complex
Measurements: H. 54.7 (of sculpture) L. W.
Material of block:
Material of statue: marble

TEXT

none

Type of Inscription: Dedicatory and votive
Dedicated to: Kore
Erected by: Leirio
Erected in honor of:
Erected to: Kore

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality:
occupation:
sex:

Dedicator; nationality: Koan
occupation: priestess
sex: female

PUBLISHED

Text: Laurenzi 1932, 183-4; Kabus-Preisshofen 1975, 53-5

Photo: Kabus-Preisshofen 1975, pl. 34 fig. 12-3

Drawing:

Commentary: I have seen this sculpture in the Kos Museum. Upon viewing it on display in the Museum there does not appear to be any visible evidence for this sculpture to have belonged to the dedication set up by Leirio. I can only assume that this assumption came from the base and the findspot of the sculpture.

Catalogue no. 7

Date: c.270

Statue of: Arsinoë II (Figure 6)

Provenance: Kos town

Findplace: found in the bath of the gymnasium of Paide in the Hellenistic rubble found beneath a Roman floor

Measurements: H. 22 (of head) L. W. 13.5

Material of block:

Material of statue: local marble

TEXT

None.

Type of Inscription: Honorary

Dedicated to:

Erected by:

Erected in honor of: Arsinoë II

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Ptolemy

occupation: queen

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex:

PUBLISHED

Text: Kabus-Preisshofen 1989, no. 89, 114-5; Laurenzi 1938, 26 ff.

Photo: Kabus-Preisshofen 1989, pl. 34, 1.2; Laurenzi 1938, fig. 10

Drawing:

Commentary:

Catalogue no. 8

Date: late 3rd c.

Statue of: Delphis (?) (missing)

Provenance: Asklepieion

Findplace: Near the church of Panagia tis Tarsou.

Measurements: H. 40 L. 78 W.

Material of block: square block of stone

Material of statue:

TEXT

Οὐ μόνον [ἀθλητῆρας ἀμύμ]ονας, ὦ χρυσέα Κῶ,
ύ[μ]ῖν ο[ύ]κ [-----φαιδι]μος οἶκος ἔχει
ἀλλ' ἰδὲ καὶ θ[-----]αοίδιμος ἄ(δ)ε ἀνέτειλε,
Δελφίς ἐπεὶ Μου[σ]ᾶν [ῆψ]α[τ]ο Ὀλυμπιάδων
καὶ [-----]”Α(?)]σκρα τέτευκε
ρ

This famous house has not only excellent
athletes for you, golden Kos, [-----] nor only [-----]
but see, also [-----] this Delphis rose up, famous in song,
after she was touched by the Olympian Muses,
and [-----] Α(?)skra brought forth

Type of Inscription: Honorary

Dedicated to: Delphis

Erected by:

Erected in honor of: Delphis

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Koan

occupation: poet

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality:

occupation:

sex:

PUBLISHED

Text: Paton and Hicks, no. 137; Höghammar 1993, no. 60

Photo:

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 9

Date: late 3rd c.

Statue of: Kyros, son of Eutychidas and Nikesippe (missing)

Provenance: Asklepieion

Findplace: Found down in a well.

Measurements: H. 66 L. 46-8 W. 29

Material of block: square block of marble damaged on the right side with one dowel hole on top in the center

Material of statue: marble

TEXT

Εὐτυχίδας Κύρου]
Νικησίππη Κρατίνου]
Κῦρον τὸν υἱόν. Θεοῖς]

Eutychidas, son of Kyros (and)
Nikesippe, daughter of Kratinos, on
behalf of Kyros, their son. To the
gods.

Type of Inscription: Dedicatory and votive

Dedicated to: the gods

Erected by: Eutychidas

Erected in honor of:

Erected to: the gods

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex: male child

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex: male and female

PUBLISHED

Text: Höghammar 1993, no. 72

Photo:

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 10
Statue of: Arsinoë III (missing)

Date: c. 217-205

Provenance: Asklepieion
Findplace: 1987 situated on Terrace IV, at the eastern edge.
Measurements: H. max 56 L. max 100 W. max 20
Material of block: plaque of marble
Material of statue:

TEXT

[Ὁ δᾶμ]ος ἀνέθηκε
[βασιλισσ]αν Ἀρσινόαν
[βασιλέως] Πτολεμαίου
[ἀρετᾶς ἕωεκ]α καὶ εὐνοίας
[τᾶς ἐς] αὐτόν

The *damos* set up Queen Arsinoë,
daughter of king Ptolemaios, for her
arete and *eunoia* towards it.

Type of Inscription: Honorary
Dedicated to: Arsinoë III
Erected by: the *damos*
Erected in honor of: Arsinoë III
Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Egyptian
occupation: queen
sex: female

Dedicator; nationality: Koan
occupation:
sex:

PUBLISHED

Text: Höghammar 1993, no. 63; *SEG* XLI 561.

Photo: Höghammar 1993, Fig. 28

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 11

Date: c. 215-205

Statue of: Arsinoë III (missing)

Provenance: Kos town

Findplace: 1987 situated in the Castro, outside the museum yard, to the right

Measurements: H. 22.1 L. 64.5 W. 55.2

Material of block: black Egyptian stone

Material of statue: black Egyptian stone

TEXT

Βασίλισσαν Ἀρσινόην θεὰν
φιλοπάτορα βασιλέως Πτολε-
μαίου και βασιλίσηςΙ
Βερενίκης θεῶν εὐεργετῶν
ΚαλλίμαχοςΙ Ἀντιφίλου
Ἀλ[εξαν]δρεὺς ἄθονοτεθῆσας

Queen Arsinoë, goddess,
Philopatora, daughter of king
Ptolemaios and queen Berenike,
Gods and *Euergetae*. Kallimachos,
son of Antiphilos, from Alexandria
as *agonothetes* (erected the statue).

Type of Inscription: Honorary

Dedicated to:

Erected by: Kallimachos, son of Antiphilos

Erected in honor of: Arsinoë III

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Egyptian

occupation: queen

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality: Alexandrian

occupation: *agonothetes*

sex: male

PUBLISHED

Text: Höghammar 1993, no. 2

Photo:

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 12
Statue of: none

Date: 3rd/2nd c.

Provenance: Kos town

Findplace: found during demolition of the city and included in the portal of a door.

Measurements: H. 43 L. 35 W. 7

Material of block:

Material of statue:

TEXT

Ταῖδε ἐπαγγείλαντω ἐς τὸ ἱερόν
τᾶς Δάματρος·
Φιλαινὶς Νικη[ρ]ά[του] (δρ.) Φ Ἀβρότιο[ν Φ]ανίου (δρ.) Ρ
Κλειτῶ [Ἀ]ριστό[κλ]εῦς (δρ.) Φ Ἀρίστιον Δαλίου (δρ.) Ρ
Ζωπυρὶς Ἀπ[ολλοδ]ώ[ρο]υ (δρ.) Τ Φιλιάς Νιλάνορος (δρ.) Ρ
Ἡραί[ς]]ίλλη Τιμόκλεϋς (δρ.) Σ
Αἰσχ[ρ] Με]ωεστρ[ά]τα [Φι]λτίδα Τ
Λυκο (δρ.) Τ Νικαρ[έ]τα Ναυκλ[άρ]ου (δρ.) Ρ
Ἄριστ[ις Νικαγό]ρα (δρ.) Φ Χορηγίς Ἀρκεσίλα (δρ.) [.]
Τείσιον Νικοστράτου [(δρ.)] Ρ Αἰσχ[ρ.....]που (δρ.) Ρ
Γνάθα [Τελευ]τία (δρ.) Σ Λευκίπ[πη]](δρ.) Ρ
Πυθιάς Νικοκλεῦς (δρ.) Φ Μη[
Βιτιάς Λυκαίου (δρ.) Φ Μενε[
Πυθιάς Ἀρίστου (δρ.) Σ []Λ[] [(δρ.)] Ρ
Δίη Ἀχελώϊου (δρ.) Φ Ἡδεῖα [.....]ου (δρ.) Ρ
Λάμπιον Μενετίδα (δρ.) Φ Νικασ[ώ] Δ[ιου]υσοκλεῦς (δρ.) Ρ
Καλλιστράτη Ἀριστέως (δρ.) Τ Γλ[α]υ[κί]ς Κάλλικράτου (δρ.) [.]
Ζωπυρὶς Ζωπυρίωνος (δρ.) Ρ Κλυμένη Χαιρέα (δρ.) Σ
Ζωπυρὶς Δαμονόμου (δρ.) Φ Τιμ[ά]γο[ρις] Κράτητος (δρ.) Σ
Κλευφύλη Ἀντιγόνου (δρ.) [.] Κλευμ[ά]χα Νίκωνος (δρ.) Ρ
Ἄρισταγόρη (Ἡ)ρακλείτου (δρ.) [.] Φ Εὐτελιστράτη Γλ[αυ]κ[ί]α (δρ.) [.]
Παρμενὶς Πυθοκλεῦς (δρ.) Φ Φιλτίς Ἐκατοδώ[ρου] (δρ.) Φ
Παρμενὶς Παρμενίσκου (δρ.) Φ Εὐδημί[α] [...]Λ[.ο]υ (δρ.) Φ
Λάμπιον Ἐρμώνακ[τος] (δρ.) API[

Let these women be announced to the sanctuary of Demeter;
Philainis Nike[r]a[tou] (500 drachma), Habrotio[n Ph]aniou (100 drachma)
Kleito [A]risto[kl]eus (500 drachma), Abristion Daliou (100 drachma),
Zopuris Ap[ollod]o[ro]u (300 drachma), Philiias Nilanoros (100 drachma),
Herai[s]]ille Timokleus (200 drachma),
Aisch[r] Ma]oestr[a]ta [Phi]ltida (100 drachma),
Luko (300 drachma), Nikar[eta] Naukl[ar]ou (100 drachma),
Arist[is Nikago]ra (500 drachma), The female Choragos Arkesila (? drachma),
Teisios Nikostratou (100 drachma) Aisch[r.....]pou (100 drachma),

Gnatha [Teleu]tia (200 drachma), Leukip[pe] (100 drachma),
Pythias Aristou (200 drachmas), [] L [.....](100 drachmas)]
Die Acheloioi (500 drachmas), Hedeia [.....]ou (100 drachmas),
Lampion Menetida (500 drachmas), Nikas[o] D[ion]usokleus (100 drachmas),
Kallistrate Aristeos (300 drachmas), Gl[a]u[ki]s Kallikratou (200 drachmas),
Zopuris Zopurionos (100 drachmas), Klumene Xairea (200 drachmas),
Zopuris Damonomou (500 drachmas), Tim[ago]ris Kratetos (200 drachmas),
Kleuphule Antigonou (? drachmas), Kleun[ach]a (100 drachmas),
Aristagore (He)rakleitou (500 drachmas), Eutelistrate Gl[au]k[i]a (? drachmas),
Parmenis Pythokleus (500 drachmas), Philtis Hekatodo[rou] (500 drachmas),
Parmenis Parmeniskou (500 drachmas), Eudemi[a] [...] L [..o]u (500 drachma),
Lampion Hermonak[os] (? drachmas).] ARI[

Type of Inscription: Subscription

Dedicated to: Demeter

Erected by:

Erected in honor of:

Erected to: Demeter

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality:

occupation:

sex:

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex:

PUBLISHED

Text: Segre 1993, ED 14

Photo: Segre 1993, pl. 4

Commentary: I made this translation and I have looked up each name in an onomastikon of Kos to make sure that all names are used for females, and indeed they are.

Catalogue no. 13
Statue of: none

Date: 3rd/2nd

Provenance: Kos town

Findplace:

Measurements: H. L. W.

Material of the block:

Material of statue:

TEXT

Αἴσχρον Α[---θυγάτ]ηρ,
Νικομάχο[υ δὲ γυνὰ Δάματ]ρι
Σωτεῖραι [Κόραι Ποτει]δᾶι.
Ἄνικα γᾶμ Μερόπ[ων χαλκογλώχινι τρι]αίνοι
παῖς Κρόνου ἐνδε[κάται νυκτὶ Βοαδρομίου]
ἐν τελεταῖς Δάμα[τρος ἀπορρήτωι τε συνέ]δραι
τρισακί σεῖσ', Αἴσχ[ρον κέκλετ' ἀπημοσύναν]
αἰτεῖν εἰς Σώτει[ραν ἀνισχούσας χέρας ἀγνάς]
Δάματρος σεμν[ᾶς μύστιδας εὐσεβέας,]
ὦν καὶ ἀπαρξαμ[ένα Δάματρα θεὰν Σώτειραν]
καὶ Κούραν νυχ[ίαις ἰλάσατ' ἐν τελεταῖς.]
λῆξε δ' ἅπας μυπ[ηθμὸς ἐκοιμίσθη τε θάλασσα.]
χθῶν [δὲ σα]λευ[ομένα παύσατ' ἐπευξαμένας].

Aischron, daughter of A---, wife of Nikomachos, to
Demeter Soteira, Kore, and Poseidon.

When the land of Meropes with a point of a brass trident,
the child of Kronos, in the eleventh night of the Boadromia
during the secret rites of Demeter, was shaken three times, they
gathered and asked for aid, Aischron called for freedom from harm
appealing to Soteira, lifting her hands in sacred prayer as a pious initiate
to revered Demeter, and since the goddess Demeter Soteira and Kore
were content, being appeased in the nighttime rites.

All escaped and the sea was put to rest.

The earth ceased shaking by her praying.

Type of Inscription: Dedicatory

Dedicated to: Demeter, Poseidon, Kore

Erected by: Aischron

Erected in honor of:

Erected to: these gods

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality:

occupation:
sex:

Dedicator; nationality: Koan
occupation: priestess
sex: female

PUBLISHED

Text: Sherwin-White 1978, 311

Photo:

Drawing:

Commentary: My own translation.

Catalogue no. 14
Statue of: Kore (Figure 8)

Date: c. 200

Provenance: Hippias
Findplace: At the church Ag. Giorgios Leisio.
Measurements: H. (of inscription) L. W.
H. 13 (of sculpture) L. W.
Material of block: square block of stone
Material of statue: marble

TEXT

Πυθιάς Τεισίωνος
ἱερατεύσασα
Δάματρι

Pythias, daughter of Teision,
priestess. | To Demeter.

Type of Inscription: Dedicatory and votive
Dedicated to: Demeter
Erected by: Pythias
Erected in honor of:
Erected to: Demeter

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality:
occupation:
sex:

Dedicator; nationality: Koan
occupation: priestess
sex: female

PUBLISHED

Text: Laurenzi 1938, 24-6; Segre 1993, EV 4; Höghammar 1993, no. 87

Photo: Laurenzi 1938, Fig. 8,9, pl. 1; Segre 1993, pl. 78

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 15

Date: c. 200-150

Statue of: Hermias (and Aischron?) (missing)

Provenance: Asklepieion

Findplace: 1986 situated on Terrace II, the big flight of steps, west side against the steps

Measurements: H. 65 L. 97 W. 24

Material of the block: square block of marble and broken off on the right and left and one cramp hole on the upper edge, approximately in the middle

Material of statue:

TEXT

[Αἰσχρον] Αὐτοφῶντος

[Ἑρμίαν] Ἐμμενίδα

[τὸν αὐτᾶ]ς ἄνδρα. Θεοῖς

Αἰσχρον Α

[Aischron, daughter] of Autophon

[over Hermias, son] of Emmenidas,

her husband. To the gods.

Aischron A

Type of Inscription: Dedicatory and votive

Dedicated to: the gods

Erected by: Aischron

Erected in honor of: Hermias (and Aischron?)

Erected to: the gods

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Koan

occupation: doctor

sex: male

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation: wife

sex: female

PUBLISHED

Text: Höghammar 1993, no. 64

Photo:

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 16
Statue of: unknown (missing)

Date: 2nd c.

Provenance: Kos town
Findplace: Built into the wall of Ag. Gabriel
Measurements: H. 28 L. 18.5 W.
Material of block: white marble
Material of statue:

TEXT

Ἀφίλλης
Διὸς Πατρῶιου

Aphillis | dedicated to Zeus Patroios.

Type of Inscription: Dedicatory and votive
Dedicated to: Zeus Patroios
Erected by:
Erected in honor of:
Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality:
occupation:
sex:

Dedicator; nationality: Koan
occupation:
sex: female

PUBLISHED

Text: Segre 1993, EV 329

Photo:

Drawing: *ibid.*, pl. 144

Commentary: This is my own translation.

Catalogue no. 17

Date: 190-60

Statue of: Kallistrate (missing)

Provenance: Asklepieion

Findplace: 1986 situated on Terrace II. Standing free in front of the statue bases free in front of the bases before the priests' house.

Measurements: H. 77 L. 67 W. 46

Material of block: square block of white marble

Material of statue:

TEXT

Παρμενικός Ἰέρωνος
Καλλιστράτην Κλευμάχου τὰν
γυναῖκα, καὶ Ἰέρων καὶ Ἀρισ-
ταγόρα τὰν ἰμάτερα, καὶ Νάννακις
Ἰέρωνος ἰ τὰν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ματέρα,
ἰ καὶ Παρμενίσκος Ἰέρωνος καὶ
Παρμενίσκος ἰ Σωστράτου τὰν
μαῖαν, ἰ ἱερείαν Ἀσκληπιοῦ
Ἰγυείας Ἰπιόνας ἰ Ἀπόλλωνος
Δαλίου Λατοῦς
ἰ Βασιλέως Εὐμένους

Parmenikos, son of Hieron, for
his wife Kallistrate, daughter of
Kleumachos, and Hieron and
Aristagore, their mother, and
and Nannakis, her husband's
mother, and Parmeniskos, son of
Hieron and Parmeniskos, son of
Sostrates, for their grandmother,
the priestess of Asklepios, Hygieia,
Epione, Apollo of Delos, Leto and
King Eumenes.

Type of Inscription: Honorary

Dedicated to:

Erected by: private persons

Erected in honor of: Kallistrate

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Koan

occupation: priestess

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex: male and female

PUBLISHED

Text: Höghammar 1993, no. 65; Sherwin-White 1978, 133

Photo:

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 18

Date: end of 2nd c.

Statue of: Arsinoë or Kleopatra II or III (Figure 7)

Provenance: Kos town

Findplace: Odeion, Room B

Measurements: H. 23.5 (of head) L. W. 22.5

Material of block:

Material of statue: crystalline marble of the best quality

TEXT

None.

Type of Inscription:

Dedicated to: Demeter or Kore

Erected by:

Erected in honor of: Arsinoë or Kleopatra II or III

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Egyptian

occupation: queen

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality:

occupation:

sex:

PUBLISHED

Text: Kabus-Preisshofen 1989, no. 56, 154-55; Laurenzi 1932, 115 ff.

Photo: Kabus-Preisshofen 1989, pl. 63, 1-3; 64, 1-3; Laurenzi 1932, fig. 21-22

Drawing:

Commentary:

Catalogue no. 19

Date: 2nd/1st c.

Statue of: [-----]es, son of Kleinos (missing)

Provenance: Kos town

Findplace: Found down in a well.

Measurements: H. L. W.

Material of block: block of stone

Material of statue:

TEXT

[-----]ην Κλείνου	(The likeness of)
[ἡ δεῖνα Ν]ικομήδου[ς]	[-----]es, son of Kleinos.
[εὐεργ]ε[τη]κότα ἔαυ[τ-	[-----], daughter of Nikomedes,
[ἀν---ω]ς, καὶ ἐπιθ . ο	[----] her benefactor (?)
[-----]φιλοστόργως,	[---- .] and [.....-----]
[ἀρετᾶς ἕνεκ]εν καὶ εὐνο[ί-	[-----] affectionately
[ας τᾶς] ἐς αὐτάν	(erected the statue)
	for his <i>arete</i> and <i>eunoia</i> to her.

Type of Inscription: Dedicatory

Dedicated to:

Erected by: [-----] daughter of Nikomedes

Erected in honor of: human, [-----]es, son of Kleinos

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex: male

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex: female

PUBLISHED

Text: Paton and Hicks 1899, no.133; Höghammar 1993, no. 6

Photo:

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 20
Statue of: Demeter (Figure 9)

Date: 1st c. B.C.

Provenance: Kos town
Findplace: Near the theater.
Measurements: H. 197 (of sculpture) L. W. 56
Material of block:
Material of statue:

TEXT

Not published.

Type of Inscription: Dedicatory and votive
Dedicated to: Demeter
Erected by: Are
Erected in honor of:
Erected to: Demeter (or a Muse ?)

Sculptor: Philiskos

Honorand; nationality:
occupation:
sex:

Dedicator; nationality: Koan
occupation: priestess
sex: female

PUBLISHED

Text: Kabus-Preisshofen 1989, no. 56, 154-55

Photo: Kabus-Preisshofen 1989, no. 56, 154-55; Laurenzi 1932, 116, pl. IX, X

Drawing:

Commentary: I have not been able to find a published translation of this inscription.

Catalogue no. 21
Statue of: unknown (missing)

Date: 1st c. B.C.

Provenance: Kos town

Findplace: Near the theater.

Measurements: H. 75 L. 50 W. 40

Material of block: square block of marble with a cornice, molded below and broken in two

Material of statue:

TEXT

Ἄπόλλωνι [Δα]λίωι Καλύμνας
μεδέοωτι κ[ατ]ὰ χρησζμόν
Διδυμέως, Λό[χ]ος Λόχου φυ(σει)
δὲ Ξενοκράτ[ο]υς, μετὰ τῶν
τέκνων, Νικομήδους, Ὀλυμ-
πίχου τοῦ καὶ Κλευσθένης, Ξε-
νοκράτους τοῦ καὶ Βωλίου,
καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς Πώλλης
[τ]ῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ
[Χρ]ηστῶπου τοῦ Λό-
[χου] Λόχου

To Apollo Dalios, guardian of
Kalymnos, after the oracle of the
Didymaeon. Lochos, son of Lochos,
by nature son of Xenokrates, with
the children Nikomedes,
Olympichos also called
Kleusthenes, Xenokrates also called
Bolios, and his wife Polle, daughter
of Alexander, and Chrestopos, son of
Lochos, Lochos' son.

Type of Inscription: Dedicatory and votive

Dedicated to: Apollo Dalios

Erected by: private persons

Erected in honor of:

Erected to: Apollo

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality:

occupation:

sex:

Dedicator; nationality: Koan (Kalymnian)

occupation:

sex: male and female

PUBLISHED

Text: Laurenzi 1932, 179-85; Paton and Hicks 1899, no. 60; Höghammar 1993, no. 37;
Segre 1993, EV 232; Laurenzi 1938, 24

Photo: Segre 1993, 124

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar with a couple revisions.

Catalogue no. 22

Date: c. 46-44

Statue of: Iunia, daughter of Decimus, wife of P. Servilius Isauricus (missing)

Provenance: Asklepieion

Findplace: 1986 situated on Terrace III, northwest of the Xenophon niche.

Measurements: H. 74 L. W.

Material of block: cylindrical block of bluish limestone with a dowel hole on top

Material of statue:

TEXT

Ὁ δᾶμος ἐτίμασε
Ἰουνίαν Δέκμου θυγατέρα
γυναῖκα δὲ Ποπλίου
Σερο(υ)ιλίου Ποπλίου υἱοῦ
Ἰσαυρικοῦ ἀνθυπάτου

The *damos* honored Iunia, daughter of Decimus, wife of Publius Servilius Isauricus, son of Publius, proconsul.

Type of Inscription: Honorary

Dedicated to:

Erected by: the *demos*

Erected in honor of: Iunia

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Roman

occupation: wife of a proconsul

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality: *demos*

occupation:

sex:

PUBLISHED

Text: Höghammar 1993, no. 52

Photo

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 23

Date: c. 46-44

Statue of: Iunia, wife of P. Servilius Isauricos (missing)

Provenance: Kos town

Findplace: In the cistern of Al. Thymanakis.

Measurements: H. L. W.

Material of block: nearly square block of marble and hollowed out to look like a reservoir

Material of statue:

TEXT

Ἴουνία Δέκμου θυγάτηρ
γυνὴ δὲ Ποπλ[ίου Σερο]υ[ιλίου]

Iunia, daughter of Decimus
wife of Publ[ius Servilius].

Type of Inscription: Honorary

Dedicated to:

Erected by:

Erected in honor of: Iunia

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Roman

occupation: proconsul's wife

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality:

occupation:

sex:

PUBLISHED

Text: Paton and Hicks, no. 206; Höghammar 1993, no. 8

Photo:

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 24

Date: c. 25-23

Statue of: Cornelia, wife of Titus Statilius Taurus (missing)

Provenance: Asklepieion

Findplace:

Measurements: H. c. 22 L. 80 W. 31

Material of block: flat and square block of marble

Material of statue:

TEXT

Ὁ δᾶμος ἐτίμασε Κορνηλίαν
τὰν Τίτου Στατιλίου Ταύρου
γυναῖκα, τοῦ πάτρωνος τᾶς πόλιος

The *damos* honored Cornelia, wife of
Titus Statilius Taurus, *patron* of the
polis.

Type of Inscription: Honorary

Dedicated to:

Erected by: the *demos*

Erected in honor of: Cornelia

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Roman

occupation:

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex:

PUBLISHED

Text: Höghammar 1993, no. 56

Photo: *ibid.*, Fig. 24

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 25

Date: c. 15

Statue of: Iulia, daughter of Augustus, wife of Agrippa (missing)

Provenance: Isthmos

Findplace: In the grounds of Manolis Angelidis.

Measurements: H. 28 L. 58 W.

Material of block: square block of marble broken on the left and right side with surface destroyed

Material of statue:

TEXT

Ὁ δᾶμος ὁ Ἴσθμιω[τᾶν]
[ἀ]νέθηκεν Ἰουλίαν Μάρκ[ου]
[Ἀ]γρίππα γυναῖκα, θυγατέρα
[Καί]σαρος Θεοῦ υἱοῦ Σεβαστοῦ

The *deme* of Isthmos dedicated Iulia, wife of Marcus Agrippa, daughter of Augustus Caesar, son of *divus* (Iulius).

Type of Inscription: Honorary

Dedicated to: Iulia

Erected by: the deme of Isthmos

Erected in honor of: Iulia

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Roman

occupation:

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex:

PUBLISHED

Text: Höghammar 1993, no. 77

Photo:

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 26

Date: c. 15

Statue of: Iulia, as Artemis (missing)

Provenance: Halasarna

Findplace: Agia Theotis, site of the Sanctuary of Apollo.

Measurements: H. 63 L. 53 W. 13

Material of block: square block of marble

Material of statue: bronze (?)

TEXT

Ὁ δᾶμος (ὁ?) Ἀλασαρνιτᾶν Ἰουλίαν γυναῖκα Ἀγρύππα, θυγατέρα Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος, εἰκόνι Ἀρτάμιδος	The <i>deme</i> of Halasarna (dedicated) Iulia, wife of Agrippa, daughter of Caesar Augustus, in the likeness of Artemis
--	---

Type of Inscription: Honorary

Dedicated to:

Erected by: the *deme* of Halasarna

Erected in honor of: Iulia

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Roman

occupation:

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex:

PUBLISHED

Text: Höghammar 1993, no. 78

Photo:

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 27

Date: Augustan

Statue of: Iulia as Leto Kallitechnos (missing)

Provenance: Halasarna

Findplace:

Measurements: H. L. W.

Material of block:

Material of statue:

TEXT

Unpublished.

Type of Inscription: Honorary

Dedicated to: Iulia

Erected by:

Erected in honor of: Iulia, daughter of Augustus, wife of Agrippa

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Roman

occupation:

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality:

occupation:

sex:

PUBLISHED

Text: Mentioned in Höghammar 1993, no. 79

Photo:

Drawing:

Commentary: A translation for this inscription has not yet been published to my knowledge.

Catalogue no. 28

Date: Augustan

Statue of: Kleo ?, Philonidas' granddaughter (missing)

Provenance: Kos town

Findplace: Built into the wall of an old Turkish house in the neighborhood of the theater.

Measurements: H. 27 L. 77 W. 89

Material of block: square marble with blue and white striations

Material of statue:

TEXT

Φιλωνίδας [----- την]
θυγατριδῆν Κλη[-----]
Θε[οῖς]

Philonidas, [son of -----]
(erected a statue of)
the granddaughter Kle[-----]
To the gods

Type of Inscription: Honorary and votive

Dedicated to: the gods

Erected by: Philonidas

Erected in honor of: Kleo -----

Erected to: the gods

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex: male

PUBLISHED

Text: Höghammar 1993, no. 24; Paton and Hicks, no. 127

Photo:

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 29

Date: Augustan

Statue of: Kynnīs, daughter of Eukleitos, wife of Onasikles (missing)

Provenance: Kos town

Findplace: In a street of the suburb of Aspa.

Measurements: H. L. 57 W.

Material of block: square block of stone

Material of statue:

TEXT

[Ἐ]γγενεῖς τοὶ ἀπὸ Ὀνασικλεῦς
[τ]οῦ Χαρικλείτου Κυννίδα Εὐκλείτου
τὰν [Ὀνασικλ]εῦς γυναῖκα. Θεοῖς.

The descendants of Onasikles,
son of Charikleitos,
(erected a statue of) Kynnīs,
daughter of Eukleitos, wife of
Onasikles. To the gods.

Type of Inscription: Honorary and votive

Dedicated to: the gods

Erected by: descendants of Onasikles and Kynnīs

Erected in honor of: Kynnīs

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Koan

occupation: wife

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex: male and female

PUBLISHED

Text: Höghammar 1993, no. 25; Paton and Hicks, no. 124

Photo:

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 30

Date: Augustan

Statue of: Paula Euphrania, daughter of Marcus, wife of Eutychidas (missing)

Provenance: Asklepieion

Findplace: situated on Terrace II NW of temple A

Measurements: H. 62 L. 50 W. 42

Material of block: square block of blue marble with white striations and damages on left side. Anathyrosis and one square dowel hole on top maybe for a seated statue.

Material of statue:

TEXT

Ὁ δᾶμος ἀνέθηκε Παῦλα[ν]
[Εὐφρανίαν Μάρκου θυγατέρα
[γυ]ν(ι)αῖκα δὲ Εὐτ[υ]χίδα τοῦ Δαρδά-
[ν]ου, φύσει δὲ Δημοσ[σ]θένους
[φ]ιλοκαίσαρος, ἀρετᾶς ἕνεκα
καὶ σωφροσύνης.

The *damos* dedicated (the statue of)
Paula Euphrania, daughter of Marcus,
wife of Eutychidas, son of Dardanos, by nature
the son of Demosthenes, friend of Caesar, for
her *arete* and *sophrosyne*.

Type of Inscription: Honorary

Dedicated to: Paula Euphrania

Erected by: the *demos*

Erected in honor of: Paula Euphrania

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex:

PUBLISHED

Text: Höghammar 1993, no. 68; Sherwin-White 1978, 144f.

Photo:

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 31

Date: 1st/1st

Statue of: Suetonia Prima, daughter of Gaius Suetonius Hermias (missing)

Provenance: Kos town

Findplace: At the entrance to the fortress, built into the wall to the left.

Measurements: H. 80 L. 60 W.

Material of block: square block of white marble

Material of statue:

TEXT

Ἄ βουλὰ καὶ ὁ δᾶμος
ἐτείμασαν Σουητω-
νίαν, Γαίου θυγατέρα,
Πρεΐμαν, ζήσασαν
σωφρόνως καὶ κοσ-
μίως διὰ τε τὰν ἐς
τὸν πατέρα αὐτᾶς
Σουητώνιον Ἑρμί-
αν εὖνοϊαν τειμᾶς χάριν

The *boula* and the *damos* honored
Suetonia Prima, daughter of Gaius,
who lived honorably and orderly, for
her *eunoia* towards her father
Suetonius Hermias. To honor her.

Type of Inscription: Honorary

Dedicated to:

Erected by: the *boule* and the *demos*

Erected in honor of: Suetonia Prima

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex:

PUBLISHED

Text: Paton and Hicks, no. 116; Höghammar 1993, no. 18

Photo: Höghammar 1993, Fig. 8

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 32

Date: 1st/1st

Statue of: Anaxikleia, daughter of Euaion, wife of Charmylos (missing)

Provenance: Kos town

Findplace: At the entrance to the fortress, built into the wall to the right.

Measurements: H. 71 L. 65 W.

Material of block: square block of white marble

Material of statue:

TEXT

Ὁ δᾶμος ἀνέθηκε
Ἀναξίκληαν Εὐαίου
γυναῖκα δὲ Χαρμύλου τοῦ
Χαρμύλου, ἀρετᾶς ἔνεκα καὶ
σωφροσύνας καὶ τᾶς ποτὶ
τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτᾶς εὐνοίας

The *damos* dedicated Anaxikleia,
daughter of Euaion, wife of
Charmylos the son of Charmylos, for
her *arete* and *sophrosyne*, and her
eunoia towards her husband.

Type of Inscription: Honorary

Dedicated to: Anaxikleia

Erected by: the *demos*

Erected in honor of: Anaxikleia

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Koan

occupation: wife

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex:

PUBLISHED

Text: Paton and Hicks, no. 115; Höghammar 1993, no. 31

Photo:

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar.

Catalogue no. 33
Statue of: unknown (missing)

Date: 1st/1st

Provenance: Kos town
Findplace: built into a wall at Kumburnu
Measurements: H. 28 L. 31 W. 50
Material of block:
Material of statue:

TEXT

[Δι]ονυσία
[ι]ερόδουλος
ἀνέθηκεν

Dionysia,
a *hierodoulos*,
dedicated this.

Type of Inscription: Dedicatory and votive
Dedicated to:
Erected by: Dionysia
Erected in honor of:
Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality:
occupation:
sex:

Dedicator; nationality: Dionysia, Koan
occupation:
sex: female

PUBLISHED

Text: Segre 1993, EV 41

Photo: *ibid.*, pl. 86

Drawing:

Commentary: My own translation.

Catalogue no. 34

Date: 1st/1st

Statue of: Kottia Melissa (missing)

Provenance: Kos town

Findplace: In the fortress, on the right hand wall of the “tunnel” at the interior entrance of the fort.

Measurements: H. 63 L. 63 W. 30

Material of block: square block of white marble

Material of statue: bronze (?)

TEXT

Ὁ δᾶμος ἀνέθηκε Κο[τ-]
τίας Μελίσσας τὰν εἰκ[ό-]
να τειμᾶς χάριν διὰ τε [ᾶ-]
ἴδιον ἀρετὰν καὶ τὰν [τοῦ]
ἀνδρὸς αὐτᾶς καὶ τῶν π[αί-]
δῶν ποτὶ τὰν πόλιν ε[ῦ]ν[οιαν]

The *damos* dedicated an image of Kottia Melissa to honor her, for her everlasting *arete* and for her husband's and children's *eunoia* towards the *polis*.

Type of Inscription: Honorary

Dedicated to: Kottia Melissa

Erected by: the *demos*

Erected in honor of: Kottia Melissa

Erected to:

Sculptor:

Honorand; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex: female

Dedicator; nationality: Koan

occupation:

sex:

PUBLISHED

Text: Maiuri 1925, no. 458; Höghammar 1993, no. 32

Photo: Höghammar 1993, Fig. 13

Drawing:

Commentary: Translation courtesy of Kerstin Höghammar

Appendix II: Inscriptional Comparanda

Dodekanesos:

No. 1

Date: 400

Provenance: Rhodes

Archipolis, daughter of Sosigeon, dedicates a tenth to Athena.

[Dyggve and Poulsen (1960) no. 18]

No. 2

Date: 400

Provenance: Rhodes

Athans Stasia dedicates a tenth to Athena.

[Dyggve and Poulsen (1960) no. 28]

No. 3

Date: 275

Provenance: Rhodes

Polykrate, from the family of Polykrates.

[Dyggve and Poulsen (1960) no. 76]

No. 4

Date: 193

Provenance: Rhodes

Aristotima from Salamis, to her husband Cassandros Aspendios for his *euergetism*. To Athena Lindia.

[Dyggve and Poulsen (1960) no. 78]

No. 5

Date: 193

Provenance: Rhodes

Aristo Pedapatrou over her husband Timapolis Xenophon, who was a priestess, to Athena Lindia, Zeus Polias, Apollo Pythia, Artemis Kekoia, Poteidavo Hippios, to the gods.

[Dyggve and Poulsen (1960) no. 158]

No. 6

Date: 2nd

Provenance: Rhodes

Timanassa set up an image of her husband to the Gods.

[Maiuri (1925) no. 31]

No. 7

Date: 2nd
Provenance: Rhodes
A son honors his mother Dionysia. To the Gods.
[Jacopi (1932) no. 35]

No. 8
Date: 2nd
Provenance: Rhodes
The *koinon* honors Phasilita with a statue.
[Laurenzi (1932) no. 53]

No. 9
Date: 2nd
Provenance: Rhodes
Nausikos for his mother because of good will and care to him. To the Gods.
[SEG (1994) no. 648]

No. 10
Date: 1st
Provenance: Rhodes
The *demos* honors Symmacha to Artemis.
[Maiuri (1925) no. 29]

No. 11
Date: 1st
Provenance: Rhodes
Phillina to Aphrodite.
[Maiuri (1925) no. 12]

No. 12
Date: 1st
Provenance: Rhodes
The *demos* honors Teimokrateia.
[Maiuri (1925) no. 25]

No. 13
Date: 1st
Provenance: Rhodes
[fem. name, patron., demot. whose ky(rios)]
 [masc. name, patr. T]elos 100
[fem. name Laodikis from Ph]oenicia whose ky(rios)
 [masc. name a resident from Phoenicia] 10
[fem. name Laodikis] from Phoenicia whose ky(rios)
 [masc. name] Laodikeus
 [from Phoenic]ia a foreign citizen 10
[fem. name D]rakon of Damatria

[whose ky(rios) Mna]sagoras of Hypsikleus a citizen of Lindos	50
[fem. name Mn]asagora citizen of Lindos [whose ky(rios) Mnas]agoras of Hypsikleus citizen of Lindos	50
[fem. name] Tyria whose ky(rios) [masc. name] of Sidon	80
[fem name --]olaos Phagaia whose ky(rios) [masc. name--]ia Politas	10
[fem. name A]riston Kasaris [whose ky(rios)--]os son of Timarchos of Telos	10
[fem name] Seleukis whose ky(rios) Euodos Seleukeus to whom the right of residence was given	10
Leonaketis, a foreign citizen, whose ky(rios) Nysios a citizen of Nea	10
[Ag]athanora Pataris, a foreign citizen, whose ky(rios) Trityllos Hagmonida by adoption the son of Trityllos Lelis	10
[P]tolemas of Iason Argeia whose ky(rios) Aristomachos the son of Alexander from Kamyndos	50
[Ch]ryso daughter of Aristomachos from Kamyndos whose ky(rios) Aristomachos the son of Alexander from Kamyndos	60
[K]leupatra daughter of Aristomachos from Kamyndos whose ky(rios) Aristomachos the son of Alexander from Kamyndos	60
[K]leupatra from Mylisia whose ky(rios) Deksilia a foreign citizen from Patareus	10
[P]asikrateia Pataris whose ky(rios) Deksilia a foreign resident from Patareus a foreign citizen	10
Pantakleia daughter of Politos his daughter Pausania Amia whose ky(rios) Hagesipolis of Hagesipolis Brasios	80
Homonoia, a kinsman, whose ky(rios) Pharnakes, a foreign citizen kinsman	80
[Ho]monoia of Halikarnassos whose (ky)rios Pharnakes, a foreign citizen kinsmen	80
[Th]eudora from Beruit whose ky(rios) Theodoros a foreign citizen	

of Beirut	10
[Eir]ene from Antioch whose ky(rios)	
[T]ryphon of Antioch	10
vacat	

No. 14

Date: 1st

Provenance: Rhodes

Sculpture in honor of an Egyptian woman

[Dyggve and Poulsen (1960) no. 6]

No. 15

Date: 56

Provenance: Rhodes

Philaina Pausania dedicates her husband Andrias Autokrates to the Gods.

[Dyggve and Poulsen (1960) no. 322]

No. 16

Date: 10

Provenance: Rhodes

The Lindians honor a priestess Nikassa Muonideus.

[Dyggve and Poulsen (1960) no. 394]

No. 17

Date: 10

Provenance: Rhodes

The Lindians honor the priestess Neikassa Muonideus.

[Dyggve and Poulsen (1960) no. 395]

No. 18

Date: 9-6

Provenance: Rhodes

The Lindians to Iulia.

[Dyggve and Poulsen (1960) no. 385]

No. 19

Date: 9-6

Provenance: Rhodes

The Lindians to Livia.

[Dyggve and Poulsen (1960) no. 387]

No. 20

Date: 4th

Provenance: Astypalaia

Euxamena set me up this *agalma* for a favor to Archo Eleithua to repay a favor.

[IG III iii, no. 192]

No. 21

Date: 4th

Provenance: Astypalaia

Aristoklea, daughter of Kydarchos, priestess, to Athena.

[*IG III iii*, no. 184]

No. 22

Date: 4th/3rd

Provenance: Astypalaia

Aristoklea, daughter of Kydarchos, to Hera.

[*IG III iii*, no. 194]

No. 23

Date: 4th

Provenance: Telos

Family honored wife and mother Nikanassa daughter of Hermodokos. To Athena Polias and Zeus Polias.

[*IG XII iii*, no. 40]

No. 24

Date: 4th

Provenance: Karpathos

Nikagora, daughter of Alkemon, a Karpathian citizen.

[*IG XII i*, no. 983]

No. 25

Date: 3rd

Provenance: Nisyros

The *demos* honors Kallithemis with a statue.

[*SEG* (2001), no. 1059]

Delos:²⁸⁷

No. 1

Date: second half of the 4th c. B.C.

Provenance: found to the side of the Temple of Apollo

The inscription reads that Archippe, the daughter of Sostratos and wife of Ikarios, made this dedication to Artemis.

²⁸⁷ All Delian inscriptions are taken from André Plassart's (1950) compilation *Inscriptions de Délos: Périodes de l'Amphiclyonie Ionienne et de l'Amphiclyonie Attico-Délienne* and P. Roussel and M. Launey's (1937) volumes *Inscriptions de Délos* volumes 4 and 5.

[52. Inv. E 346]

No. 2

Date: after 166

Provenance: found in Portico of Antigone

Phaidimos dedicates this to Apollo in the name of his daughter Meniske.

[1990. Inv. E 1099]

No. 3

Date: after 166

Provenance: found in the Syrian Sanctuary

Dionysia dedicates this to Aphrodite in honor of her son Timon.

[2246. Inv. A 1496]

No. 4

Date: after 166

Provenance: found in the ground which leads to the great court of the Syrian Sanctuary

Apollonia, daughter of Eukleon, made this dedication to Aphrodite.

[2293. Inv. A 1532]

No. 5

Date: after 166

Provenance: found at the Synagogue

Laodike makes a dedication.

[2330. Inv. A 3048]

No 6

Date: after 166

Provenance: near the Temple of Apollo

In this inscription Babullia, daughter of (...), makes a dedication to Demeter and Kore for their good graces. This is a rare dedication to the divinities of the Thesmophoria on Delos.

[2399. Inv. A 1157]

No. 7

Date: after 166

Provenance: found in the Dodekatheion

Nike, daughter of Alexandros, makes a dedication to Herakles Kallinikos for his good graces.

[2433. Inv. A 3110]

No. 8

Date after 166

Provenance: found at Serapieion C in a wall to the east of the Inopos

The Athenians Hephaistion and Menodotos dedicated their mother Diodora, daughter of Hephaistion, to Sarapis, Isis, Anubis and Harpokrates.

[2096. Inv. E 670]

No. 9

Date: after 166

Provenance: Philadelphion

Image of Arsinoë II as Agathe Tyche.

[Plassart 1928, 311]

No. 10

Date: after 166

Provenance: Found among the debris of the cella of the Temple of Apollo Kleopatra the daughter of Ptolemaios honors the Athenian Himeros Zenonos in dedication to Apollo, Artemis and Leto.

[1537. Inv E 156]

No. 11

Date: 138/7

Provenance: *in situ* in House of Kleopatra in the Theater Quarter

Kleopatra dedicates this in honor of her husband Dioskourides for giving three tripods of silver to the Temple of Apollo in the archonship of Timarchos.

[1987. Inv. E 379]

No. 12

Date: 110/9

Provenance: Found in the extreme north end of the Portico of Philip

Artemisia, the daughter of Diogenes, dedicated this to her husband Dionysios in the archonship of Polykleitos.

[1815. Inv. E 275]

No. 13

Date: c. 100-75

Provenance: House of the Diadoumenos

Portrait of a Roman lady.

[Michalowski 1932, pl. XXXIII-XXXV, fig. 32]

Samothrace:

No. 1

Date: 3rd century

Provenance: Samothrace

The *mystai* dedicate Queen Stratonike for her good will.

[SEG 35 no. 964a]

No. 2

Date: 3rd
Provenance: Hall of Votive Gifts
Portrait of Arsinoë III
[Lehmann and Lehmann 1962, no. 131]

No. 3
Date: 3rd century
Provenance: found in upper spring of ancient town
The *deme* honors Pythokle.
[Fraser (1960) no. 17]

No. 4
Date: 2nd
Provenance: Temenos
Portrait of a private woman.
[Lehmann and Spittle 1982, no. 110]

No. 5
Date: 2nd century
Provenance: Samothrace
The *mystai* dedicate Queen Apollonis.
[SEG 35 no. 964b]

Appendix III: Sculptural Dedications Arranged by Date

Catalogue	Date	Sculpture Subject	Patron	Location	Purpose
R1	400	Goddess	Woman	Sanctuary	D and V
R2	400	Goddess	Woman	Sanctuary	D and V
3	375	Queen	Demos	Public	H
A20	350	Goddess	Woman	Sanctuary	D and V
A21	350	Goddess	Priestess	Sanctuary	D and V
D1	350	Goddess	Woman	Sanctuary	D and V
K24	350	Woman	Demos	Public	H
T23	350	Woman	Family	Public	H and V
1	350	Unknown	Woman	Sanctuary	D and V
2	350	Goddess	Priestess	Sanctuary	D and V
A22	300	Goddess	Woman	Sanctuary	D and V
R3	275	Woman	Family	Public	H
7	270	Queen	Demos	Public	H
N25	250	Woman	Demos	Public	H
S1	250	Queen	Official	Public	H
S2	250	Queen	Demos	Sanctuary	H and V
4	250	God	Woman	Sanctuary	H and V
5	250	Goddess	Priestess	Sanctuary	H and V
6	250	Goddess	Priestess	Sanctuary	H and V
8	225	Woman	Demos	Sanctuary	H
9	225	Family	Family	Sanctuary	D and V
10	217	Queen	Demos	Sanctuary	H
11	215	Queen	Demos	Public	H
S4	200	Woman	Demos	Public	H
14	200	Goddess	Priestess	Public	D and V
15	200	Family	Woman	Sanctuary	D and V
R4	193	Family	Woman	Sanctuary	D and V
R5	193	Family	Priestess	Sanctuary	D and V
17	190	Priestess	Family	Sanctuary	H
18	175	Queen	Demos	Public	H
D10	166	Family	Queen	Sanctuary	D and V
D2	166	God	Family	Public	H and V
D3	166	Goddess	Woman	Sanctuary	D and V
D4	166	Goddess	Woman	Public	D and V
D5	166	Unknown	Woman	Public	D and V
D6	166	Goddess	Woman	Sanctuary	D and V
D7	166	Family	Woman	Sanctuary	D and V
D8	166	Woman	Family	Public	H and V
D9	166	Queen	Demos	Sanctuary	H and V

R6	150	Family	Woman	Public	D and V
R7	150	Woman	Family	Public	H and V
R8	150	Woman	Demos	Public	H
R9	150	Woman	Family	Public	H and V
S4	150	Woman	Demos	Public	H
S5	150	Queen	Official	Public	H
16	150	Unknown	Woman	Public	D and V
D11	138/7	Family	Woman	Private	D
D12	110/9	Family	Woman	Public	D
19	100	Family	Woman	Public	D
D13	100	Roman	Family	Private	H
R15	56	Family	Woman	Public	D and V
R10	50	Woman	Demos	Public	H and V
R11	50	Goddess	Woman	Public	H and V
R12	50	Woman	Demos	Public	H
R14	50	Woman	Family	Public	H
20	50	Goddess	Priestess	Public	D and V
21	50	Unknown	Woman	Public	D and V
22	46-4	Roman	Demos	Sanctuary	H
23	46-4	Roman	Demos	Public	H
27	30	Roman	Demos	Public	H
28	30	Woman	Family	Public	H and V
29	30	Woman	Family	Public	H and V
30	30	Roman	Demos	Sanctuary	H
24	25	Roman	Demos	Sanctuary	H
25	15	Roman	Demos	Public	H
26	15	Roman	Demos	Public	H
R16	10	Priestess	Demos	Sanctuary	H
R17	10	Priestess	Demos	Sanctuary	H
R18	9-6	Roman	Demos	Public	H
R19	9-6	Roman	Demos	Public	H
31	1st/1 st	Roman	Demos	Public	H
32	1st/1 st	Woman	Family	Public	H
33	1st/1 st	Unknown	Priestess	Public	D and V
34	1st/1 st	Woman	Demos	Public	H

Bibliography:

- Ager, Sheila L. 1991. "Rhodes: the Rise and Fall of a Neutral Power." *Historia* 40: 10-41.
- Ager, Sheila L. 1996. *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337-90 B.C.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Allen, Reginald E. 1983. *The Attalid Kingdom: A Constitutional History.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Austin, Michael. 2000. "Ancient Greece: Some General Points." In *Production and Public Powers in Classical Antiquity*, edited by E. Lo Cascio and D.W. Rathbone, 20-6. Cambridge: The Cambridge Philological Society.
- Benson, Jack L. 1963. *Ancient Leros.* Watertown: The Eaton Press, Inc.
- Berthold, Richard M. 1984. *Rhodes in the Hellenistic Age.* London: Cornell University Press.
- Bieber, Margarete. 1961. *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age*, 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Blinkenberg, Chr. and K. F. Kinch. 1941. *Lindos: Fouilles et Recherches 1902-1914, Vol. II.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Blundell, Sue. 1998. *Women in Ancient Greece.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brulé, Pierre. 1978. *La Piraterie crétoise hellénistique.* Paris: Annales Littéraires de L'Université de Besançon.
- Buraselis, Kostas. 2000. *Kos between Hellenism and Rome: Studies on the Political, Institutional and Social History of Kos from ca. the Middle Second Century B.C. until Late Antiquity.* Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Burn, Lucilla. 2004. *Hellenistic Art: From Alexander the Great to Augustus.* Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Burton, Joan B. 1995. *Theocritus's Urban Mimes: Mobility, Gender, and Patronage.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Carney, Elizabeth. 1991. "'What's in a Name?': The Emergence of a Title for Royal Women in the Hellenistic Period." In *Women's History and Ancient History*,

- edited by Sarah B. Pomeroy, 154-72. The University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill.
- Cary, Max and Howard Hayes Scullard. 1975. *A History of Rome Down to the Reign of Constantine*, 3rd ed. London: MacMillan Press Ltd.
- Cohen, Getzel M. 1995. *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands and Asia Minor*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cole, Susan Guettel. 1994. "Demeter in City and Countryside." In *Placing the Gods: Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece*, edited by Susan E. Alcock and Robin Osborne, 199-216. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Déonna, Waldemar. 1948. *La Vie privée des déliens*. Paris: E. de Boccard.
- Dillon, Matthew. 2002. *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion*. London: Routledge.
- Dörpfeld, Wilhelm. 1910. "Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1908-1909, I. Die Bauwerke." *AM* 35: 346-523.
- Dyggve, Ejnar and Vagn Poulsen. 1960. *Lindos Fouilles de l'Acropole 1902-1914 et 1952, III, Vol. 2, Le Sanctuaire d'Athéna Lindia et l'Architecture Lindienne*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Fantham, Elaine, Helene Peet Foley, Natalie Boymel Kampen, Sarah B. Pomeroy and H. Alan Shapiro, ed. 1994. *Women in the Classical World: Image and Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foraboschi, Daniele. 2000. "The Hellenistic Economy: Indirect Intervention by the State." In *Production and Public Powers in Classical Antiquity*, edited by E. Lo Cascio and D.W. Rathbone, 20-6. Cambridge: The Cambridge Philological Society.
- Fraser, Peter Marshall. 1960. *Samothrace, Vol. 2, pt. 1, The Inscriptions on Stone*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Frost, Frank J. 1996. "Faith, Authority, and History in Early Athens." In *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World*, edited by Pontus Hellström and Brita Alroth, 83-90. Motala: Motala Grafiska AB.
- Garland, Robert S. 1984. "Religious Authority in Archaic and Classical Athens." *BSA* 79: 75-122.

- Garland, Robert S. 1996. "Strategies of Religious Intimidation and Coercion in Classical Athens." In *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World*, edited by Pontus Hellström and Brita Alroth, 91-100. Motala: Motala Grafiska AB.
- Hermay, Antoine, Philippe Jockey and François Queyrel. 1996. *Sculptures déliennes*. Paris: École Française d'Athènes.
- Herzog, Rudolph. 1899. *Koische Forschungen und Funde*. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlags-Buchhandlung.
- Höghammar, Kerstin. 1988. "Honorary Statues on Kos (320 BC to AD 15/20)." In *Archaeology of the Dodecanese*, edited by Soren Dietz and Ioannis Papachristodoulou, 191-98. Copenhagen: Special-Trykkeriet Viborg.
- Höghammar, Kerstin. 1993. *Sculpture and Society: A Study of the Connection between the Free-standing Sculpture and Society on Kos in the Hellenistic and Augustan Periods*. Uppsala: ACTA UNIVERSITATIS UPSALIENSIS.
- Höghammar, Kerstin. 1997. "Women in Public Space: Cos c. 200 BC to AD 15/20." In *Sculptors and Sculptures of Caria and the Dodecanese*, edited by Ian Jenkins and Geoffrey B. Waywell, 127-33. London: British Museum Press.
- Hornblower, Simon and Antony Spawforth, ed. 2003. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jacopi, Giulio. 1932. *Clara Rhodos*, Vol. 2, pt. 2, *Il Templo e il Teatro di Apollo Eretemio - Nuove Epigrafi dalle Sporadi Meridional*. Bergamo: Officine dell' Istituto Italiano d'Arte Grafiche.
- Kabus-Preisshofen, Renate. 1975. "Statuettengruppe aus dem Demeterheiligtum bei Kyparissi auf Kos." *AntP* 15: 31-64.
- Kabus-Preisshofen, Renate. 1989. *Die hellenistische Plastik der Insel Kos*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.
- Kreeb, Martin. 1988. *Untersuchungen zur figürlichen Ausstattung delischer Privathäuser*. Chicago: Ares Publishers Inc.
- Kron, Uta. 1996. "Priesthoods, Dedications and Euergetism: What Part Did Religion Play in the Political and Social Status of Greek Women?" In *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World*, edited by Pontus Hellström and Brita Alroth, 139-82. Motala: Motala Grafiska AB.
- Laurenzi, Luciano. 1932. *Clara Rhodos*, Vol. 5, pt. 3, *Monumenti di Scultura del Museo Archeologico di Rodi e dell' Antiquarium di Coo (Scultura di Coo)*. Bergamo: Officine dell' Istituto Italiano d'Arte Grafiche.

- Laurenzi, Luciano. 1938. *Clara Rhodos*, Vol. 9, pt. 1, *Monumenti di Scultura del Museo Archeologico di Rodi – IV e dell’ Antiquarium di Coo – II*. Bergamo: Officine dell’ Istituto Italiano d’ Arte Grafiche.
- Lawrence, Arnold Walter. 1969. *Later Greek Sculpture and its Influence on East and West*. New York: Hacker Art Books.
- Lehmann, Karl. 1960. *Samothrace*, Vol. 2, pt. 2, *The Inscriptions on Ceramics and Minor Objects*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Lehmann, Karl and Phyllis Williams Lehmann. 1962. *Samothrace*, Vol. 4, pt. 1, *The Hall of Votive Gifts*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Lehmann, Karl. 1975. *Samothrace: A Guide to the Excavations and the Museum*, 4th ed. New York: J. J. Augustin Publisher.
- Lehmann, Phyllis Williams and Denys Spittle. 1982. *Samothrace*, Vol. 5, *The Temenos*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Linders, Tullia. 1996. “Ritual Display and the Loss of Power.” In *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World*, edited by Pontus Hellström and Brita Alroth, 121-4. Motala: Motala Grafiska AB.
- Llewellyn-Jones, Lloyd. 2003. *Aphrodite’s Tortoise: The Veiled Woman of Ancient Greece*. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales.
- Macurdy, Grace Harriet. 1985. Reprint. *Hellenistic Queens: A Study of Woman-Power in Macedonia, Seleucid Syria, and Ptolemaic Egypt*. Chicago: Aris & Anderson, Inc. Original edition, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1932.
- Maiuri, Amedeo. 1925. *Nuova Silloge Epigrafica di Rodi e Cos*. Firenze: Felice le Monnier.
- Malkin, Irad. 1996. “Territorial Domination and the Greek Sanctuary.” In *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World*, edited by Pontus Hellström and Brita Alroth, 75-82. Motala: Motala Grafiska AB.
- Marcadé, Jean. 1969. *Au Musée de Délos: Étude sur la Sculpture Hellénistique en Ronde Bosse Découverte dans l’Ile*, BEFAR 215. Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard.
- Mattusch, Carol. 1996. *Classical Bronzes: The Art and Craft of Greek and Roman Statuary*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Meeteer, Henrietta Josephine. May 1904. *The Artists of Pergamum*. Ph.D. diss. The University of Pennsylvania.

- Merker, Gloria, S. 1973. *The Hellenistic Sculpture of Rhodes*. Göteborg: Professor Paul Aström.
- Michalowski, Kazimierz. 1932. *EAD XIII: Les Portraits hellénistiques et romains*. Paris: École Française d'Athènes et de Rome.
- Papachristodoulou, Ioannis. 1999. "The Rhodian Demes within the Framework of the Function of the Rhodian State." In *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society*, edited by Vincent Gabrielsen, Per Bilde, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Lise Hannestad, and Jan Zahle, 27-44. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Paton, William Roger and Edward Lee Hicks. 1990. Reprint. *The Inscriptions of Cos*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. Original edition, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891.
- Perlman, Paula. 1999. "Krêtes aei lêistai? The Marginalization of Crete in Greek Thought and the Role of Piracy in the Outbreak of the First Cretan War." In *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society*, edited by Vincent Gabrielsen, Per Bilde, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Lise Hannestad, and Jan Zahle, 132-61. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Plassart, André. 1928. *EAD XI: Les sanctuaires et les cultes du Mont Cynthe*. Paris: École Française d'Athènes et de Rome.
- Plassart, André. 1950. *Inscriptions de Délos: Périodes de l'Amphiclyonie Ionienne et de l'Amphiclyonie Attico-Délienne*. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion.
- Pleket, Henri Willy, Ronald S. Stroud and J.H.M. Strubbe, ed. 1993. *SEG 43*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.
- Pomeroy, Sarah B. 1990. Reprint. *Women in Hellenistic Egypt: From Alexandria to Cleopatra*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press. Original Edition, New York: Schocken Books, 1984.
- Pomeroy, Sarah B. 1995. Reprint. *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity*. New York: Schocken Books. Original edition, New York: Schocken Books, 1975.
- Richter, Gisela M.A. 1984. *The Portraits of the Greeks*, 2nd ed. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Ridgway, Brunilde Sismondo. 1971. "The Setting of Greek Sculpture." *Hesperia* 40: 336-56.
- Ridgway, Brunilde Sismondo. 1987. "Ancient Greek Woman and Art: The Material Evidence." *AJA* 91: 399-409.

- Ridgway, Brunilde Sismondo. 1990. *Hellenistic Sculpture I: The Styles of ca. 331-200 B.C.* Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Ridgway, Brunilde Sismondo. 2000. *Hellenistic Sculpture II: The Styles of ca. 200 – 100 B.C.* Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Rostovtzeff, Mikhail. 1967. Reprint. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press. Original edition, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1941.
- Roussel, Pierre and Marcel Launey. 1937. *Inscriptions de Délos, Vol. 4-5.* Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion.
- Segre, Mario. 1993. *Inscrizioni di Cos.* Rome: L'ERMA di Breschneider.
- Schaps, David M. 1979. *Economic Rights of Women in Ancient Greece.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Schober, Arnold. 1951. *Die Kunst von Pergamon.* Wien: M.F. Rohrer.
- Sherwin-White, Susan M. 1978. *Ancient Cos: An Historical Study from the Dorian Settlement to the Imperial Period.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Sinn, Ulrich. 1996. "The Influence of Greek Sanctuaries and the Consolidation of Economic Power." In *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World*, edited by Pontus Hellström and Brita Alroth, 67-74. Motala: Motala Grafiska AB.
- Smith, R.R.R. 1988. *Hellenistic Royal Portraits.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Smith, R.R.R. 1996. "Ptolemaic Portraits: Alexandrian Types, Egyptian Versions." In *Alexandria and Alexandrianism.* Papers delivered at a Symposium organized by J. Paul Getty Museum and the Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities and held at the Museum, 22-25 April, 1993, edited by Kenneth Hamma. Malibu: Science Press, Division of the Mack Printing Group.
- Snyder, Jane McIntosh. 1989. *The Woman and the Lyre: Women Writers in Classical Greece and Rome.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Stewart, Andrew. 1990. *Greek Sculpture: An Exploration.* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Stewart, Andrew. 2000. "Pergamo Ara Marmorea Magna: On the Date, Reconstruction, and Functions of the Great Altar of Pergamon." In *From Pergamon to Sperlonga: Sculpture and Context*, edited by Nancy T. de Grummond and Brunilde S. Ridgway, 32-57. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Syme, Ronald. 1960. Reprint. *The Roman Revolution*. London: Oxford University Press. Original edition, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1939.

Thomas, Christine M. 1998. "The Sanctuary of Demeter at Pergamon: Cultic Space for Women and Its Eclipse." In *Pergamon Citadel of the Gods: Archaeological Record, Literary Description, and Religious Development*, edited by Helmut Koester, 277-98. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.

Umholtz, Gretchen. 1980. "Royal Patronage of Greek Architecture as an Instrument of Foreign Policy in the Hellenistic Period." Ph.D. diss., University of California at Berkeley.

van Bremen, Riet. 1996. *The Limits of Participation: Women and Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, Publisher.

Wikander, Charlotte. 1996. "Religion, Political Power and Gender – the Building of a Cult-Image." In *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World*, edited by Pontus Hellström and Brita Alroth, 183-8. Motala: Motala Grafiska AB.

Woodhead, Arthur Geoffrey. 1981. *The Study of Greek Inscriptions*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Worthington, Ian. 2004. *Alexander the Great: Man and God*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.