There are probably several other Classical sites with the archaeological potential of Zeugma, but very few of them have been subjected to the kind of systematic interdisciplinary analysis that has characterized the Zeugma excavations during the last few years — an examination made possible largely through the generosity of the Packard Humanities Institute. As a consequence, we know more about the domestic, commercial, and military activities there than is the case at almost any other site in Roman Turkey, even those with more substantial and better preserved domestic remains, such as Ephesus and Antioch. Although the majority of the material uncovered at the site spans only three hundred years, its liminal position between the borders of Parthia and the Roman empire makes it a site critically important to our understanding of the cultural and commercial interaction between East and West. It is, in a sense, a counterpart to Troy, the discoveries from which have highlighted Trojan interaction with both Mycenaean and Hittites, as well as Greek and Persians.

In terms of religion, and especially the ruler cult, the salvage excavations at Zeugma have been particularly important in that the trenches have yielded epigraphic and sculptural evidence from a temenos for Antiochus I of Commagene. There is now evidence for ten sanctuaries or temene of Antiochus I in Commagene, and three hierothesia or tomb sanctuaries built on or near the summit of a high hill. The new discoveries at Zeugma enable us to chart the development of the ruler cult more comprehensively than ever before, and to diagram the king’s evolving relationship with a range of Greek and Persian deities.

The finds in question concern two stones discovered during the emergency excavations at Zeugma in 2000: one, found in Trench 15, is a basalt stele with a dexiosis relief on one side and a long Greek inscription on the other; the second, unearthed in Trench 9, is a limestone wall block with a fragmentary Greek inscription that appears to be contemporary with the first one. The two inscriptions have been published by C. Crowther, who was able to show that both...
pertained to a single decree, and he and Margherita Facella have recently examined all of the Commagenian inscriptions of Antiochus I as a group.7 Their study has enabled us to understand as never before the chronology and development of the Commagenian ruler cult. In this article I provide an analysis of the iconography of the Zeugma relief, as it reflects the king’s political program, and I attempt to situate it in the corpus of royal imagery of Hellenistic date.

The stele, catalogued here as SS1 (WS 510, context 15009), has a height of 1.46, a width of .68, and a thickness of .27 m (figs. 1–4; Plates 68C, 69A).8 The carved face of the stele has been broken on the left and right sides, especially at the base; the top of the king’s tiara is also missing, as is most of the face of Helios, but otherwise the relief is intact. The relief surface is only .09 m high, but such low relief was common in Commagenian sculpture. Antiochus as king stands at the left, which was his standard position in dexiosis reliefs, and shakes the hand of Helios at the right.9 Each turns toward the other in ¾ pose, and their bodies are essentially mirror images of each other. The head of Helios begins at a higher level than that of Antiochus, and the sun god’s foot overlaps that of the king, but the greater height of the king’s crown would have made Antiochus seem slightly taller. Almost identical copies of the Zeugma relief survive from Sofraz Köy and Samosata (figs. 5–6), the capital of the Commagenian kingdom, and details missing from the Zeugma example can be restored by analogy with the other two.10 All are approximately the same size, and the stelai from Zeugma and Sofraz Köy have a point chiseled base approximately .30 m in height.

Antiochus is shown in military costume with the attributes of kingship: the scepter, which he holds in his left hand, and the Armenian tiara, which is characterized primarily by the five upright feathers at the top (fig. 3).11 The main body of the tiara features a facing eagle with spread wings and a laurel wreath in its mouth. The eagle is flanked by stalks of laurel, and another band of laurel appears on the base of the tiara and on the raised lappets. The diadem, worn at the top of the forehead, is decorated with a row of four eagles in profile, and a row of lions appears on his metal neckband.12 This type of tiara had been employed by Tigranes II of Armenia, who had ruled Commagene before Antiochus, and the king’s appropriation of it seems to have
been intended to establish himself, at least in visual terms, as Tigranes’ successor. The line of eagles in profile was also featured on Darius the Great’s diadem on his image at Nemrud Dagi, and since such decoration was not used by the Achaemenids, we should probably view it as a creation of Antiochus. Originally, the upright feathers of the tiara would have partially echoed the solar rays of Helios, and radiate stars often appeared as tiara decoration on other numismatic and sculptural portraits of Antiochus.

The remainder of the costume is similar to that of the king’s Orontid predecessors who were represented in relief at Nemrud Dagi: a light long-sleeved shirt is covered by a short-sleeved leather cuirass, laced in front, with an eight-pointed star in each of the lozenges that cover the surface of the cuirass. Over the cuirass is a knee-length cloak that is fastened over the right shoulder by a heart-shaped brooch. Tight-fitting trousers are visible under a long skirt, the center of which is suspended by a cord attached to a sash with more laurel decoration. The scabbard has two crossbars ending in round bosses, at the top and near the bottom, and it hangs from a sash over his right thigh. The top of the scabbard is rounded, and a laurel branch adorns the shaft and the sash that holds it. The boots have the same kind of central flap and long laces that are featured on images of Attis and Parthian barbarians in Roman triumphal monuments. In each of the Commagenian dextiosis reliefs that survive, the king’s costume features decoration intended to foster a stronger tie between him and the god whose assistance he is acknowledging, and here the laurel, sacred to Apollo/Helios, clearly fulfills that function.
Helios is nude with the exception of a long cloak fastened by a round fibula on his right shoulder. The cloak descends to the line of his ankles, and his body has been slightly foreshortened. In his left hand he holds a laurel vine aid is therefore not surprising, nor is the emphasis on solar imagery, which was always popular in both Classical and Near Eastern ruler iconography. What is surprising is the use of the dexiosis gesture to unite human and god. This had never happened before, as far as we know. Gods shook hands with each other, and rulers were shown in dexiosis with personifications, but no other large scale images of human/divine dexiosis were ever produced. The closest comparanda come from Egypt, especially tomb reliefs and sarcophagi that show a god (often Anubis) leading the deceased by the hand to a standing or seated god, such as Osiris or Ra. These are not technically dexiosis scenes; the clasped hands signify the god's role as guide of the deceased's spirit to the afterlife, not as an equal partner.

The only other examples that I have been able to find are Commagenian bullae of the second century A.D., which appear to show a Roman emperor, probably Antonine, shaking hands with Jupiter Dolichenus, but these were only 20 mm in size. No other ruler appears to have sanctioned representations showing such close communication with a god.

Equally unusual is the identical height and stance of ruler and god. There are a few such examples in Hittite and Pharaonic Egyptian sculpture, and a few more in which the heads of ruler and god occupy the same horizontal level, although the god is enthroned and the ruler stands before him. But visual equality of king and deity was never a feature of Hellenistic royal iconography. The presentation of the two at Zeugma was, of course, not identical: their costumes immediately allowed the viewer to identify their respective status; but the uniform size and dexiosis signaled a powerful link between the two, as did their youthful, unbearded portraits and the common use of laurel.

The costumes chosen for both figures highlighted the distinctive dynastic profile, both Greek and Persian, that had been so carefully constructed by Antiochus. His eastern dress alluded to his Achaemenid ancestry, which he traced on his paternal side as far back as Darius the Great; the heroic nudity of Helios, on the other hand, signaled the Seleucid ancestry of his mother, which allegedly stemmed from Alexander. A more encyclopedic presentation of the dual nature of the dynasty was featured in the iconographic program at Nemrud Dagi, where both terraces featured reliefs of the king's paternal and maternal ancestors, beginning with Darius and Alexander. Intermarriage among the Seleucid, Commagenian, and Persian/Parthian royal houses had occurred throughout the Hellenistic period, but such emphasis on a dynasty's Graeco-Persian structure...
was relatively rare—only Mithradates VI of Pontus had devised the same type of dynastic strategy, claiming descent from both Alexander and Cyrus in an attempt to appeal to both “eastern” and “western” components of his kingdom. It is not unlikely, in fact, that Antiochus looked to Mithradates as a model in this regard, although the visual evocation of this type of program was carried much further by Antiochus.

Perhaps the most important aspect of the relief is its relationship to the inscription on the back, quoted above, which describes Antiochus’ close relationship to three deities in syncretised form: Zeus Oromades, Apollo Helios Mithras Hermes, and Artagnes Herakles Ares. The inscription, in effect, clarifies the visual narrative on the reverse of the stele. Copies of the same inscription are preserved at Samosata and Doliche, and it looks as if the carving of the relief occurred at the same time in which the inscription was added to the other side. This was not, however, the first inscription to have occupied the stone. An earlier decree was erased prior to the addition of the new inscription, and the edges of the pre-existing text were removed when the relief of Antiochus and Helios was carved. The new text was too long for the available space on the stele, and the decree had to be continued on an adjacent wall composed of limestone blocks, one of which constitutes the second inscription found at Zeugma, in Trench 9.

Only parts of the earlier text can be read, but the discernible sections indicate that the text is essentially the same as that preserved on stelai from Sofraz Köy, Adiyaman, and Çaputlu Ağac Küllük. That text refers to two fully Greek deities—Apollo Epekoos and Artemis Diktynna, to whom sanctuaries were dedicated by Antiochus at the beginning of his reign:

I, King Antiochus, the God, Just, Manifest, a Friend of the Romans and a Friend of the Greeks, the Son of King Mithradates the Gloriously Victorious, the founder and benefactor and the first to assume the tiara, consecrated to Apollo Epekoos and Artemis Diktynna this place, and having set up both the images of the gods carved on the stelai and the images of myself that I established together with them, I appointed priests both in this place and in the other sanctuaries of the kingdom, and assigned lands for all the sanctuaries so that from the incomes that arise from the same land, the priests might make the burnt offerings of incense and sacrifices every month on the sixteenth day, the day of my birth, and the inhabitants of the land might celebrate and feast.

The date of both inscriptions can be roughly fixed in time. In the first (erased) inscription Antiochus mentions that the dedications occurred after he had assumed the tiara, but apparently before he assumed the diadem and acquired the title “megas.” J. Wagner and G. Petzl, who published the duplicate inscription from Sofraz Köy, dated the composition to ca. 66–64 B.C., indicating his receipt of the diadem was later interpolated, probably after 64 B.C. when Pompey reorganized the kingdom and recognized Antiochus’ authority. Since the king obtained control of Zeugma only at that time, our inscription probably dates to more or less the same time as the revised inscription from Sofraz Köy. The second inscription, and the associated dexiosis relief, date to the latest phase of the ruler cult, when Antiochus had reached an advanced age, and they were probably carved in the later 40s or very early 30s B.C.

Based on this sequence of inscriptions we can reconstruct the chronology of the cultic activity as follows: Antiochus dedicated a sanctuary at Zeugma (and in other areas) to Apollo and Artemis, and copies of the decree recording the dedications were erected in those sanctuaries. The temene were decorated with images of the king and reliefs of the two gods, although they do not seem to have appeared together, and the inscriptions and reliefs did not share the same stones. Toward the end of his reign, the focus of the sanctuaries appears to have been altered from Apollo Epekoos and Artemis Diktynna to the new syncretised group of Zeus Oromades, Apollo Mithras Helios Hermes, and Artagnes Herakles Ares. The king now appeared on the same stone with the gods in dexiosis, and the priests appointed to

Figure 7. Stele of Antiochus and Helios, Nemrud Dagi.
the cult were to wear only Persian costume, which suggests that the earlier sacerdotal dress code had been more flexible. The earlier inscriptions mentioning Apollo and Artemis were erased, and the revised dedications naming the syncretised deities replaced them.

I assume that the sanctuaries of Zeus, Apollo, and Herakles were fashioned from the pre-existing sanctuaries of Apollo and Artemis, considering the reuse of the inscribed stones for the later dexiosis reliefs, and such reuse would also explain why no traces of the earlier sanctuaries have been uncovered. It has been suggested that the first inscription on the Zeugma stele may have referred to such a sanctuary of Zeus, Apollo, and Herakles, in spite of the fact that it otherwise seems to duplicate the inscription from Sofraz Köy, which speaks of Apollo and Artemis. Since this section of the Zeugma inscription has been erased and covered by the later decree, one cannot be certain of the words. But the Commagenian ruler cult had very few regional variations. The changes in iconography appear to have been tied primarily to different types of complexes, such as hierothesia and temene, and the temene themselves seem to have been remarkably similar. It therefore seems very likely that the first sanctuary of Antiochus at Zeugma was dedicated to Apollo and Artemis, as at Sofraz Köy.

This chronology of the dedications also raises the issue of Antiochus’ statement at the beginning of the second Zeugma inscription, where he claims that the temene of Zeus, Apollo, and Herakles in syncretised form were founded immediately after he became king. The evidence so far gathered argues against an early foundation date, but it is conceivable that the hierothesia were originally dedicated to Zeus, Apollo, and Herakles in syncretised form, and that the dedication was subsequently extended to the temene that had first been built in honor of Apollo and Artemis.

The sequence of events outlined above is directly relevant to the iconography of Helios in the Zeugma relief. In examining the five preserved dexiosis reliefs of Helios, one finds two very different versions of the god: a Greek format with heroic nudity in the reliefs from Zeugma, Sofraz Köy, and Samosata (figs. 2, 5–6), and an eastern costume in the reliefs from Arsameia am Nymphaios and Nemrud Dagi, with a Phrygian helmet and vestments that nearly duplicate the costume of Antiochus (figs. 7–8). In other words, in the former group he has been invoked as Apollo, and in the latter group as Mithras.

Until recently, scholars have tended to assume that this divergent Graeco-Persian iconography is indicative of a chronological change in the ruler cult, with the Apollo version tied to the earlier sanctuaries, and the Mithras version to the later ones. Charles Crowther’s new examination of the cult inscriptions of Antiochus has shown that all of the dexiosis reliefs relate to the latest phase of the ruler cult, and the traditional dating scheme therefore needs to be revised. Since the reliefs of Helios in Greek format date to the end of Antiochus’ reign, they cannot be viewed as representations of the earlier deity Apollo Epekoos, whose cult had been superseded by the time the reliefs were carved. The choice of iconography instead seems to be related to spatial rather than temporal factors. The reliefs in Persian format were found in the hierothesia built by Antiochus (Nemrud Dagi and Arsameia am Nymphaios), whereas those in Greek format appear to have been used only in the temene established by the king. The different contexts seem to have mandated a different iconography for the god, although Artagnes Herakles Ares appeared in heroic nudity in both hierothesia and temene (figs. 9–10).

The context of the Zeugma relief and the cult activities that surrounded it can be reconstructed at least in part on the basis of the surviving inscriptions. The decree on the reverse indicates that this relief formed part of a series that would also have included reliefs of Antiochus in dexiosis...
with Zeus Oromasdes and Artagnes Herakles Ares, all of which would probably have been set adjacent to each other in a single line above a common base, judging by the well preserved assemblage at Nemrud Dagi (fig. 11). If the scale and sequence featured at Nemrud were also followed at Zeugma, then the largest relief would have been that of Zeus in the center flanked by smaller but similarly sized reliefs of Herakles and Helios, both in heroic nudity. Zeus Oromasdes was enthroned and clothed in the dexiosis scene at Nemrud, but the same format was clearly not always followed in temene and hierothesia, and none of the Zeus dexiosis reliefs has been recovered from the other Commagenian sanctuaries. If the scale and sequence featured at Nemrud were also followed at Zeugma, then the largest relief would have been that of Zeus in the center flanked by smaller but similarly sized reliefs of Herakles and Helios, both in heroic nudity. Zeus Oromasdes was enthroned and clothed in the dexiosis scene at Nemrud, but the same format was clearly not always followed in temene and hierothesia, and none of the Zeus dexiosis reliefs has been recovered from the other Commagenian sanctuaries. If the scale and sequence featured at Nemrud were also followed at Zeugma, then the largest relief would have been that of Zeus in the center flanked by smaller but similarly sized reliefs of Herakles and Helios, both in heroic nudity. Zeus Oromasdes was enthroned and clothed in the dexiosis scene at Nemrud, but the same format was clearly not always followed in temene and hierothesia, and none of the Zeus dexiosis reliefs has been recovered from the other Commagenian sanctuaries. If the scale and sequence featured at Nemrud were also followed at Zeugma, then the largest relief would have been that of Zeus in the center flanked by smaller but similarly sized reliefs of Herakles and Helios, both in heroic nudity. Zeus Oromasdes was enthroned and clothed in the dexiosis scene at Nemrud, but the same format was clearly not always followed in temene and hierothesia, and none of the Zeus dexiosis reliefs has been recovered from the other Commagenian sanctuaries.

The Zeugma stele had to be visually accessible from both sides, because the decree related to the relief, so it (and the companion stelai) would not have been set up against a wall. Since the decree continued on a limestone block, however, there must have been a wall in close proximity to the reliefs, probably separated from them by a corridor. We should also probably restore altars in front of each of the dexiosis reliefs at Zeugma, as at Nemrud, since the inscriptions speak of burnt offerings of incense and libations on the altars. Those altars would have been used at least twice every month—on the tenth, which marked the day of Antiochus’ accession, and on the 16th, which was his birthday—but there were also other festivals devoted to the gods who were worshipped here. The sacrifices to Antiochus and his tutelary deities were followed by feasts, and since attendance at those celebrations appears to have been mandatory, we should undoubtedly also restore a large dining area within the temenos. The inscriptions from Nemrud and Arsameia am Nymphaios also speak of musicians and games, and some of these festivals were probably more elaborate than the others. This would have been only one of several such regional sanctuaries strategically situated throughout Commagene, so that all of the residents of the kingdom could easily attend the many festivals, and each temenos was assigned land whose income was intended to pay for those festivals.

The location of the sanctuary at Zeugma cannot be established with certainty. The dexiosis relief was discovered within terrace fill of the first century A.D., although the foundations of a late Hellenistic building discovered nearby may be related to it. The other inscribed fragment was found 300 meters away, reused in a late Byzantine wall.
Two fragments of another dexiosis relief, representing Antiochus and Herakles, were found close to the summit of nearby Belkis Tepe, and there was almost certainly a sanctuary of Antiochus in that area (fig. 9). The Herakles relief was probably carved at more or less the same time as the Helios relief, and each undoubtedly formed part of a series, yet it seems unlikely that they belonged to the same group. They are fashioned of different materials (Helios in basalt, Herakles in limestone) and the Herakles relief was originally 3.1 m high, which is nearly twice the size of the Helios. Such a major discrepancy in the scale of dexiosis reliefs is duplicated in no other sanctuary in Commagene: in the two instances in which we have companion reliefs of Helios and Herakles (Nemrud Dagi and Samosata), the images are essentially the same size, and carved from the same material. We should therefore consider the possibility of two temene of Antiochus within the general area of Zeugma: one on Belkis Tepe, and another in the city itself.

The visual effect of the Zeugma sanctuary would have been very much in keeping with the syncretised Graeco-Persian nature of the deities honored there. Although the posted religious decrees were in Greek, the priests were required to wear Persian garb. The erection of a line of stelai with depictions of the gods was also distinctly Near Eastern, especially Hittite, although Helios and Herakles were presented in a Greek format. This is consistent with the city's role as a major crossing point of the Euphrates.

The most remarkable feature of these dexiosis reliefs is their mass-production with uniform iconography within a relatively short period of time. Among the Helios dexiosis reliefs, for example, the only difference in iconography lies in the number of rays in the solar crown, and there are no discernible variations among the Herakles reliefs, other than in size. The same uniformity exists in the epigraphic record, and it seems clear that a master model with visual and verbal components was created, probably in Samosata, and subsequently disseminated to all of the relevant sanctuaries in Commagene.

Mass-production of ruler imagery is not unprecedented during the Hellenistic period, but it was previously found only in the court of the Ptolemies. This began during the reign of Ptolemy II, when a large number of faience oinochoai with the image of Arsinoe II were produced for use in the dynastic cult, and the voting of multiple statues of the monarch and his family became increasingly common during the second half of the century. The young daughter of Ptolemy III died in 238 B.C., and the priests of Egypt ordered that gold and jeweled images of her be placed in all Egyptian temples of the first and second rank. The practice was carried even further during the reign of Ptolemy IV, when statues of him and his wife were placed in all Pharaonic temples by command of the priests of Memphis, and included in each group was an image of the local god presenting the king with a sword of victory. A similar format was ordered by the Egyptian priests in honor of Ptolemy V, as described in the Rosetta Stone of 196.

During the Roman empire a system designed to facilitate the widespread dissemination of ruler portraits was quickly developed, but the Imperial dedications occurred at different times and were the product of local initiative. The monuments of Antiochus seem to constitute the final ancient example of a systematic state-sponsored program of ruler imagery within the borders of a particular realm. The Commagenian decrees emphasize that the king intended the cult to continue in perpetuity, but there are no indications that it lasted beyond the king's death, and by the early empire, the decorative components of the sanctuaries, including the relief from Zeugma, were being reused in later construction.
If we consider the importance of the new discoveries at Zeugma in the context of the Antiochene ruler cult, it is clear that the inscriptions are far more important than the companion relief, in that the two versions of the decree make it possible to reconstruct the chronological phases of the cult with much greater precision. The Zeugma relief and its copies in the other Commagenian sanctuaries can now be accurately dated for the first time, and the development of the format of the sanctuaries is consequently much clearer. What we are still lacking is the visual evidence pertaining to the sanctuaries in their earliest form, when they were dedicated to Apollo Epekoos and Artemis Diktynna, although considering the extensive reuse of earlier elements in these sanctuaries, such evidence should be forthcoming in those areas of the city that escaped inundation by the Birecik Dam.69

Appendix: Other Stone Sculpture

The Helios relief was the most important of the stone sculptures discovered in the excavation season of 2000, but there were a few other small finds, all in marble, that deserve mention. Most pieces that contain a worked surface have been catalogued below, and all are housed in the Gaziantep Museum. All dimensions are in centimeters.

SS2 (ws 517, context 15001)
Over-lifesize head of a woman
H. 19; W. 25; D. 31. Broken at proper right side and at bottom. Probably early Roman Imperial in date.

The preserved section includes part of the hair, which was strongly waved and ended in a chignon, as well as part of a large headband, which does not completely encircle the head and stops just before the chignon. Carefully finished at front and back.

SS3 (ws 257, Trench 1)
Relief fragment of a face
H. 16; W. 19; D. 06. Only a small part of the hair and ears are preserved.
Probably first century A.D.

The hair is very curly, and has been defined with the point chisel rather than the running drill.

SS4 (sf 2135, context 2080)
Miniature proper right foot on base
L. 75; W. 35; H. 57. Broken at ankle. All toes broken away.

The foot is bare, and probably represents a mythical or divine figure.

SS5 (sf 26, context 03)
Statuette fragment
H. 10; W. 8; D. 5. Only a fragment of the central part of the body is preserved.

Preserves part of a snake in relief on the chest of a draped female. Probably a statuette of Hygieia.60

Figure 12. SS2

Figure 13. SS3

Figure 14. SS5
For the type, see Smith 988, 25–26, 02–04, 2; Ridgway 2002, 0. Sofraz Köy: Wagner and Petzl 976; Wagner 2000, 6–7; Crowther 2003, 59, no. 39 (relief of Shalmanesar III [858–824 B.C.] in dexiosis with the king of Babylon, Marduk-zakir-sumi).

The preserved height of the figure of Antiochus, which lacks the top of the tiara, is 1.16 m, and 1.13 m from his feet to the top of his head. The figure of Helios is 1.13 m high. The length of his rays varies between .08 and .25 m.

In dexiosis scenes of Roman date, the left side was generally reserved for the person of higher status: Nollé and Nollé 1994.


11. The total length of the scepter is .84 m, although the lower end of it disappears behind the leg of Helios. For the scepter type, see Sanders 1996, 382; for the tiara type, see Young 1964; Sullivan 1973; Sanders 1996, 397–398; Metzler 2000, 53–55.


13. Sullivan 1973. Sullivan 1990, 194. The only major change was the substitution of eagles for the lion and star that Tigranes had used.


17. Sanders 1996; Metzler 2000, 55. This type is common in the dexiosis reliefs: Wagner 2000, 16, fig. 21; Jacobs 2000, 31, fig. 38, 32, figs. 39, 40; Dörner-Goell 1963, Tafel 51A.


32. McGing 986, 3–5, 94–95, 97–98; Arikan Erciyas 2000, 74, 97–98. The only major change was the use of the substitution of eagles for the lion and star that Tigranes had used.


22. Translated by Crowther and Facella 2003, 47.


The unique iconography of these dexiosis scenes should be viewed in conjunction with the colossal enthroned figures on the east and west terraces of Nemrud Dagi. Each group featured Antiochus, Zeus, Herakles, Apollo, and the personification of Commagene, at the same scale, and all of the males were dressed in eastern costume. No other enthroned images of a king are known from the Hellenistic period. The only comparable example is that of Diodoros Pasparus, a late Hellenistic ambassador from Pergamon to Rome, who would have been a contemporary of Antiochus. One of the honors bestowed on him by Pergamon was an enthroned statue placed among the images of the gods of the palaestra (IGRR 4.293, II. 43–45). A seated state of Berenike, wife of Ptolemy III, may have been set up in the Egyptian sanctuary of Hermopolis Magna: Wace 1959, 9.

27. Lange and Hirmer 1961, pl. 92 (Sesostris I); Walker 2000, 143, no. 96.


30. Messerschmidt 2000. It seems unlikely that any of the reliefs of Antiochus’ ancestors would have been exhibited in the vicinity of the Zeugma relief, but it is clear from the Nemrud Dagi reliefs that the king’s Orontid ancestors wore the same costume.


33. For the relationship among the inscriptions, see Waldmann 1973, 5–15, 45–47; Crowther 2003, 59, 63–67; Crowther and Facella 2003, 56, 60–65. A Helios dexiosis is preserved on the reverse of the Samosata inscription (Crowther and Facella 2003, Tafel 81); the back of the Dolichic inscription is broken, and it is not clear whether it too featured a dexiosis relief (Wagner 1982, 162).

34. Crowther 2003, 64–67; Crowther and Facella 2003, 57–61. The texts recovered at Sofraz Köy and Adıyaman were not updated.

35. Translated by Crowther and Facella 2003, 73–74.


38. See Sanders (1996, 121, 234) for the same practice at Nemrud Dagi.


43. For a description of the Nemrud example, see Sanders 1996, 226–227; 240–243; Jacobs 2000, 32, fig. 39.


47. See Aylward, this volume.

48. See Tobin, this volume.

49. Wagner 1976, 117–123; Wagner 2000, 15, fig. 20. Also found near the summit of Belkis Tepe was a colossal enthroned statue usually identified as Tyche (Wagner 1976, 123–127). If the summit was originally a sanctuary to Antiochus, then she could conceivably represent Commagene, as was the case at Nemrud Dagi (Sanders 1996, 189–191, 201–203). Nevertheless, the Belkis Tepe statue is not a copy of the one at Nemrud, since there is no wreath of fruits on her lap, and given the high level of standardization in the Antiochene ruler cult, a Commagene identification therefore seems unlikely. A temple was later built on the summit and reproduced on coins of Zeugma (Price and Trell 1977, 23–24; Butcher 1998, 235). A male cult statue is visible inside the temple on the coins, and he is usually identified as Zeus.

50. Waldmann 1973, 16, 35; Sanders 1996, 225, 228, 237, 243–244, fig. 271; Jacobs 2000, 30, fig. 37.


52. Crowther and Facella 2003, 74.

53. There are 19 rays at Zeugma, 14 at Sofraz Köy, and 20 at Samosata. The diameter of the nimbus at Sofraz Köy and Zeugma is identical (0.32 m).


59. The fate of these earlier reliefs of Antiochus and the gods is unknown, and as far as we know, none was recut into one of the later dexiosis scenes.

60. For the type, see Katakas 1990, 558–563.
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