

CHAPTER I - THE RELIGIOUS INVENTIVENESS OF THE PTOLEMIES AND THE PLACE OF THE DIVINE QUEEN

Varying social, political, economic or psychological motives have been attributed to the multifarious religious initiatives of succeeding Ptolemies. Frequently some special purpose such as racial integration or cultural imperialism has been accorded to a particular innovation but Alan E. Samuel (1983, 101) has offered an alternative view of the religious exploits of the entire dynasty. Rather than political opportunism he imputes to the Ptolemies an innate Greek conservatism combined with pragmatism to account for such contentious issues as the "introduction" of the Sarapis cult. In particular, after having examined the dynastic Alexander Cult, he states that

There was in cult behaviour some change, some evolution, but it was by no means startling or of such a nature as to redirect traditional patterns.....Although surrounded by new ideas and different concepts of deity, cult and religion, the Greeks managed to insulate themselves from novelty, for the most part, and remained almost purely Hellenic for the three hundred years of Ptolemaic rule in Egypt.

True novelty being ever difficult to attain the conclusion that the Ptolemies did nothing really new cannot be wholly denied. Nevertheless I would doubt that conservatism is an adequate explanation of the involvement of the Ptolemies in the practice of religion in Egypt. To propose a blanket motivation for this involvement would be difficult enough for any one Ptolemy, let alone for the whole dynasty, and would deny the multiplicity of possible causes for their varied religious enterprises over the space of three centuries. Any particular religious innovation may well have been motivated in part by a reverence for the traditions

of the known old gods combined with a sensible desire to propitiate the new. Such pragmatism has, however, very definite political as well as religious implications for a new dynasty ruling an ancient country with a vast population of differing ethnic origin. In such circumstances not unnecessarily to cause dissension among either gods or men was very politic indeed; if found the favour of the old and new gods might well quell incipient rebellion, or, if it did not exist, then merely to be seen to seek it might still have the same effect.

In such pragmatism political opportunism seems apparent. The end result of the religious activities of the dynasty was the furtherance of their own worship through their own particular version of ruler cult. As the Ptolemies were worshipped as gods, collectively and individually, on at least an official basis for some two hundred and seventy five years they might be considered to have succeeded brilliantly in enhancing their prestige and strengthening their power through religious propaganda. Their success in this might also indicate a uniquely Ptolemaic gift for manufacturing new religions from old, a creative talent which must negate a view of them as overly cautious and uninspired. Rather than insulating themselves from novelty they seem in fact to have been remarkably good at introducing novel interpretations of older forms and at using these innovations for their own ends.

The Gods of the Ptolemies.

The Ptolemaic talent for the creation of religious propaganda showed itself in numerous forms, in the introduction of founder cults, cults "maritime", literary cults, assimilations, divine genealogy and temple sharing. It was a talent brilliantly displayed by Ptolemy I in the introduction of the Sarapis cult which incorporated existing religious formulae into the "new" entity of Sarapis presented in the style of a Greek Pluto, thereby presenting Osiris-Apis to the Greeks as a Greek god (Stambaugh, 1972, 12/13). This was a god who could be seen to characterise

the new dynasty without confronting entrenched religious groups such as the priesthood of Amen at Thebes. Through its very own old yet shining new deity the sanctity of the new ruling house was displayed in the possession of a powerful, awesome yet approachable deity to attend their affairs. In the close identification of the royal house with the cult Sarapis and Isis were the only gods named with the monarchs in the royal oath and thus appeared as divine counterparts of the ruling pair. Royal patronage brought the notion of Sarapis as holding the key to advancement and the spread of the cult outside Egypt spread with it awareness of the new rule in Egypt. Stambaugh (1972, 95 and 101) has seen as "well warranted" the hypothesis that the intent of the cult was to continue Alexander's policy of racial fusion through this "old god newly apprehended", a combination of Pluto, Osiris, Apis, Dionysos and Asklepios, and the combination of stern Pluto and benevolent Osiris an "inspired insight" enriched with Asklepios and Dionysos into a universal god who would answer universal needs. The old yet new cult which transformed the Apis bull/Osiris into the hellenised Sarapis brilliantly exemplifies the Greek penchant for Egyptian cult forms put to practical use.

As Fraser has pointed out (1960, 17) Sarapis worship was largely an act of loyalty which was "no doubt closely associated in the public mind with the dynastic cult". The god's function as the dynastic deity of the Ptolemies was to be shared with Dionysos, however. Although absorbed in his chthonian aspects into the Asar-Hapi/Osiris/Sarapis compendium the above ground aspects of the god of wine and fertility and the mythology of his eastern conquests furnished material for the all Ptolemies, every one of whom paid tribute to this god in identifications, coinage, statues, festivals or dedications (Tondrau, 1950a, 283-316). The especial place of honour accorded to Dionysos in Ptolemy II's Grand Procession in his representation as Conqueror of the East (Kallixenos, 200D-201C) linked the dynasty with Alexander. The Ptolemies' claim to blood relationship with both

Alexander and Dionysos through descent from Herakles exceeded the pretensions of the other Diadochi, who claimed ties only with Alexander (Rice, 1983,43 and 84). O.G.I.S. 54, the Adulis Inscription, lines 4/5, salutes Ptolemy III and his descent from Herakles and Dionysos; as an ancestor Dionysos may have been considered better qualified than Sarapis as a protector for the dynasty. In Ptolemy IV's elevation of the Dionysos cult the king appeared as Dionysos in the coinage (Poole,1963,63, nos. 16-20 and pl. 14), established several festivals and sacrifices for the god and issued an edict ordering that those performing the rites of the god should be registered (B.G.U. 6.1211). The king's special involvement with Dionysos has been explained as a wish to unite the Greeks and Jews in Dionysos worship as Soter had tried to unite the Greeks and Egyptians with Sarapis (Tarn, 1964,727 and Brady, 1978,25). Outbreaks of Egyptian rebellion in the reign of Ptolemy IV may have prompted his attention to the numerous identifications of Osiris with Dionysos (Diodorus I.15-19) and made the espousal of Dionysos also a concession to indigenous belief. Ptolemy IV did not neglect the gods of Egypt, however, the Pithom Stele testifies to his generous donations of treasure to the temples and to the response of the priests to this in the placing of the statues of all past and present Ptolemies in every temple of Egypt with festivals and processions on the anniversary of the battle of Raphia (Bevan, 1968,388-392). Through temple sharing Ptolemaic ruler cult became a point of contact between the Greeks and the native gods. Ptolemy V also bestowed great benefactions upon the temples and was similarly rewarded by temple sharing and festivals (O.G.I.S. 90).

The Ptolemies as Gods.

It is, however, in the institutionalising of their own worship that the Ptolemies devised their most striking contribution to ruler cult, through the introduction of the dynastic Alexander Cult which was created for their personal deification and which combined elements of Greek, Egyptian and Oriental religions. This cult,

quite separate from the ruler worship accorded the Ptolemies as Pharaohs, and, *ipso facto*, as gods, seems to have emanated from the joint circumstances of Ptolemy I having been hailed as "Soter" by the grateful Rhodians (Diodorus 20.100.4 and Pausanias 1.8.6) and his acquisition of the body of Alexander (Diodorus 18.25 ff. and Strabo 17.1.8).

When Alexander's body was taken to Alexandria is unsure but at some time during the reigns of the first two Ptolemies it was entombed there in the Sema, which, according to Strabo (17.1.8) also contained the tombs of the kings. Possession of this most powerful talisman had obvious advantages, through it the Ptolemies could claim a link with the departed unavailable to the other Diadochi and strengthen their claim to be the direct successors of Alexander. Possibly as early as 290 Ptolemy I instituted a cult to Alexander quite separate from the existing cult instituted by the Alexandrians to Alexander as the founder of the city (Fraser, 1972, 1.215/6). The cult instituted by Ptolemy I was intended for the whole of Egypt and had its own priesthood, which was to become eponymous and used for the dating of Greek and demotic documents. The cult may well have been instituted by Ptolemy I to express his admiration for Alexander; it also added lustre to his house by emphasising the relationship which the Ptolemies claimed with Alexander through joint Argead descent by way of Dionysos' son-in-law, Herakles, Amyntos of Macedonia and Arsinoë, mother of Soter (Rice, 1983, 43).

The deification of the Ptolemies began with Ptolemy II's deification of his father at the Ptolemaia, the games devised by him in his father's honor to which the members of the League of the Aegean Islanders agreed to send *theoroi* to make sacrifices to Ptolemy I on behalf of the League (S.I.G. 3.390). Theocritus (17, ll.121-125) pays tribute to this singular act by a devoted son. Although he did not include his parents in the Alexander Cult Ptolemy II, possibly concluding that divine parents ensured one's own divinity, deified himself and his second wife, Arsinoë II, within the Alexander Cult founded by his father.

The Divine Queen.

It is with the official deification of Arsinoë II within the Alexander Cult that the systematic worship of the Ptolemaic queens really begins, and much effort has been expended upon the contentious question of whether Arsinoë II was alive or dead at the time. The answer to this depends upon the dating system adopted for P. Hibeh 2.199, whether the Macedonian or Egyptian calendar is used and whether the year fourteen which the papyrus gives is calculated from the beginning of the regency of Ptolemy II or from the beginning of his sole rule. Depending upon the system employed the year of the papyrus can be calculated to be either 272/1, 270/69 or 269/8. Arsinoë II's death is certainly dated by the Mendes stele to 9th July, 270 (Nock, 1930, 5 and n.2). Opinions are divided between those such as Fraser, (1972, 1.216 and 2.364/5, nn. 205 and 208) Rice (1983, 41) Teixidor (1988,190) Tondra (1953, 127/8) and Nock (1930, 5/6 discussing a second papyrus, P. Hibeh 1.99), who conclude that the queen was alive when deified, and Mahaffy, (1899, 79) and Quaegebeur (1978, 257/8) who argue that she had already died.

Whether Arsinoë II was alive or dead when deified is not, however, as important as the fact of the deification of the queen equally with the king, who was certainly still living and thus brought the cult of the living monarch into the Alexander Cult. From thenceforward Ptolemaic queens were regularly worshipped within the cult, whereas in pharaonic Egypt the queens had been included in monarchic cults only irregularly and by special favour (Bouché-Leclercq, 1978, 2.33 and 84). In the Ptolemaic temples of Dendara, Edfou, Kôm Ombo and Philae the kings are almost invariably represented accompanied by their wives while the pharaonic queens are only rarely shown in ritual scenes (Quaegebeur, 1978, 246, Kurth, 1982/3, 129-132, Grenier, 1982, 75-8 and Gutbub, 1982/3,79-91). Similarly, in the cults of the Seleucids and Attalids only the kings were automatically included

although queens could be given a place by special privilege while living and were apotheosised after death (O.G.I.S. I. 229, 245 and 6). At Alexandria, however, when the cult of past and present couples had been fully instituted the queens were both deified in life in company with the kings, with special priestesses in their honour, and further elevated after death. They also received individual worship in identification with various goddesses and thereby a bridge was formed between the dynastic cult and the traditional worship of such goddesses.

The permanent and official commemoration of royal couples as gods recognised on an everyday basis in the prescripts of Greek and demotic documents throughout Egypt was a peculiarly Ptolemaic institution and an important propaganda medium. This innovation employed the eponymity of the Alexander priest so that his name was used for dating purposes on official documents throughout the kingdom. The dating by the eponymous priest was followed by the ritual mention of all the Ptolemies who were members of the Alexander Cult, a use of names similar to the Egyptian usage of litanies of titles received by the pharaohs at their coronation but here commemorating the whole dynasty and not just the current incumbent. This constant repetition of the name of the deified monarchs in daily transactions which recognised the deification of the queens equally with that of the kings was of great significance for spreading popular awareness of the divinity of the Ptolemies and was especially important for the status of the Ptolemaic queens.

Titles and Offices in the Alexander Cult.

The epithets acquired by the Ptolemies for their worship in the Alexander Cult are a distinctive element of Ptolemaic ruler cult and combine with the singular practice of calling all heirs to the throne, and thus all ruling monarchs, "Ptolemy", a device which brilliantly exhibits dynastic solidarity with the weight of tradition

adding a cumulative sanctity to the possessor of that name. The security and unassailability of a rule conducted always by a "Ptolemy" is a significant instance of Ptolemaic ingenuity in the construction of their own image; its psychological impact upon their subjects must have been considerable. No formal system has been discerned by which the Alexander Cult titles which serve to distinguish one from the other were added to the name "Ptolemy", but whether or not the cult names expressed the true personal qualities of each king it is likely that the names exhibited the particular image which the individual Ptolemy wished to promote, whether apt or not. The intense religious and psychological significance given to personal names in antiquity emphasises the importance of the names chosen, for which some kind of precedent might be seen in pharaonic nomenclature although the pharaohs were given numerous titles and not just one characteristic and personal one (Nock, 1928, 389). The Ptolemaic kings received Egyptian throne names and were sometimes given further titles by the synods of Egyptian priests and their Alexander Cult titles have been seen as an adoption and adaptation of the Egyptian ideology of the kingship of the victorious king (Koenen, 1983, 189). The names they held within the Alexander Cult were, however, quite separate from their Egyptian throne names, were usually Greek in origin and were not bestowed by the Egyptian priests.¹

In the Alexander Cult titulature only the name of Alexander the Great appears without the prefix "Theos" and without a cult title, thus giving him alone the status of an Olympian (Cerfaux and Tondriau, 191); all members of the house of Ptolemy admitted to the cult are designated Theos, Thea or Theoi with their usual cult title. The title chosen for the deification of Ptolemy II and Arsinoë II, "Theoi Adelphoi" is often considered to have been an exercise in public relations to make palatable to their Greek subjects the marriage of this full brother and sister, Theocritus (17, ll.130-132) compares the marriage to that of Zeus and Hera, thereby offering a sacred precedent in defence of the union. By the late 270's,

however, the approximate date of both the *Idyll* and the institution of the *Theoi Adelphoi*, Ptolemy and Arsinoë may have been married for years (Theocritus, notes, Gow (1950) 2.339, n.86 and 2.346, n.130 and Fraser, 1972, 2.367 and n.228); if the reason for the choice of the title was to sanctify the marriage, therefore, then it seems a little overdue.

Whatever the reason for the marriage, and suggestions have ranged from the devotion inspired by Arsinoë's personal charms (Davis and Kraay, 1973,156) to a variety of economic, political and diplomatic advantages (cf. White, 1971, 248-250, and Vatin, 1970, 60/61) it introduced full brother and sister union into the dynasty, a further example of Ptolemaic innovativeness and tolerance of Egyptian royal custom by a monarchy willing to accept and initiate changes of lifestyle unknown in the traditions of the old cities of Greece (Hopkins, 1980, 311). Vatin (1970, 73) has seen the necessity to justify the incestuous marriage as the cause of the divinisation of the dynasty and the extraordinary dignities conferred upon Arsinoë II, and although unlikely to have been the sole cause it is quite possible that the marriage made deification even more desirable than it may otherwise have been.

Arsinoë II not only shared equally with her brother in the *Theoi Adelphoi* but was deified alone as the goddess *Philadelphos*, fraternal affection being again so heavily emphasised that this title also seems likely to have been chosen for moral overtones which would placate the Greeks. Again the exact timing of the honour is uncertain but the term seems to have been applied in her lifetime by the Greeks though not by the Egyptians (cf. Fraser, 1972, 1.217 and 2.367, n.228 and Quaegebeur, 1978, 262). The title belonged principally to the queen, however, and for Ptolemy II seems to have been applied only after death in order to distinguish him from the rest of his line, in life "Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy" may have been all that was necessary. Numerous inscriptions, which reflect the great extension of the Alexander Cult. under Ptolemy II, honour Arsinoë II as either

Philadelphos, Thea Philadelphos or as part of the Theoi Adelphoi (I.G.P. pp. 104/5) After her death the worship of Arsinoë II was decreed in all the Egyptian temples through her sharing in the cult of Mendes in the Delta, the first instance of Ptolemaic temple sharing (Nock, 1930,4/5 and Koenen, 1983, 159). Quaegebeur, (1978, 249-254) in an examination of the Ptolemaic queens and the Egyptian tradition analyses the several representations of Arsinoë II as Thea Philadelphos in the Mendes stelae and other plaques and the frequent depictions of the deified queen, often shown being venerated by her husband. She is recognised as ΑΡΣΙΝΟΗΣ ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΟΥ with a double cornucopia bound with a fillet on the reverse of a gold coin, possibly from Egypt, on the obverse of which her head is shown with the horn of Zeus Ammon and wearing the diadem, stephane and veil (Poole, 1963, 42, no. 1 and pl. 8.1). There are several similar gold and silver coins from Egypt and Cyprus, some of which were struck by Ptolemy II, though possibly not in the lifetime of the queen, and others by Ptolemies III, V, VI, IX and X (Poole, 1963, 42-5, nos. 2-40 and pl.8 and cf. Kahrstedt, 1910.272). Arsinoë also appears in the coinage with her husband and the legend ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ (Poole, 1963, 40/1, nos. 1-11 and pl.7). Ptolemy II is only rarely shown alone in the coinage and only began his own system of dated coinage by his regnal year during the nineteenth year of his reign (White, 1971, 250). A very considerable number of Egyptian titles were given to Arsinoë II in temple reliefs and statuary (Troy, 1986, 178/9) and her extensive identifications with goddesses such as Agathe Tyche, Aphrodite, Akraia, Artemis, Athena, Demeter, Hera and Isis are well documented (Tondriau, 1948c,15-21).

In 269, again apparently posthumously, Arsinoë II received another and most signal honour with the appointment of her own priestess, a kanephoros (P.L. Bat. 24, p.6, C), establishing her even more firmly as a goddess worshipped within the Alexander Cult, the only priestly office of which until this time had been that of the Alexander priest himself (P.L. Bat. 124. 1-22). The ritual function of this

priestess is given in a demotic papyrus of 17th November, 181, as the "bearer of the basket of gold before Arsinoë who loves her brother" (P. Pestman Recueil 2.1= P. Brooklyn 37.1781, line 2). The office held the same title as that of the priestess of Demeter, who in Athenian processions carried on her head a basket containing sacred objects, as did the priestesses in processions for the feasts of Bacchus and Athena (Rice, 1983, 49, Liddell & Scott, 1968, 347). The office of the kanephoros of Arsinoë Philadelphos was regularly filled in Alexandria for some one hundred and sixty years, from about 269 to at least 107/106 (P.L. Bat. 24, pp. 6-39 and nos. C - 184b).

The considerable posthumous honours awarded Arsinoë and the strong emphasis placed upon her image in the coinage, a propaganda medium of much importance in the contemporary environment, give the impression of the deliberate promotion of the divinity of the queen by Ptolemy II, carried out mostly after her death and for his own political and economic reasons. The elevation of Arsinoë was no doubt intended to make more palatable such enterprises as the diversion of the apomoira of produce from vineyards and orchards from the temples to the crown by means of the cult of the deceased queen (C. Ord. Ptol. 17-18). Paradoxically, however, in exploiting the divinity of the goddess Arsinoë Ptolemy II paved the way for the increasing acquisition of power by later Ptolemaic queens who were forceful enough to obtain and exercise power themselves whenever the opportunity arose. The sanctity which surrounded the divine queens after the elevation of Arsinoë II to the gods gave them a status unattainable had they remained merely mortal.

Until 211 the name of the kanephoros of Arsinoë Philadelphos appeared in the protocols immediately after that of the Alexander priest. In that year precedence was given to a new institution, the athlophoros of Berenike Euergetis (P.L. Bat. 24.80).

Berenike II, the daughter of Magas of Cyrene, became Berenike Euergetis as the wife of Ptolemy III. With this royal couple there began the regular assimilation of the living sovereigns into the Alexander Cult, with the queen being always accorded equal honours with the king. Koenen (1983,154/5) has equated the representation of the kings as gods in the Alexander Cult with Egyptian divine kingship, with the titles "Soter" and "Euergetes" portraying their holders as the epiphany of the protecting Egyptian gods Wadjet and Nekhbeth. The antecedents of the title Euergetes can be found in the veneration and gratitude expressed to the benefactor of a city, often shown in the right to the dedication of a statue or temple to that person. In the Hellenistic era, especially in the period from the second century B.C. to the first century A.D., there are examples of women playing an important public role in "euergetism" rendering the same social, political and financial services to their cities as men in the building of facilities such as temples and public baths and holding public office (Van Briemen, 1983, 223-241). Euergetai as a category at times received honours appropriate to a deity without actual deification and the title may have been the precursor to actual temple sharing (Nock, 1930, 52-54). Ptolemaic usage may have stemmed from Euergetes as an epithet for the benevolent Osiris-Apis found in the composite figure of Sarapis, but its specific application to Ptolemy III probably came from his re-unification of Cyrenaica with Egypt (Nock, 1928, 39) or his recognition by the Egyptian priests for returning the sacred images to the temples (Canopus Decree - O.G.I.S. 56, lines 8-12). The title was to be revived by Ptolemy VIII and used with both Kleopatra II and Kleopatra III.

It was not the husband of Berenike II but her son, Ptolemy IV, who instituted her formal recognition in the Alexander Cult with her own priestess. The precedence of the newly appointed athlophoros displaced the kanephoros of Arsinoë II and downgraded that office. The function of the athlophoros, given in the same demotic papyrus which describes the function of the kanephoros, was to carry

the prize of victory before Berenike Euergetis (P.Pestman Recueil, 2.1= P. Brooklyn 37.1781, line 1). The office first appeared in 211/10 and continued until at least 107/6 (P.L. Bat. 24.80-184b), after which the name of the office bearer is not determined. With the inception of the athlophoros there evolved the system, known as "Bell's Law", in which the athlophoros of one year normally became the kanephoros of the next (Glanville and Skeat, 1933, 45/6).

Both Greek and demotic papyri testify to Berenike II's inclusion in the Theoi Euergetai (P.L. Bat. 15, p.28), and several inscriptions also call the queen by this title (I.G.P. pp. 104 and 106) although coins attributed to Berenike Euergetis are marked only BEPENIKHΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΗΣ with no Alexander Cult title (Poole, 1963, 59/60, nos. 1-15 and pl.13). With the reign of Ptolemy III and Berenike II a new element appears in the Egyptian iconography of the Ptolemaic queens with the depiction of the living royal couple shown together with the Egyptian gods (Quaegebeur, 1978, 254). The identifications of this queen with various goddesses among whom are Aphrodite, Demeter and Isis though not as extensive as that of Arsinoë II is, nevertheless, considerable (Tondriau, 1948c, 21-23).

A few years before instituting his mother's athlophoros Ptolemy IV incorporated another significant entry into the Alexander Cult by regularising the position of Ptolemy I and Berenike I. In 215/4 he made the cult truly dynastic by including within it the Ptolemy who had founded both the cult and the dynasty and his third wife, the mother of Ptolemy II (B.G.U. 1275/6 and 1278 and cf. Oates, 1971, 57). Until then the status of this pair had been somewhat ambiguous, in the Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphos they had been honoured by a procession strangely called the τοῖς τῶν βασιλέων γονεῦσι κατωνομασμένη (on this see Rice, 1983, 38-43) and by that time Ptolemy II had deified them singly in Alexandria but he had not formally included their names in the Alexander Cult. Whether he considered their existing veneration by the Ptolemies, the Alexandrians and the

Rhodians to be sufficient or whether the plan of a truly dynastic cult was not yet fully formulated the omission was now repaired and in the same year Ptolemy IV also set up a separate eponymous cult to Soter in Ptolemais as the founder of that city, a cult which had marked similarities to the Alexander Cult in the formulaic prescripts of the documents (P.L. Bat. 24.76).² The protocols echo the form of the protocols of the Alexander Cult in using the Alexander Cult titles of the Ptolemies and were used in Upper Egypt together with those of the Alexander Cult, resulting in a cumbersome double formula for those scribes. It was the Alexander Cult protocols alone, however, which were valid for the whole of Egypt. The Ptolemais protocols first listed Soter, then the reigning king and then the previous kings from Ptolemy II onwards; the imitation in Ptolemais of the forms of the dynastic cult in Alexandria emphasises the importance to the Ptolemies of this kind of recognition and illustrates the success of the Alexander Cult in conveying a corporate image of Ptolemaic solidarity and divinity.

In the deification of Ptolemy I and Berenike I as the Theoi Soteres in their proper position after Alexander the Great, Berenike shared equally in the honour conferred by the title "Soter", evidence for which is found in inscriptions such as I.G.P. 13, 39 and 69. The title conferred upon Ptolemy I for saving the city of Rhodes (Pausanias I.8.6) may have been earlier used for him by his own family³. The fairly common application of "Soter", bestowed upon Brasidas, Lysander, Dion of Syracuse, Antigonos Gonatos, Demetrius Poliorketes, Antiochus IV and later upon Julius Caesar, may indicate that it was first considered rather in the nature of a compliment than a deification (cf. Cerfaux and Tondriau, 1957, 426 and n.2, Fredricksmeyer, 1981,151-3, Woodhead,1981,362/3). The use of this title and of "Euergetes" for Julius Caesar, Mark Antony, Augustus, Tiberius and other members of the imperial family is one of several links between Ptolemaic and Roman ruler cults (Taylor, 1975,267). The attribution of coinage to this queen is considered doubtful (Kahrstedt, 1910,262/3) but she does appear with

Soter on coins struck by later Ptolemies with the legend ΘΕΩΝ (Poole, 1963, 40, nos. 1-9 and pl. 7.1-6). The depiction of Berenike I in the stele of Kôm el Hisn, a version of the Canopus Decree of March 3rd, 237 (O.G.I.S. 56) in which the Egyptian priests accorded divine honours to Ptolemy III and Berenike II, is a good example of Egyptian recognition of the Alexander Cult. In this stele the whole series of divine Ptolemaic kings and queens to that date are shown, Ptolemy I and Berenike I, Ptolemy II and Arsinoë II and Ptolemy III and Berenike II. Berenike I holds the papyrus sceptre, wears the ankh sign and the crown of Isis and is called mother of the god (Quaegebeur, 1978, 247/8). Other identifications for Berenike I as Isis have been established and this queen also appeared as Aphrodite and possibly as Demeter (Tondriau, 1948c, 14/15).

A date of 215/6 has been given for the entry of Ptolemy IV and Arsinoë III into the Alexander Cult as the Theoi Philopatores (Oates, 1971, 6 on P. Frank. 4). Filial piety along with dynastic solidarity is apparent in this title. Despite Ptolemy IV's apparent involvement in the death of his wife the practice of equal deification was maintained and Arsinoë III appears in numerous inscriptions with Ptolemy IV as the Theoi Philopatores (I.G.P. pp.104/5). Inscriptions honouring the royal couples under their Alexander Cult titles have been found throughout Egypt and the empire; they come from such scattered districts as Alexandria, Edfou, Cyprus, Xanthos, Philae and Asswan and testify to the widespread acceptance of the Cult over a very large area and for a very long period of time. In the coinage Arsinoë III is also honoured as ΑΡΣΙΝΟΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΠΑΤΟΡΟΣ (Poole, 1963, 67, nos. 1 and 2 and pl. 15.6). In Egyptian temple reliefs Arsinoë III is frequently shown, like Berenike II, as the living queen in the company of her living husband, and also appears with Ptolemy IV and all their Ptolemaic ancestors in Egyptian reliefs which are virtually the Egyptian expression of the Alexander Cult (Quaegebeur, 1978, 255). Arsinoë III appeared in identifications with several goddesses, including Aphrodite, Artemis and Isis (Tondriau, 1948c, 23-15).

Arsinoë III was the third of the Ptolemaic queens to receive a priestess in her own honour in the Alexander Cult, although like the kanephoros of Berenike II, this was an appointment made by the son and not the husband of the queen. In 199/8 Ptolemy V appointed a priestess for his mother, with no other title than that of ἱέρεια, an office filled at least until 105/4 (P.L. Bat. 24. 92 -186). Arsinoë II, Berenike II and Arsinoë III were now all represented in the Alexander Cult by their own special priestess and cult title, whereas the kings were represented by the priesthood only collectively through the priest of Alexander and the deified Ptolemies who also represented the queens in the joint titles. The only individual priests appointed for the kings were the priests appointed in the cult at Ptolemais by Ptolemy V to Soter and himself and by Ptolemy VI for each of the kings. In that cult priestesses were also appointed for the queens, however, a kanephoros for Arsinoë II was added by Ptolemy V in 184/5 and in due course priestesses were appointed at Ptolemais for Kleopatras I, II and III (P.L. Bat. 24. 112-153).

The Reception of the Alexander Cult.

The acceptance of the Alexander Cult by both Greeks and Egyptians is seen throughout the papyri. A demotic prescript, P. Pestman Recueil 2.8 = P. Dublin 1659, dated to February/March, 198 and probably from Djême, lists not only the kings and queens by their cult titles but also gives the names of the Alexander priest and of the priestesses of the three queens. The priestess of Arsinoë III, Eirene daughter of Ptolemy, and the kanephoros of Arsinoë II, Themisto daughter of Hegesistratos, appear to be Greek, while the athlophoros of Berenike II, the daughter of Apelles, is called in demotic Nsy3s or Nsy3t3, which, in the difficulty of its transliteration into Greek may imply an Egyptian background although the mingling of Greek and Egyptian names in Ptolemaic Egypt for a variety of social reasons complicates discussion of the racial background of individuals on the basis of their names.

In the Alexander Cult, however, honours were awarded by the dynasty to the dynasty, unlike the ruler cult to the Roman emperors discussed by Price (1984) which was the product of an elaborate courtship ritual between emperor and subject cities necessitated by the political impossibility of a Roman emperor calling himself a god (Price, 1984, 73-5). None of the Ptolemies, especially Kleopatra III, had any such inhibitions or subjected themselves to any kind of restriction upon their claim to divinity and consequently Ptolemaic dynastic cult emanated from the rulers downwards to the community rather than being a grass-roots movement. It could not, therefore, be termed a "popular" institution other than in the sense of widespread popular awareness and compulsory recognition of the cult through the eponymity recognised in the dating formula of everyday documents throughout Egypt and through the spectacle which must have accompanied the ritual of the cult.

In Alexandria processions were a popular form of celebration; the Ptolemies celebrated their birthdays, their accession and various dynastic events by processions and the titles of priestesses which infer a bearer, and therefore a processional, function as at least part of their duties imply that processions formed an important part of the ritual of the Alexander Cult. The carrying of sacred objects in processions was common to both Greeks and Egyptians and for the Ptolemies kanephorai played as important a role as they had in Attic religion where, often at the head of religious processions and in Dionysian festivals, they bore baskets of offerings such as first fruits. In such processions the athlophorai carried the prizes of victory. P. Oxy. 2465, the Alexandrian decree on the Arsinoeia, the procession of the kanephoros of Arsinoë II through the city, calls for the priestess and the priests to be accompanied by the city magistrates and various public officials and for private and public animal sacrifice. Although this particular procession may not have been specifically a part of Alexander Cult ritual it is safe to assume that Alexander Cult processions would have been at

least as splendid. The impact upon the watching crowd of a succession of priestesses venerating in ritual fashion and with great splendour the divinity of a succession of Ptolemaic queens was probably considerable, vividly illustrating to the people the long tradition of the divine queens of the Ptolemies and personally involving them in cult observance through the emotion generated in them by their enjoyment of and response to the religious spectacle.

During the Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus, an instance of the procession used as an instrument of foreign policy in displaying the enormous wealth and military forces of the Ptolemies (Kallixenos 197C to 203B), copious quantities of wine were provided to the onlookers. Alexander Cult festivities, although religious occasions, involved not only the worship of the dead but of the living monarchs and may, therefore, have had a terrestrial nature which permitted a similar furthering of public approval through bodily as well as spiritual sustenance. Free drinks and spectacular pageantry could well be conducive to a mass fervour of royalty worship, perhaps intensified by the chthonic elements of a ritual presumably carried out at or near the tombs of Alexander and the Ptolemies.

Apart from processions the Alexander Cult could have offered frequent opportunities for celebrations in the form of dedicatory altars, annual festivals and sacrifices, games and competitions such as those included in the Soteria and Ptolemaia (Athenaeus 497C and S.I.G. 3.390). An inscription concerning the conduct of the Alexander Cult in Cyrene, S.E.G. 18.727, in the reign of Ptolemy VIII but of uncertain date, contains provisions for annual sacrifices, libations and prayers on behalf of the king, his wives and their children (Fraser, 1958, 101-4). A further inscription from the reign of either Ptolemy VIII or IX, S.E.G. 9.5, decrees that priests and officials are to wear white, offer sacrifices, libations and prayers at the altars in the agora, that priests and priestesses are to open and wreath the

temples and offer sacrifice and that officials are to deck public premises and sacrifice. Alexandrian festivals would hardly have been less elaborate than this.

Processions and festivals with sacrifices and libations in honour of the Ptolemies were also decreed by the Egyptian priests, who recognised the Alexander Cult in their use of the cult titles (O.G.I.S. 56 and 90). The possible practice of the cult in some form within the Egyptian temples is noted by Quaegebeur (1978, 256/7) in temple reliefs and steles which depict the kings and queens worshipping their ancestors or show the dead queen as an object of a cult rendered by the king or in those which involve temple-sharing by the divine couples, with the comment that here *On est tenté d'y reconnaître l'interprétation égyptienne du culte dynastique*. An Egyptian version of the Alexander Cult is also discerned in an indigenous clergy attached to the cult of the sovereigns as Theoi Synnaoi, whose sacerdotal titles are given in hieroglyphs inscribed on private funerary monuments, steles and statues, and in demotic or Greek in the papyri (Quaegebeur, 1983, 307). After the probably posthumous sharing by Arsinoë II of the cult of Mendes in the Delta the placing of numerous royal statues in the temples indicates that this became a standard practice, giving in every temple a deity whom the Greeks could worship as well as the Egyptians (Nock, 1930, 4-10, Cerfaux and Tondriau, 1957, 211).

A further aspect of the recognition of the Alexander Cult by Egyptians and Greeks alike can be seen in the use of the cult titles in the "Royal Oath" prescribed for legal proceedings throughout the kingdom (P. Amh 35, line 25). Under Ptolemy II the form was to swear by King Ptolemy and by Arsinoë Philadelphos, Theoi Adelphoi, a formula later extended to enumerate all the kings of the house, beginning with the reigning king, and also including Sarapis, Isis and "all the other gods" (Cerfaux and Tondriau, 1957, 207). However the only fully compulsory observation of the cult seems to have been the dating of documents by the eponymous Alexander priest.

F.W. Walbank (1984, 96/7) has disclaimed the "popular view" that the Ptolemies manufactured the Alexander Cult in order to reinforce the power of the ruling house, suggesting instead that the intention of the cult was to provide a ritual form of worship for the royal house, the court, the bureaucrats and the army displaced from their own Greek cities. This explanation may well provide some part of the reason for the cult but its limitations appear when it is considered that the cult embraced successive generations of Ptolemies for more than two hundred years and that its recognition extended throughout Egypt and the empire. In view of the duration and extent of the cult a larger and more political purpose, successfully implemented, seems more convincing, however "popular" a view this may be.

In ruling Egypt the Ptolemies had the enormous advantage of occupying a country where dynasties of pharaohs had been deified by the indigenous priesthood and an intensely religious people. They capitalised on this situation by exploiting Greek and Egyptian religious themes adapted to their own use. To avoid alienating either their Greek or Egyptian subjects they selectively conserved elements of earlier dogma, a conservatism which arose from a pragmatic view of what needed to be done to retain and maintain political power in this strange new land.

Through their own deification and through spectacular ceremonies carried out with *un éclat incomparable* (Cerfaux and Tondriau, 1957, 226) the Ptolemies bolstered their status by religious symbolism which became increasingly important as the dynasty began to decline. Of all their initiatives, however, it is the Alexander Cult which emerges as the most ingenious. In including the worship of the queens as well as the kings the cult embraced Egyptian traditions in which the rights and power of the queen were recognised but went further than this in institutionalising the worship of the queens in their automatic recognition within the cult equally with the kings. In deifying all members of the dynasty and

maintaining the worship of both the dead and the living it made a homogeneous unit of the dynasty in which each benefited from the divinity of the other in a cumulative process of ancestor worship. The acceptance and recognition of the Alexander Cult is clear from the consistent use of the cult titles throughout the documentation and in the archaeological evidence. The ritual language of the Alexander Cult became the official expression of loyalty throughout all the Ptolemaic territories, holding up the image of the royal family as gods for all the people, a positive master-stroke of image building in a country in which a new dynasty governed a mixed population of doubtful loyalty. The use of the Alexander Cult formulae in the protocols gave a method of communication which instilled the continuing presence and stability of the rule into the awareness of their most distant subjects. The cumulative effect of the constant mention of all past and present Ptolemies created a mass and omnipresent Ptolemaic divinity, the principal purpose of which was to uphold the power of the ruling house. To label such an ingenious strategem, the product of the fervent adherence of several successive generations, as conservative and lacking in novelty seems entirely inappropriate to its originality and usefulness.

For Kleopatra III steadily to assume an increasing number of personal religious honours can thus be seen as an extension of the form of ruler cult which was practised with particular fervour by her house, a principal component of which was the worship of the dynasty as the heirs and successors of Alexander. Although Kleopatra III drew upon the whole background of religious tradition and innovation available to her as a descendant of the Ptolemies it was the Alexander Cult, a unique weapon for promoting the personal cult of the queen, which she brought to its greatest heights and which she put to its greatest use in the promotion of her personal cult and in upholding her personal rule.

CHAPTER 2 - DIVINE AND POWERFUL QUEENS

The Alexander Cult exemplifies the collective ingenuity of the early Ptolemaic kings in devising a religious policy within which to sanctify themselves and their queens. It was an essay in ruler cult in which the signal honours granted to the first Ptolemaic queens by their husbands assured their worship and thereby greatly elevated the status of both king and queen. After Arsinoë III, however, the queens themselves gained increasing political power and the Alexander Cult became more their instrument than that of the kings, a development which mirrors their increasing strength as the kings declined from the standards set by the first two Ptolemies. This evolution is particularly noticeable with Kleopatra III whose extensive use of the Alexander Cult contrasts sharply with its disuse by her sons. The increase in the administrative power of the queens began before this, however, with the steadily more decisive role played in the government of Egypt first by Kleopatra I and then by Kleopatra II. It is unfortunate that an examination of the aggregation of power by the Ptolemaic queens is necessarily performed in the context of evidence principally concerned to record the activities of the kings.

Kleopatra I.

Kleopatra I, the grandmother of Kleopatra III, was the first of the Ptolemaic queens to emerge as a political figure in her own right and not merely as the consort of a king. She was not, like her predecessors Arsinoë II and Arsinoë III, the sister of her husband. Ptolemy V, the only child of Ptolemy IV and Arsinoë III, had no sister to wed and fresh blood was, therefore, brought to the dynasty with his marriage to Kleopatra, the daughter of Antiochos III of Syria and Queen Laodike, the Persian daughter of Mithridates of Pontus (Peremans and Van 't Dack, no. 14515). This infusion seems to have invigorated at least Kleopatra I's

female descendants, who, unlike the later Ptolemaic kings, displayed remarkable energy and willpower until the extinction of their line with the death of Kleopatra VII. Kleopatra I also gave her female descendants the name which was to become so famous with the last of her line and which was to be given to the daughters of the Ptolemies as consistently as that of Ptolemy was given to their sons, thereby conferring the same dynastic continuity and solidarity upon the image of the Ptolemaic queens as that conferred upon the kings by the consistent bestowal of the name of the dynasty's founder. The translation "daughter of a noble father" (Davis and Kraay, 1973,171) may well account for its popularity with patriarchs.

Kleopatra I was betrothed to Ptolemy V in about 196 while both were still children, Kleopatra I's date of birth is unknown but Ptolemy V was born on October 9th, 210 (Peremans and Van 't Dack, nos. 14515 and 14546). The date of the betrothal is unsure but Livy (33.40) says that Antiochos mentioned the prospect of such a marriage in 196 in conversation with the Roman ambassadors at Lysimachia (Bevan, 1968, 296 and n.3 on the dating of 196/5 given by Jerome and the *Chronicon Paschale*). The betrothal took place, therefore, some four years after the battle of Panium, at which Antiochos III won back from Egypt the province of Coele-Syria previously lost to Ptolemy IV at the battle of Raphia in 217. The match between Kleopatra I and Ptolemy V was intended to secure an alliance between Syria and Egypt which for the Egyptians would minimise the consequences of their defeat at Panium and for Antiochos was to secure the friendship of Egypt in anticipation of conflict with Rome (Vatin, 1970,64 and n.3)

At the time of the betrothal Ptolemy V may have concluded a contract with Antiochos which included the cession to Egypt of the territory, or at least the revenues, of Coele-Syria as Kleopatra I's dowry. The province was of the first importance to Egypt and had formed part of the ring of possessions, which included Cyprus, Cyrenaica and parts of Asia Minor and the Aegean, intended by

Ptolemy I to act as a buffer zone around Egypt as a protection from the Seleucid empire (Heinen, 1984, 442-5). The strategic and economic value of the province and the prestige attached to its possession by both the Seleucids and the Ptolemies made Coele-Syria the subject of centuries of dispute between the two dynasties. Polybius (28.1 and 28.20) states that at this time the province remained under Syrian rule, although this is contradicted by Josephus (A./ 12.154), Appian (*Syr.* I) and Porphyry (F.H.G. 2.260, F47) who assert that it was ceded to Egypt. It may be that Antiochos, after a resounding military victory, was able to negotiate an agreement with the immature Ptolemy V through which he was able to obtain a firm engagement for the marriage simply against *des promesses ambiguës* (Vatin, 1970,67). Ambiguous though Antiochos may have been the suspicion remains, however, that the Egyptians must have had some basis for the forcefulness with which they were to pursue their claim to the territory as the dowry of Kleopatra I (Polybius 28.20).

Two or three years after the betrothal the marriage was celebrated at Raphia, possibly in the presence of Antiochos himself whose attendance would necessarily have conferred far greater distinction upon the proceedings than that of a mere ambassador (Livy, 35.13). At about the same time as the marriage of her daughter Queen Laodike became the object of a Persian cult established in the Seleucid kingdom, which necessitated the inauguration of a chief priestess for the queen in all the satrapies as Seleucid queens, unlike those of the Ptolemies, were not automatically included in the cult of the royal house (O.G.I.S. 224 and see also Price, 1984, 30/1 and 37). This elaborate process of inauguration implies an increasing awareness of the usefulness of conferring religious honours upon the queens as well as the kings, and may infer the influence of Ptolemaic practice in the atmosphere of accord prevailing at the time of the wedding.

Ptolemy V's accession to the throne as a small child has been dated to 205 or 204 (Skeat, 1969, 32). It was not until November 26th, 197, however, that he was crowned at Memphis, as the Rosetta Stone inscription records (O.G.I.S. 90). This first coronation of a Ptolemy at Memphis with Egyptian rites and numerous Egyptian honours accorded to the king by the native priesthood is a significant indication of growing Egyptian influence upon the court, while conversely the Egyptian priests' use of the Alexander Cult title adopted by Ptolemy V, Theos Epiphanes Eucharistos, demonstrates their acceptance of the dynastic ruler cult of the Ptolemies.

The earliest Ptolemaic use of Epiphanes as a title has been attributed to Ptolemy IV (Nock, 1928, 38-41, Tondriau 1948d, 171) but it was Ptolemy V to whom the epithet was applied as his Alexander Cult title, apparently in 199/8 (P. Dublin Dem. 1659 and P. Berl. Dem. 13593, and see Lanciers, 1968, 61 and n.1). For the royal couple, however, it seems that their inclusion as Theoi Epiphanes in the priestly titles and the acquisition of the privileges voted the king at his coronation in 197 did not take place until 185/4, after some twenty years of kingship (Nock, 1930, 8).

There is extensive evidence of the application of Epiphanes to both Ptolemy V and Kleopatra I. In the Greek papyri and in the inscriptions Ptolemy VI is referred to as the son of the θεῶν Ἐπιφανῶν (e.g. P. Amh. 2.42-44, B.G.U. 993); the demotic papyri contain frequent references to the royal couple as the Gods Epiphanes (e.g. P. Cairo dem. 30602/3, 31079 and 31254). Epiphanes is a title whose meaning has been variously defined and it has been equated with an ancient Egyptian epithet with a hieroglyphic equivalent of "he who cometh forth" (Nock, 1928, 39 and Eddy, 1961, 300); its Egyptian origin with the idea of a divine apparition is supported by Tondriau (1948e, 41 and n. 93). The increasing Egyptianisation of the Ptolemaic court under this king lends credibility to his

assumption of an Alexander Cult title with Egyptian antecedents but the intended implication may have been for the sudden appearance or manifestation of divine power in the king rather than for his actual incarnation as a deity. A god or deified king is ἐπιφανής when by his ἐπιφάνεια some striking result, perhaps in healing or war, is produced, and the title can also be used in a more earthly sense simply to mean "distinguished" (Nock, 1928, 40 and nn. 103 and 4). Louis Delatte has distinguished three separate nuances, for Epiphanes alone as indicating the royal presence with a supernatural character, for Theos Epiphanes as the revelation of a new divinity in the person of the sovereign and for Dionysos Epiphanes as the incarnation of the divinity from the pantheon (Cerfaux and Tondriau, 1957, 422). For Ptolemy V its particular relevance may lie in the "manifestation of power" in which an Egyptian uprising was suppressed in 197 and its leaders executed at Memphis at the time of his coronation, an execution which makes the fulsome tributes paid him by the Egyptian priests as politic an action as that of the Ptolemaic king's coronation with Egyptian rites. For this king the title of Epiphanes may also have signified assimilation to Dionysos, the god *par excellence* of epiphanies. In this context it is notable that Epiphanes has also been found applied to Ptolemy IV, who identified so strongly with Dionysos (Tondriau, 1948e, 45/6).

Although Epiphanes is not frequently used in the coinage of Ptolemy V (Poole, 1963, liii-lvii), Morkholm (1983, 247) has drawn attention to a series of silver tetradrachms showing Ptolemy V with winged thunderbolt and the caption ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΟΥΣ as one of the earliest instances of the use of the Alexander Cult name of a living king on his coinage. Antiochos IV, who also adopted this epithet, made frequent use of it in the coinage which he struck (Morkholm, 1966, 48) and the comment has been made that Appian's view that the Syrians called Antiochos "Epiphanes" because he appeared to them as a king of their own when foreigners were ravaging their kingdom seems to

enunciate the real sense of the title for Antiochos at least (Nock, 1928, 41 and n. 107).

In several inscriptions Ptolemy V and Kleopatra I are called Theoi Epiphanes (I.G.P. 70, 84, 85, 95, 103, 105, 140), and both are also called Epiphanes Eucharistos (I.G.P. 74, 76, 77, 81, 93); one of these (I.G.P. no. 76) is on behalf of the king and queen as the gods Epiphanes and Eucharistos and includes with them the gods Sarapis, Isis and Anubis. Eucharistos has also been variously translated, as, from its hieroglyphic equivalent, "man of goodness" (Koenen, 1983,157) or as "lord of Beauties" (Nock, 1928, 39 and Eddy, 1961.300). The title has little force in Greek and may possibly, like Epiphanes, have been adopted because of Egyptian antecedents in order to please the native population. An early demotic papyrus, P.B.M. Eg. 10624 dated to 195, which concerns a plea by a nameless youth for protection in the temple of Soknebtunis at Tebtunis from fiends is unusual in referring to the king both as "the god Epiphanes Eucharistos" and as "the god Ptolemy Eucharistos". The vernacular rendering of the title is given as the one "whose favour is beautiful" (Thompson, 1940, 72 , note to line 4). P. Pestman Recueil 9, a demotic papyrus dated July 14th, 176 and probably from Djême, gives a further title for Ptolemy V as Epiphanes and Euergetes, an interesting combination of his usual Alexander Cult title with that of Ptolemy III and a very early instance of the revivification of previous Alexander Cult titles for use by later members of the dynasty.

Recognition of Kleopatra I as a political figure during the lifetime of her husband appears in connection with Egypt's attitude to the growing power of Rome in the early second century. Instead of aligning with the Seleucids in Antiochos III's struggle with Rome, as might have been expected and as the marriage of Kleopatra I and Ptolemy V was presumably intended to ensure, Egyptian foreign policy was directed towards gaining Roman friendship. In 191 an embassy was sent from Egypt to Rome with corn and money; this was refused. In 190, when

Rome had driven Antiochos from Greece, a further embassy *ab Ptolomaeo et Kleopatra regibus Aegypti* came with congratulations and assurances that the *reges Aegypti* were ready for whatever the Senate might order in future dispositions of the Roman army in Asia (Livy, 37.3.9). That Livy refers to the king and queen as joint rulers indicates that the combination of Kleopatra's own prestige and wealth as the daughter of a foreign king had combined with the tradition of esteem in which Ptolemaic queens were held to accord her full recognition with her husband even outside of Egypt.

The greatest political power of Kleopatra I came, however, after the death of her husband in 180 when she became regent for her son Ptolemy VI, then a child of five or six (Peremans and Van 't Dack, no. 14548). This was a striking and unprecedented event and illustrates both the willingness and ability of the queen to take the affairs of the kingdom into her own hands and the willingness of the court and people to accept that she should do so. The independent standing of Kleopatra I as the wealthy and powerful daughter of a wealthy and powerful foreign king who came to Egypt to represent an alliance between two strong nations gave her a position and influence unavailable to the earlier Ptolemaic queens; the separate identity and importance of Κλεοπάτρα ἡ Σύρα, Syrian Princess and Egyptian Queen, was great enough to ensure that her control on behalf of her son was unchallenged. That Kleopatra I took over the government of Egypt afforded an excellent precedent for her daughter and granddaughter of female administrative capacity and self-confidence.

The regency was short, however. Kleopatra I died by 14th July, 176, a *terminus ante quem* given by P. Dublin 1660 (cf. P. Pestman Recueil 9, note a), but in the four years in which this queen exercised power there is no record of opposition by alternative power groups around male rivals. As Queen Regent her position was legitimised by Egyptian custom and Greek tolerance in default of an adult male heir and it seems that she conducted affairs firmly and wisely,

with no significant internal disturbances and with peace with Syria maintained in a good relationship with her brother, Seleukos IV. No overt threat came from Rome in the wake of the good relations earlier established.

The impressive position of Kleopatra I in Egypt, exceeding that of any earlier Ptolemaic queen, is demonstrated in the prescripts of documents, for example in P. Tebt.3. 822, where her names precedes that of her son. Although Kleopatra I did not have a separate priestess of her own in the Alexander Cult at Alexandria P. Pestman Recueil 9, a demotic papyrus of July 14th, 176 gives a reference to Gjn3s as the priest of King Ptolemy (VI) and of his mother Kleopatra (I) taking precedence over the kanephoros of Arsinoë II in the cult at Ptolemais. This priesthood does not occur in the Greek texts by name (P. Pestman Recueil 9, n.e) but functioned at Ptolemais from about 177/6 to 170/69 (Otto, 1971, 195C [b]). As Kleopatra I died in 176 (Peremans and Van 't Dack no. 14515) this was apparently a posthumous honour conferred upon his mother by the young Ptolemy VI, or, more probably, in the name of the young king by the new regents, Eulaeus and Lenaeus. A priesthood for Ptolemy VI and Kleopatra I at Ptolemais is attested in the Greek texts in P. Grenfell I.10 of 174, although the priest is not named; in P. Grenfell I.12 dated ca 148 a priestess of Kleopatra II and Kleopatra the mother appears at Ptolemais and in P. Grenfell I.24 dated 146-117 there is a priesthood there of Kleopatras I, II and III. An interesting papyrus, P. Grenfell 2.15 of 139, attests to a priesthood at Ptolemais of Queen Kleopatra the Sister, Queen Kleopatra the Wife, Queen Kleopatra the Daughter and Queen Kleopatra the Mother, that is of Kleopatra II as the sister of Ptolemy VIII, Kleopatra III as his wife and the daughter of Ptolemy VI and Kleopatra II, and Kleopatra I as the mother of Ptolemy VI and Kleopatra II. These priesthoods, established very soon after the death of Kleopatra I and existing over a long period of time at Ptolemais, where the cult to Soter as its Founder bore a strong resemblance to the Alexander Cult, denote the enduring respect in which her memory was held.

Poole (1963, 78/9, nos. 1-13 and pl. 18. 7-9) lists several coins of the Regency period showing Kleopatra I on the obverse, some with the legend ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΗΣ ΚΛΕΟΠΑΤΡΑΣ, and with the queen represented as Isis with long curls bound with corn, or as Artemis wearing the stephane. A special silver issue of the Regency period which shows busts jugate of Sarapis and Kleopatra I as Isis, with, on the reverse, an eagle bearing a double cornucopia, implies that the queen is under Sarapis' especial protection. A copper issue with busts jugate of Apollo and Kleopatra I as Artemis, with Ptolemy I on the reverse, implies Apollo's protection also and in the presence of Ptolemy I emphasises the enduring cohesion of the dynasty. In later years coins depicting Kleopatra I as Isis on the obverse continued to be struck by her son Ptolemy VIII (Poole, 1963, 89, nos. 6-12 and pl. 21.3, and 93/4, nos. 67-77 and pl. 22.5), an impressive example of continuing filial honour. The queen's identifications as goddesses are found mainly in the coinage, although she also appeared as Hathor in temple reliefs (Tondriau, 1948c, 25).

In the temples of Karnak and Edfou Kleopatra I is shown with Ptolemy V being worshipped by their sons, Ptolemies VI and VIII; the significance of the queen's appearance alongside the king in the reliefs and statuary equals and mirrors her inclusion with him in the Theoi Epiphaneis in documents written before and after her death (Quaegebeur, 1978, 255 and nn. 63 and 64).

Dorothy Burr Thompson has examined in detail the Ptolemaic oinochóai and portraits in faience for the light which they shed on ruler cult. The most numerous representations are of Arsinoë II but Berenike II and Arsinoë III are also clearly identified in this material (Thompson, 1973, 82-91). For the later queens the evidence is more difficult to specify as manufacture declined and names were omitted from the artefacts, but nevertheless Thompson has attributed representations in the oinochóai to Kleopatra I, who is shown dressed as Isis in

the ornamentation of these vessels, probably used for pouring libations to the royal family. In no. 123 (p.166) a full length figure of the queen as Isis is shown in Egyptian dress and with a cornucopia, this is varied in no. 124 where the queen still appears as Isis but wears a Greek himation and carries a palm branch, the symbol of victory. Votive medallions set in frames appear to have taken over from the oinochoai when these were falling into disuse (Thompson, 1973,77) and three of these which have an Egyptianised appearance with stylised smile and loosely worn diadem (p. 92/3 and nos. 274-6, pp.200/1) are probably attributable to Kleopatra I, perhaps issued at the time of her marriage, while two others (nos. 277-8) may also be attributable to this queen or to Kleopatra II or III.

An innovation from the reign of Ptolemy V and Kleopatra I which was to be echoed in the career of Kleopatra III was the institution of a particular system of honours, a hierarchy of court dignitaries with titles ranging from "Kinsman" to "Friend" (Mooren, 1977, especially 17-61, and cf. Fraser, 1972, I.101-3). The complex origin and purpose of these offices, whether real or honorary, do not permit any certainty on their purpose, whether to inspire loyalty, gain revenue or for a combination of reasons, but with the decline of real external power and wealth in the gradual loss of the Ptolemaic empire there came a discernible escalation in the internal proliferation of honours and titles.

Kleopatra II.

When Kleopatra I died the peace of her regency was soon broken. She left three young children, Ptolemy VI, Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II, whose ages ranged somewhere between eleven and five years (Peremans and Van 't Dack, nos. 14548, 14551 and 14516) and the continuing absence of an adult heir necessitated a further regency. From this and from the ensuing dynastic strife between the three children came a lengthy and disastrous period of war and unrest which contributed greatly to the decline of the royal house from the

position established by the first two Ptolemies. During this time, as the power of the Ptolemaic kings declined, Kleopatra II further increased the power of the queens and established for herself a significant place in the history of the dynasty. Building on the position attained by Kleopatra I she left a legacy of female power to Kleopatra III, in whose career she played a major role.

As Ptolemy VI was still a minor his ministers Eulaeus, an Egyptian, and Lenaeus, a Syrian, acted as regents. The authority they exercised is demonstrated by the issue of a new copper coinage showing the head of Zeus Ammon on the obverse and on the reverse an eagle with sceptre and lotus and the letters ΕΥΛ for Eulaeus (Poole, 1963, lxiii and pl.19.2).

Shortly after the death of their mother Kleopatra II was married to the elder of her two brothers, Ptolemy VI, in April, 175 (P. B.M. Eg. 10.589 and cf. P.L. Bat.15, pp.140/1 and n.c). Considering the age of the children this marriage was undoubtedly arranged by someone other than the participants and the obvious assumption is that it took place at the behest of the two regents. The marriage carried on the burgeoning family tradition of brother/sister unions begun with the marriages of Ptolemies II and IV, and may also have appealed to Eulaeus, as an Egyptian, in reflecting some "pharaonic tradition". Practical advantages for the marriage of Ptolemy VI and Kleopatra II would have included those of earlier such marriages in the consolidation of power and wealth within the dynasty rather than its dispersal in foreign unions. In this particular marriage the likelihood that such consolidation placed increased influence in the hands of the ministers in power may well have been a determining factor.

P. Amh. 2.42 indicates that Ptolemy VI gained his Alexander Cult title of Philometor at a very early age; the dating of this papyrus is not sure but its listing of priesthoods such as that of Poseidonios as the Alexander priest establishes it as at least within a year or two of 179 (P.L. Bat 24, 14, no. 111) which in turn puts

Ptolemy VI's age at around seven years when the title was assumed. It is unlikely, therefore, that this was his personal choice and if the dating can be accepted the obvious inference is that it was selected for him by his powerful mother during her regency. Its statement of filial devotion would no doubt have appealed to her in upholding her position as a worthy and respected guardian of her son's affairs. The image of the cohesion and continuation of the dynasty is maintained in this title as it was with that of Philopator for Ptolemy IV.

Speculation on the date of P. Amh. 2.42 leads to the assumption that the plural Θεῶν Φιλομητόρων which it gives in line 3, together with the year two of the reign given uncertainly in line 1, means that it is Kleopatra I who is included with Ptolemy VI in the Theoi Philometores, his marriage with Kleopatra II having not yet taken place. If this is so then Kleopatra I enjoyed a dual status as a goddess in the Alexander Cult, being also part of the Theoi Epiphaneis and Eucharistos. However the earliest demotic text to call Ptolemy VI "Philometor" is P. Dublin 1660=P. Pestman Recueil 9 of July 14th, 176, which is considered to be the *terminus ante quem* for the death of Kleopatra I. Before this time P. Pestman Recueil (p. 96 and n.c) and P. L. Bat. 15 (p.140) consider Ptolemy VI to have been included in the demotic texts with his mother under the title Epiphanes. By 174/3, his eighth year, however, Ptolemy VI has clearly become Philometor and heads the prescript of P. Grenfell 1.10 alone as King Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy and Kleopatra and appears alone in line 3 as Θεοῦ Φιλομήτορος.

During that year Kleopatra II, now his wife, was included in the Theoi Philometores (P. Giessen I.8 and P. Amh. 2.43) and she continued to hold this title throughout her marriage to Ptolemy VI, as well as that of "Sister", to which numerous papyri such as P. Lond.23 and P. Amh. 2.33 testify along with several inscriptions such as I.G.P. 81, 87, 88, 95-8 and S.E.G.32.371 and 33.682. I.G.P. 100 is an inscription from the Fayûm on behalf of Kleopatra II alone as Queen Kleopatra the goddess Philometor, sister and wife of the King. The title "Sister"

had also been given to Kleopatra I (I.G.P. 77 and cf. Koenen, 1983, 259 and n.47), and, as well, to Berenike II the wife of Ptolemy III (O.G.I.S. 56, 60 and 61). Although neither of these queens were related to their husbands the title "Sister" had designated the queen in Ptolemaic titlature ever since Arsinoë II's marriage with Ptolemy II and her identification with Isis. As Koenen (1983, 158/9 and n. 48) has pointed out *In der Isisaretalogie von Kyme nennt Isis sich nach ägyptischer Tradition* γυνή καὶ ἀδελφὴ Ὁσεΐριδος Βασιλέως. In Greek theology the relationships of brothers and sisters such as the Dioscuri, Apollo and Artemis in Delos, and of Zeus and Hera could be used to qualify "Sister" as a basis for the veneration of the queen, while the marriage of Zeus to Hera, which, like Ptolemaic marriages, violates the incest taboo but underlines the "unique equality of birth" of Hera (Burkert, 1990, 132), is a divine precedent for Kleopatra II and all the other Ptolemaic sister wives as much as for Ptolemy II and Arsinoë II (Theocritus, 17. ll.131-4).

In 170 the issue of the dowry of Kleopatra I made a crucial appearance in Egyptian affairs. Diodorus (30.15) relates that Eulaeus and Lenaeus, although ὄντες ἄπειροι τελείως τῶν κατὰ πόλεμον, engaged Egypt in war over the Egyptian claim to Coele-Syria with Antiochos IV, who had succeeded to the Seleucid throne after the murder of Seleukos IV (Morkholm, 1966, 49). That Egypt and the two regents began the hostilities is supported by Polybius (28.1), and by the age of Ptolemy VI who was still only about fifteen at the most. Antiochos apparently denied that an agreement existed such as those in Alexandria claimed to have been made between his late father and the recently deceased Ptolemy V, by which the latter should receive Coele-Syria as a dowry when he married Kleopatra, the mother of Ptolemy VI (Polybius, 28.20).

At a date between October 5th and November 12th, 170 (Skeat, 1969, 32) and at the inception of the war with Syria came the remarkable association in the joint rule of Egypt of the three children, Ptolemy VI, his younger brother, Ptolemy VIII

and his sister and wife, Kleopatra II. P. Ryl. 583 of November 12th, 170, from Philadelphia names the three as joint sovereigns and the event is also marked by a renumbering of regnal years, so that the twelfth year of Ptolemy VI became the first of the new reign (Skeat, 1969, 33). Thus a new era began with this triple sovereignty, the introduction of which may have been brought about by Eulaeus and Lenaeus to strengthen the regime (Skeat, 1969, 33) or to confound rival power groups gathering around Ptolemy VIII (Morkholm, 1966, 70). That this division of power should have come about at the initiative of Ptolemy VI as Fraser suggests (1972, I.119 and 2.211, n.212), seems unlikely, but rather that he would, instead, have resented it seems more possible. Ptolemy VI was growing up; at around the same time as the establishment of the joint rule his anakleteria, or proclamation as king on coming of age, had been celebrated (Polybius 28.12 and Morkholm, 1966, 70, and n.24) and it is possible that Eulaeus and Lenaeus, fearing that he would soon assume increasing authority and dispense with them, saw the division of regal status among the three children as lessening the threat to their control by weakening the chance of the eldest child claiming the sole rule rightfully his. If the motive of the ministers was to maintain their own power by creating dissension between the three and thereby minimising the authority of any one of them, then they could be considered to have succeeded in this. Ptolemy VI may well have been justifiably angered at dividing his kingship with his brother, while the acquisition of joint power can have done little to restrain Ptolemy VIII from rivalry with his elder. Such a situation would offer Kleopatra II the opportunity to exert considerable influence in mediating between the two.

When Antiochos IV first invaded Egypt in 170, advancing up-river to Memphis, Polybius (28.21) says that Eulaeus persuaded Ptolemy VI to abandon his kingdom and to flee with all his money to Samothrake. Both Polybius and Diodorus (30.17), though horrified at this step, excuse the conduct of the young king and attribute the blame for his flight to Eulaeus. Nevertheless that Ptolemy

VI should give up such a prosperous kingdom as Egypt without a single apparent effort to defend it against the invader says very little for his qualities of leadership and, very early in his life, shows the lack of purpose and strength of mind which seems to characterise this king and which, by contrast, illuminates the vigour with which his wife sought power. Kleopatra II did not accompany Ptolemy VI in his flight but remained in Alexandria with Ptolemy VIII.

The flight of Ptolemy VI has been dated to the winter of 170/69 (Morkholm, 1966, 75/6). The date of the synedrion which Polybius describes (28.19-21) and at which Comanus and Cineas were present with a "King Ptolemy" is unsure, but that king, previously thought to have been Ptolemy VIII, has recently been claimed by both Fraser (1972, 2.211, n.13) and Morkholm (1966, 77/8) to have been Ptolemy VI returned from his flight. Polybius, however, says that the synedrion took place after Antiochos had partially occupied Egypt and was ready to advance upon Alexandria (28.19), it was not held, therefore, at the very beginning of the war and although Ptolemy VI's flight is not introduced by Polybius until a following chapter (28.21) the "King Ptolemy" who is decisively involved in diplomatic strategems in a council with the Romans held in Alexandria seems more likely to have been Ptolemy VIII, who apparently remained in that city, than Ptolemy VI who deserted it.

At some stage, however, Ptolemy VI did return to Egypt and placed himself under Antiochos "protection" at Memphis (Polybius, 28.23, Diodorus 31.1 and Zonaras 9.25 in Dio 20), surely a strange course for a king to adopt with his enemy. At about the same time Eulaeus and Lenaeus disappeared, taking with them the greater part of the treasures they had accumulated and bringing the kingdom to utter ruin as far as it was in their power to do so, as Diodorus remarks (30.25 and cf Morkholm, 1966, 76).

In this situation there emerged a factor which was to make a repeated appearance in the affairs of Egypt, the capacity of the people of Alexandria to interfere decisively in their government when they felt the need to do so. As they were to do in the reigns of both Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra III the Alexandrians, apparently recalling their Macedonian tradition (Otto and Bengston, 1938, 58, n.3), now came forward and took affairs into their own hands by proclaiming Ptolemy VIII King in Alexandria while Ptolemy VI remained in Memphis with Antiochos (Polybius, 29.23). Ptolemy VI then came down from Memphis and the joint rule of the brothers resumed in a reconciliation which took place about 169/8 and in which Livy (45.2) credits Kleopatra II with playing the role of mediator between the two, *scrar plurimum adiuvit non consilio modo sed etiam precibus*. A certain awareness of her own interests might be seen in this mediation by Kleopatra II, should Ptolemy VIII gain supremacy over his brother and marry outside the dynasty, having no other sisters but her, her own position as wife of the older brother and joint ruler would be threatened in a redistribution of power. As the wife of Ptolemy VI she required his return and a resumption of the joint rule in order to prevent such a situation from arising, and, as herself a partner in the triad rule set up in 170, it was equally in her interest for Ptolemy VIII's acquisition of power to be constrained by the presence of both his brother and sister.

As in the time of Ptolemy V and Kleopatra I Livy (44.19 and 43.13) again recounts that for Ptolemy VI and Kleopatra II embassies to Rome from Egypt were sent from Ptolemy and Kleopatra *regibus* with replies from the Senate addressed to *Regibus Aegypti Ptolemaeo et Kleopatrae*, upon which Macurdy (1932,150) comments that "The importance here given to Cleopatra indicates that she retained the prestige that her mother enjoyed, and is evidence of the growing power of the queen in Ptolemaic Egypt". Although Kleopatra II's extreme youth at the time of the invasion does imply that this prestige was a reflection of her

mother's it nevertheless indicates her individual recognition as ruler of Egypt. Although Rome sent no military or financial aid to Egypt Roman diplomatic intervention curtailed Antiochos territorial ambition (Polybius, 29.27, Diodorus, 31.2, Justin, 34.3); the chronology and sequence of events of the war are notoriously difficult to establish but have been given a detailed reconstruction by Morkholm (1966, 71 ff). During the time in which Ptolemy VI and Ptolemy VIII resumed their joint rule, which continued until the end of 164 according to Skeat (1969, 33, nos. 10-11) relative amity seems to have existed between them. Polybius (29.23) records it as a time in which the two kings both wore the crown and exercised royal authority with no mention of Kleopatra II, however a papyrus from Serapeion near Memphis (C.Pap. Jud. 6.132 of September 21st, 164) opens with the formal greeting "King Ptolemy is well and King Ptolemy his brother and Queen Kleopatra his sister and their children" which indicates that Kleopatra II maintained a role in government. During this period a donation was given to a temple of the Egyptian gods in Argos by Ptolemies VI and VIII and Kleopatra II (S.E.G. 32.371 and cf. Picard, 1982, 278-280). The purpose of this donation is not clear but the terminology of the inscription which includes all three equally is a further indication of the continuing importance of Kleopatra II in the reign.

Kleopatra II might then be considered, as Macurdy (1932, 230) has claimed, "the first of the Egyptian Ptolemaic queens to have a place beside her husband as a monarch possessed of equal rights with the king". Josephus (*A.J.* 3.1 and 2, *Wars* 1.1.1. 7.10.3, *C.Ap.* 2.5) relates her association with the king in resettling Onias IV and his followers in Egypt after their flight from Antiochus Epiphanes, gaining Jewish gratitude and their support of her in 245. Petitions such as U.P.Z. 42 addressed to both king and queen as equally dispensing justice support such a claim, and orders of execution such as C.Ord. Ptol. 36-40 over the years 163 to 155, after the end of the joint rule and during the exile of Ptolemy VIII, show royal justice being dispensed equally by the king and queen in such diverse areas as

the allocation of arrears of indemnities to the twin priestesses of the Memphis Serapeum, the enrolment of a military recruit and the building of fortifications in the Heracleopite Nome.

The exile of Ptolemy VIII came about in 163, after a period in which he had ruled alone while Ptolemy VI was exiled from Egypt. Both brothers had increasingly sought Roman intervention in Egyptian internal affairs¹, but from the return of Ptolemy VI to Egypt in 163 he maintained an uninterrupted rule there until his death (Samuel, 1962, 243). In 153 he associated Eupator, the eldest son of his marriage with Kleopatra II, with him on the throne until Eupator died in 150. There followed a period in which Philometor and Kleopatra II ruled alone until 145, when Philometor again included a son of theirs, Neos Philopator, as joint ruler (Samuel, 1962, 143/4).

The latest date for Ptolemy VI is August 21st, 145 (Samuel, 1962, 144/5) but by that date he may already have been dead for several weeks, having fatally struck his head after a fall from his horse in his campaign against Syria, ending his reign in an unfortunate manner just after winning that war and declining the rulership of Syria, apparently from fear of offending Rome (Josephus, *A.J.* 13.4).

The conflicting views of Polybius (39.18), Diodorus (30.17 and 31.33) and Justin (30.4) portray Ptolemy VI as a mixture of cowardice, goodwill and corruption, which together may furnish a fairly accurate portrait of a Ptolemy less capable than his predecessors but less venal than his successors. His reign began badly with his flight from Antiochos at the start of the Syrian invasion of Egypt, continued strangely with his return to Egypt and shelter with the invader and ended in an unnecessary accident just at the moment of his greatest triumph. With Ptolemy VI and Kleopatra II the supremacy of the Ptolemaic queens over their weaker husbands and sons began to be apparent. At the time of Ptolemy VI's death Kleopatra II had been married to him for some thirty years from infancy

to womanhood. For twenty five of those years, since the proclamation of the joint rule in 170, she had shared the rule of Egypt; uninterrupted by the alternate flight and exiles of her co-rulers Kleopatra II had remained queen with whichever brother happened to share the throne. Of the trilogy she alone had neither fled nor been driven from Egypt and now aged about 35 she was to emerge as an even more formidable figure than during her husband's lifetime. She was soon, however, to be challenged by her elder daughter, Kleopatra III.

Ptolemy VI and Kleopatra II had four children, Ptolemy Eupator, now dead, Neos Philopator (Ptolemy VII), Kleopatra III and Kleopatra Thea (Peremans and Van 't Dack, nos. 14549, 14550, 14517 and 14518). Both of their sons briefly shared the throne with their father. Eupator, for whom an inscription from a temple to Apollo in Cyprus (I.G.P. 101) records a dedication for King Ptolemy, the god Eupator, son of King Ptolemy and Queen Kleopatra, the gods Philometores, followed his father in the kind of title chosen for his membership of the Alexander Cult. "Eupator's" connotations of family solidarity and parental veneration continued the progressive consolidation of the dynasty in the public worship of succeeding generations of ancestors; Neos Philopator instead revived an earlier cult title, indicating the virtues of the first Philopator duplicated and renewed.

Ptolemy VI's younger son was not, however, to contribute more than his name to the dynasty. His association in the joint rule with his father, probably instituted by Ptolemy VI in order to ensure the boy's accession should he himself die in his forthcoming campaign against Syria (Samuel, 1962, 144 and n. 10), lasted only a short while. In the year of his father's death and his own accession his uncle, Ptolemy VIII, returned to Egypt from Cyrene where he had remained since the apportionment of that territory to him by Rome on Ptolemy VI's return to Egypt in 163. His return was swift; Ptolemy VI died by July 145 and his brother was back in Egypt by late September of that year (Samuel, 1962, 45 and Skeat, 1969. 34/5,

no. 13). On his return he married Kleopatra II, his sister and the widow of his brother.

Justin (38.8) states quite clearly that the throne and his new wife were offered by an embassy to the Ptolemy who ruled in Cyrene *Ptolomeo per legatos regnum et uxor Kleopatra regina, soror ipsius deferitur*, a statement which accords with Trog. Prol. 3 *Ut mortuo Ptolomaeo Philometora, frater eius Physcon, accepto regno Aegypti*. Justin, in the same passage, goes on to say that Ptolemy rejoiced at this though knowing that the throne was intended by Kleopatra and the nobles for Neos Philopator. Modern comment such as that of Mahaffy (1896, 538), Macurdy (1932, 156) and Koenen (1970, 62) has expressed the view that the initiative in the marriage was Ptolemy VIII's and that the union was forced upon Kleopatra totally against her will. As far as the rulership is concerned Ptolemy VIII was now aged about 37 while Neos Philopator was still only some 16 years old, and had previously ruled in Alexandria at the behest of the Alexandrians themselves (Polybius 29.23); it seems likely, therefore, that the people may have preferred the rule of an experienced adult to that of yet another young boy. As well Ptolemy VIII's possession of Cyrene enabled him to re-unite that province with Egypt and he had, through his repeated embassies, gained friends and influence at Rome, indeed Josephus (*c. Ap.* 2) says that the Roman nobleman, Thermus, helped Ptolemy VIII to establish himself in Alexandria after the death of his brother. For the marriage it cannot unequivocally be assumed that Kleopatra II would have preferred her son to rule. Her own power as sister and wife of the new king would be far greater than that of a dowager queen and faced with the fact of Ptolemy VIII's return and offer of marriage she may well have welcomed it and decided to turn the situation to her own advantage.

That Ptolemy VIII had not previously married elsewhere is intriguing. While Kleopatra II was married to their brother no sister was available to him but instead of looking for a wife outside the dynasty he waited and married Kleopatra II when

they were aged around 37 and 35 respectively and she was already the mother of four children. This late marriage might support the theory that it was not usual for crown princes to marry before ascending the throne (White, 1971, 253), but Ptolemy VIII had already ruled. Alternatively it might suggest that Kleopatra II's personal power in Egypt, when added to her sisterhood, made her the prize candidate, especially if she brought with her some hereditary right to the throne to help consolidate Ptolemy VIII's acquisition of the kingship over the claims of the rightful heir and ruling king, Neos Philopator.

The Hereditary Rights of Queens.

Vatin (1970, 85) cites Taubenschlag in *The Law of Graeco-Roman Egypt* (564 and n. 18) for the view that "Beginning with Cleopatra II the throne could legally belong to a queen who survived her husband with the proviso that a male member of the family should be invited by her to participate in the government.....this is an equivalent to the provision in private law that in the absence of children or grandchildren the wife of the deceased was the probable heir", a situation seen to have developed from the regency of Kleopatra I being followed by the hold on political power retained by Kleopatra II after the death of Ptolemy VI and constituting as Vatin (1970, 85) expresses it *une innovation juridique consacrant le pouvoir politique des reines*.

It is not certain, however, how truly innovative such a situation might be or, if it did exist, and after Kleopatra III there is no evidence for such a process obtaining in the Ptolemaic kingdom, how far it might have derived from an earlier Egyptian tradition. That women were of sufficient importance in ancient Egypt to cause the pharaohs to acknowledge their queens as at least their equal has been claimed in the concept that to the queen "belonged the land of Egypt itself, and the king was the man who married the daughter of his predecessor " (Seltman, 1956, 42). Statements of that kind reflect the view of Diodorus (1.27) that in Egypt "it was

ordained that the queen should have greater power and honour than the king and that among private persons the wife should enjoy authority over her husband". The titles held by queens such as Tiy, mother of Amenhotep IV, who was called "Princess of both lands", "Chief heiress, princess of all lands" and of Nefertiti, called "princess of south and north, lady of both lands" (Petrie, 1904, 183, White, 1971, 264) indicate such hereditary rights. Queen Tiy acted as regent for her son and was thought to have held sole power briefly at Tel el Amarna (White, 1971, 265), and Petrie (1904, 211) goes so far as to suggest that she and Nefertiti may have been responsible for his religious conversion. Hatshepsut, whose title "daughter of Amen" must have been accepted by the Egyptian priesthood, clearly considered her claim to the Egyptian throne as the daughter, sister and wife of kings to be stronger than that of her half-brother, Tuthmosis III (Gardiner, 1972, 181). After the death of her husband, Tuthmosis II, she assumed the double crown for some twenty years and was eventually depicted, particularly at Karnak, in man's clothing, with full titulature and taking precedence over Tuthmosis III. She handed on her title of "god's wife" to her daughter, Nefrure (Robins, 1983, 73-5).

Additional support for a concept of the transmission of power in Egypt through the female line has been given by arguments such as that of Bleeker (1959, 268), who points to the circumambulation of the king by the queen at the Min-festival of ancient Egypt as signifying the sacral dignity of the queen in performing an act which is meant to renew the forces of the king; being in this not merely his equal but his superior as she gives him the forces he needs to renew his task of kingship.

Despite such arguments it has recently been held to be a misconception that the right to the throne of ancient Egypt passed through the female line, that is that the king had to legitimise his claim by marrying the daughter of the previous king, and that there is no evidence for the claim that the right to the throne came

through such marriage (Robins, 1983, 67). The title of "god's wife", it is claimed, had nothing to do with the myth of the king's divine birth but was purely a priestly office which gave power only through ritual, and the adoption of the masculine role of a king was forced upon Hatshepsut because of her political inequality as a woman (Robins, 1983, 67, 70 and 77). In view of this controversy the extent to which the adoption of the titles of the queens of ancient Egypt by the Ptolemaic queens can be seen as evidence of a continuing legality of female power becomes disputable. Kleopatra I and Kleopatra II both held the title "mistress of the Two Lands" as did Arsinoë II and Arsinoë III among numerous other ancient Egyptian titles (Troy, 1986, 178/9) but how far such titles were real or honorary is almost impossible to determine. Similarities in the iconography, such as the sceptre in the form of a flower held by Ahmès-Nefertari, who actively participated in government, later found in representations of Ptolemaic queens such as Arsinoë II (Quaegebeur, 1978, 259) certainly imply a close observance of ancient practices during the Ptolemaic era but do not prove a continuing legally defined right descending in an unbroken line from the queens of earlier times. In the absence of any documentary proof of such a female right in either ancient or Ptolemaic Egypt such evidence is merely inferential and not conclusive.

When all this is taken into account, however, it must still be admitted that the non-royal women of ancient Egypt held an important legal status in marriage and in matrimonial property far greater than any held by Greek women (P.L. Bat 9, 183/4). This status was eroded for the average Egyptian woman under the influence of Greek law but conversely for the royal Greek woman Egyptian practice could well have exercised an influence upon the perception of her rights, even if this was not legally codified, and contributed to the honour in which Ptolemaic queens were held and the respect which they were accorded as rich and powerful sovereigns. As well there seems to have been from Macedonian tradition a perception of an hereditary right to the throne through the female line.

Macurdy (1929, 273-8) discusses Diodorus 20.37 and the case of Kleopatra, the daughter of Philip and sister of Alexander the Great who wished to go to Egypt to marry Ptolemy Soter. Her hand was sought by Cassander, Lysimachus, Antigonos and Ptolemy who all wished to marry her to gain the Macedonian throne, "each of them hoping the throne of Macedon would be his wedding-gift and seeking alliance with the royal house with the desire to get the whole empire into his hands" (Macurdy, 1929, 275). The marriage with Ptolemy was opposed by Antigonos and the Governor of Sardis, from where she tried to sail to Ptolemy, had her murdered at Antigonos' orders.

Pomeroy (1975, 124) supports the view of Macurdy (1932, 6) that no Hellenistic queen had political power solely by virtue of birth but with the qualification "except when she was destined to marry her brother". Robins (1983, 69) takes the view that in ancient Egypt no line of "heiress" queens can be traced in the genealogy and that brother/sister marriage was not obligatory. Again no documentary evidence for the existence of such a system in any formal sense has been found for either the pharaohs or the Ptolemies and arguments for such a practice supporting a concept of female hereditary rights are based rather upon observed practice than upon documented rulings. Nevertheless the subject is still one of much speculation upon which interesting conclusions have been drawn.

White (1971, 254) considered that the widow of a Ptolemaic king had some kind of right to nominate her successor and that that successor needed to marry so as to increase *la quantité de sang divin*. Mahaffy (1899, 77) also discussed the question of the claim to the throne being strengthened according to the amount of divine blood possessed by the claimant, stating that in ancient Egypt "A king's son born of a concubine took rank below a daughter born of the king's sister, and she succeeded before him". The suggestion that the nobility of the royal household depended upon the quantity of the divine blood of its members leads

to the obvious conclusion that it is better in such a case to have two royal parents rather than one, and, from this, that brother/sister marriage acquired an even greater sanctity when the brother and sister were the issue of a brother and sister. Added to this comes the religious aspect reflected in Diodorus' (1.27) claim that in Egypt brother/sister marriage was the outcome of the marriage of Isis to Osiris (cf. Thompson, 1973, 56).

The issue arises very early in Ptolemaic history with the marriage of Ptolemy I to Berenike I, who has been described as his step-sister (White, 1971, 244). If this were so then this marriage might have been entered into in order to enhance the succession in the eyes of the Egyptian priesthood by improving the quantity of "divine" blood to be passed on to the children. Subsequent Ptolemaic brother/sister marriages have been attributed to a variety of causes such as Arsinoë II's personal attractions or her property rights to the cities of the Euxine, or to avoid dangerous foreign alliances, or, from Kleopatra II on, as an adjustment between the claim to the throne of the now emancipated princesses and the male heirs (White, 1971, 249-261). In general, therefore, it might be possible to attribute the Ptolemaic predilection for brother/sister marriage to the politic tradition in which they culled from pharaonic practice what they chose to see and adapted it to their own advantage in retaining power and property within the dynasty. Bouché-Leclercq (1978, 3.86-98) has concluded that the Ptolemies accepted with alacrity the divine rights of the pharaohs and adopted their system of brother/sister marriage, which touched closely on the question of inheritance, but he points out that brother/sister marriage is equally explicable for the pharaohs and the Ptolemies on grounds which have nothing to do with a female right of succession, and that where Ptolemaic princesses married outside of Egypt they took no such rights to the Egyptian crown to their husbands. This does not, however, refute White's suggestion (1971, 260 ff.) that any such rights belonged only to the eldest daughter.

Vatin (1970, 61/2) is of the opinion that for a century from the time of the regency of Kleopatra I women rather than men represented continuity in the dynasty and that this accounts for the marriages of Kleopatra II to both of her brothers, of Kleopatra III to her uncle and of Berenike III to Alexander I and Alexander II, as the kings needed the power and prestige of these princesses and could not assassinate them without risk. He suggests that the circumstance of these marriages being kept to the circle of princesses of the blood came not from any written law but from an innovation commenced by Ptolemy II which geographical situation, historical conditions and the influence of Rome on Egyptian isolation rendered irreversible, and that the reasons for each individual marriage vary and cannot be explained by one simple, fundamental formula.

When, therefore, all the aspects of the status of ancient Egyptian queens, of Egyptian women in general and of Macedonian princesses are considered together with the question of the transmission of "divine blood" through intermarriage the question of some kind of hereditary rights for Ptolemaic princesses, even if not formalised in written law, seems more likely to be answered affirmatively than otherwise. Certainly in the case of the marriages of Ptolemy VIII there is a strong implication that in this king's wish to marry both his sister and his niece there was at least an element of belief that this would strengthen his claim to the throne of Egypt. If any female right of inheritance existed, however tenuously, which was intrinsic to Ptolemaic incestuous marriage then Ptolemy VIII's long wait for his first chosen bride becomes explicable in terms of his desire for power. Vatin's view of this marriage (1970,71) is that it was entered into as a compromise between Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II to avoid civil war, was a union of two equals contracting a reciprocal engagement and, therefore, that it was based upon mutual consent in the willingness of both to live together as king and queen of Egypt. That Kleopatra II had already reigned as queen in true collegiality with both of her brothers, together and individually,

during Antiochos' invasion and their respective exiles was in itself sufficiently unusual a circumstance to suggest that acknowledgment of her queenship in its own right could have influenced Ptolemy VIII. For this marriage, at least, there may have been some kind of transmissible right to the throne, whether or not definable in terms of documentary or archaeological evidence.

The Emergence of Kleopatra III.

On Ptolemy VIII's return to Egypt recognition of Kleopatra II's queenship was evinced by the Jewish population of Alexandria as Josephus (*C.Ap.* 2.50-3) says that the Jewish General Onias led his contingents in support of the queen. On Ptolemy's side Justin (38.8) records that the people asked him to reign which implies that he had the support of the bulk of the citizens. He also had with him the Cyreneans whom Diodorus (31.13) says he took with him to Alexandria. Fortunately the Egyptian army taken to Syria by Ptolemy VI was broken up there by Demetrius so the possibility of large scale conflict with the use of those troops was diminished and the situation soon quietened with the marriage of Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II and with the decisive settlement of any dispute about the succession as Ptolemy VIII first had the adherents of Neos Philopator killed and the Neos Philopator himself. The murder took place, according to Justin (38.8) "on the day of his nuptials (when he took his mother to wife) amidst the splendour of the feasts, the embraces of his parent, and then went to the couch of his sister stained with the blood of her child". While the circumstances of the death might or might not be exact that it took place at this time seems sure as no further evidence of the existence of Neos Philopator appears after 21st August, 145 (Samuel, 1962,145).

Given this situation not a little horror has been expressed at Kleopatra II's cohabitation with Ptolemy VIII and subsequent production of a son, Memphites, in

144/3 (Peremans and Van 't Dack, no. 14552). Mahaffy (1899, 183/4) aghast at the whole business declares "these things I refuse to believe" and Bevan (1968,308) also finds belief difficult but does, however, ascribe Kleopatra II's actions to love of power rather than to fear, which he considers an unlikely emotion for a Macedonian princess. Political reality obviously dictated the death of Neos Philopator and his replacement by a child who was joint heir to both king and queen. Diodorus (33.13) says that during the celebrations for the birth of Memphites, which took place while Ptolemy VIII was "being enthroned in his palace at Memphis in accordance with Egyptian custom" Ptolemy VIII ordered the death of the Cyreneans who had accompanied him to Alexandria because they had spoken disrespectfully of his mistress Eirene. The enthronement in Memphis, the Egyptian rites and the naming of the child Memphites after so many Ptolemies are all evidence of the increasing "Egyptianisation" of the dynasty, a policy to which Ptolemy VIII was to adhere quite consistently and which was to be generally emulated by Kleopatra III.

At the time of Memphites' birth the elder of the two surviving children of Kleopatra II's first marriage, Kleopatra III, was aged somewhere between sixteen and eleven years (Peremans and Van 't Dack, no. 14517). For a princess and elder daughter not to have been at least betrothed quite soon after birth seems surprising and indicates that Polybius' statement (39.7) that Ptolemy VI had promised to give his daughter to Ptolemy VIII is true and that daughter was Kleopatra III and not, as both Bevan (1968,309) and Vatin (1970,73) conjecture, her younger sister, Kleopatra Thea. If Kleopatra III was betrothed to her uncle it is unlikely that she can have rejoiced at his marriage with her mother and the birth of this half brother/nephew. Alternatively, if it was Kleopatra Thea who was betrothed to Ptolemy VIII then no doubt it had been intended that Kleopatra III should marry either her brother Eupator, now dead, or her brother Neos Philopator who had been murdered by Ptolemy VIII. As an elder daughter

Kleopatra III no doubt grew up expecting to be queen by marriage, either with a brother or with her uncle; her mother and her uncle had now, between them, deprived her of this. There is evidence of great and unusual honours conferred upon Kleopatra III very soon after the return of Ptolemy VIII to Egypt and the inference from this is that these honours were given the young princess as a palliative for the loss of the queenship she must have considered rightfully hers. The further implication is that Kleopatra III was not easily overlooked and was aware at an early age of the value of titles and cultic recognition in enhancing her prestige and, consequently, her influence.

P. Amh. 2.45 from Gebelên gives part of the protocol of a contract which includes a list of the eponymous priesthoods at Ptolemais. The papyrus was originally dated by the editors to 150-145, a dating revised in P. L. Bat 24 (p.50, d.) to 145-142 in accordance with the names of the priests and priestesses shown in the papyrus. This dating also accords with the opening of the protocol which, although fragmentary and heavily restored, refers in line 1 to Ptolemy VIII alone as Πτολεμαίου δὲ Εὐεργέτου and in line 4 to Ptolemy VI alone as Πτολεμαίου δὲ Θεοῦ Φιλομήτορος. As Kleopatra II is no longer included in the Theoi Philometores the contract must have been written after the death of her first husband, that is by the middle of 145. As she is not listed early in the protocol and not yet included with Ptolemy VIII in the Theoi Euergetai the contract must also have been written either before her second marriage or very soon afterwards. As her marriage to Ptolemy VIII is considered to have taken place *à partir de* 144 (Peremans and Van 't Dack, no. 14616) the most likely date for this papyrus is therefore, the end of 145 and the beginning of 144.

The papyrus goes on to list at Ptolemais (lines 5 and 6) ἱερειῶν Βασιλίσσης μὲν Κλεοπάτρας Τιμαρέτης τῆς..... Βασιλίσσης δὲ Κλεοπάτρας τῆς Θυγατρὸς Βερενίκης τῆς Ἑρμίου, Κλεοπάτρας δὲ τῆς μητρὸς Θεᾶς Ἐπιφανοῦς Νικασοῦς τῆς Ἀριστονίκου. The listing of Berenike, daughter of Hermias, as the priestess of

Kleopatra the Daughter so soon after the return to Egypt of Ptolemy VIII shows that Kleopatra III had already become so much a force at the court that she was given a special priestess for her own worship and that, although the office follows the priestess of her mother, it takes precedence over the priestess of her grandmother, Kleopatra I. The first priestess to appear for her mother, Kleopatra II, is recorded at Ptolemais in P. Grenf. I.24 of 148, by which time Kleopatra II was approximately thirty two years old and had shared the rule of Egypt for some twenty two years. The first priestess of Kleopatra I was not appointed until after her death. The priestesses of the earlier queens had been appointed to them either as adult queens, or, in the case of Arsinoë II, probably posthumously. Kleopatra III is the only one of the Ptolemaic queens who acquired a priestess for her personal worship while still a very young princess.

Apparently unshaken by the recent upheavals, which included the deaths of her father and brother, Kleopatra III was already beginning to accumulate the cultic honours which were to mark her career. This public recognition of her importance as a young girl brought the comment in P. L. Bat 22 (p.66) that *Intrigante est la personnalité de la princesse Cléopâtre qui.....a réussi à se faire attribuer un certain statut officiel.....nous pouvons voir ici le premier pas sur le chemin qu aboutira à l'éviction de sa mère come épouse du roi.*

The editors make this comment, however, in connection with a later papyrus attesting to Kleopatra II's priestess, P. Berl. dem. 3113, which is firmly dated to May 8th, 141, some three years later than the probable date of P. Amh. 2.45. The demotic papyrus which they discuss shows at Ptolemais a priestess of Queen Kleopatra and a priestess of Kleopatra, Daughter of the King. The office of the priestess of Kleopatra III was not, therefore, held for only a short time but continued for a number of years and further evidence for the length of its tenure comes from P. Berl. Dem. 3090 and 3091 of 7th September 140 which also refer

to priestesses at Ptolemais for Queen Kleopatra and for Kleopatra the Daughter, that is for Kleopatras II and III.

In the Greek papyri P. Grenf. I.24 is dated by the editors to 146-117. The formula of this papyrus (lines 1 and 5) shows Ptolemy VIII alone as Theos Euergetes and Ptolemy VI alone as Theos Philometores, there are priesthoods for Κλεοπάτρας τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ Βάσσης Κλεοπάτρας τῆς Θυγατρὸς καὶ Κλεοπάτρας τῆς μητρὸς (line 6). Kleopatra II is clearly called the Wife and the papyrus is firmly in the reign of Ptolemy VIII so she is now married to this king but is not yet part of the Euergetes, therefore a possible date of 144/3 could be assigned. Again the priesthood for Kleopatra III follows that of her mother but precedes that of her grandmother.

P. Grenf. 2.15 is dated by the editors to 139. The protocol begins (lines 1-2) Βασιλευόντων Πτολεμαίου Θεοῦ εὐεργέτου τοῦ Πτολεμαίου καὶ Κλεοπάτρας Θεῶν ἐπιφανῶν, καὶ Βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρας τῆς ἀδελφῆς καὶ Βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρας τῆς γυναικὸς θεῶν εὐεργετῶν, a standard formula in keeping with a date of 139. However, after listing the priesthoods at Alexandria it goes on to list the priesthoods at Ptolemais, amongst whom are (lines 9-10) ἱερείων Βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρας τῆς ἀδελφῆς καὶ Βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρας τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ Βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρας τῆς Θυγατρὸς καὶ Κλεοπάτρας τῆς μητρὸς Θεᾶς ἐπιφανοῦς. This papyrus has been noted by its editors (P.Grenf.2, p.30) to be "remarkable in several respects"; not the least remarkable thing about it is its inclusion of a priesthood not only for Queen Kleopatra the Sister and Queen Kleopatra the Mother, which at this time refer to Kleopatras II and I respectively, but to priesthoods on behalf of both Kleopatra the Wife and Kleopatra the Daughter. The inference from this must be that the papyrus was written very soon after Kleopatra III succeeded in marrying her uncle and at a time when she had a priesthood as Kleopatra the Wife but that of Kleopatra the Daughter had not yet been discontinued.

From the evidence of these papyri it can be assumed, therefore, that the priesthood at Ptolemais of Kleopatra the Daughter continued for a period of some five to six years, that is for almost the entire period of time which elapsed between Ptolemy VIII's return to Egypt in 145 and his marriage to Kleopatra III and also for some time after that event. The continuation of this office is convincing evidence for the prominent place which the young Kleopatra III occupied at court during the years of her mother's second marriage, and may well indicate just how soon she became a threat to that marriage and to her mother's power.

A further and most significant honour accorded to the young Princess Kleopatra is the acquisition of the title Basilissa. In the Greek papyri written before her marriage, P. Amh. 2.45 where she is called (line 6) βασιλίσσης δὲ Κλεοπάτρας τῆς θυγατρὸς, and P. Grenf. 1.24 where she is called (line 6) the cursively written βάσσης Κλεοπάτρας τῆς θυγατρὸς, she bears a title normally given only to queens of the Ptolemaic dynasty.

The real importance of the titles acquired by Kleopatra III must be stressed. Βασίλισσα, the title by which Ptolemaic queens were known and the earliest use of which appears in Xenophon, *Oeconomicus* 9.15, is used by Xenophon as the general word for queen. A Macedonian derivation for the title has been suggested (Macurdy, 1928, 278) stemming from an ancient word retained in the language and revived when Macedonian queens became powerful. It was used there in the time of Olympias and Alexander the Great (Athenaeus 13.595) as the equivalent for the title of the Macedonian kings, βασιλεύς (Mooren, 1983, 213-216). As the counterpart of βασιλεύς, whose accepted meaning is that of "personal monarch", that is that in a juridical sense the King and State are one, the kings are not kings of anywhere as are constitutional monarchs but are totally supreme (Errington, 1974, 21-37), the title Βασίλισσα gains a reflected connotation of personal power. Macurdy (1932, 8) argues that the term, especially when

found on the coins of various queens acting as regents or ruling in their own right like Kleopatra VII who was the only Ptolemaic queen to strike her own coinage, does not mean "the wife of the king" but "a female king". She also (1928, 278) disputes the definition of "queen archon" for the translation of this term from the mutilated inscription of C.I.A. 2.374=I.G.2.².776, line 9.

Berenike II Euergetis was the first of the Ptolemaic queens to have the title *Βασιλίσα* in the coinage. After the death of Ptolemy V Kleopatra I had this title in the coinage struck by her as regent and it was also used in the coinage by Kleopatra II or Kleopatra III as the wife of Ptolemy VIII and by Kleopatra III when his widow and co-ruler with her sons. Kleopatra VII when sole queen and regent with Ptolemy Caesar used the title in her own coinage. Plutarch (Ant.54) calls Kleopatra VII *Κλεοπάτραν Βασίλισσαν Αιγύπτου*. Poole, (1963, xlv) states that "It is to be remarked that each of these queens had a hereditary right. Berenice II inherited the Cyrenaica; Cleopatra I brought with her the claim to Coele-Syria and Phoenicia, her dowry; Cleopatra II was treated as co-heiress by her brothers; Cleopatra III was heiress of Philometor; and the last Cleopatra was co-heiress of Auletes, striking money with the regal title, as sole sovereign, or coregent with a junior." Although the hereditary right of the Ptolemaic queens may be argued it is nevertheless a striking coincidence that those queens with most claim to such rights are the same as those who are called *Βασιλίσα* in the coinage.

Arsinoë II, though usually known as Philadelphos, is called *Βασιλίσα* by Poseidippos in an epigram mentioning the shrine dedicated to her at Zephyrion by Kallikrates (Thompson, 1973, 57 and n.3). In inscriptions such as O.G.I.S. 14,15,27,28 and 29 she is called just Arsinoë or Arsinoë *Βασιλίσα* but not Philadelphos. Thompson conjectures (1973, 56 and n.4) that the use of this title on oinochóai may possibly be posthumous.

Athenaeus (13.595) quotes Philemon on the use of βασιλίσσ' ἔση βαβυλῶνος when relating that Harpalus, the Macedonian treasurer of Alexander the Great, made his mistresses Pythionikē and Glycera queens of Babylon and Tarsus before the death of Alexander (cf. Diodorus, 17.108). The title has, therefore, connotations of great power as well as precedents for its use in circumstances other than when applied to the wife of a king.

The title was given to only two Ptolemaic princesses, to Berenike, the dead daughter of Ptolemy III and Berenike II, who is called in the Canopus Decree (O.G.I.S. 56) θυγατέρα καὶ ὀνομασθεῖσαν Βερενίκην ἥ καὶ Βασίλισσα εὐθέως, and for whom it was decreed that she be made immortal like Isis and Mnevis, with an annual festival and a gold and jewelled image in the holy of holies of each of the temples (Nock, 1930, 7), and to Kleopatra III. The honours paid to the dead Berenike illustrate the importance of the title Basilissa and its acquisition by Kleopatra III, the only living princess ever to hold the title, is a striking example of the recognition she gained from a very early age (cf. P. Cairo Zen II 59251). The dates of the papyri which show her with this title before her marriage, P. Amherst 2.45 of 145/4, and P. Grenfell I.24 probably dated to about 144/3, are evidence that she acquired the title when aged somewhere between ten and eighteen years. If the dating of P. Amherst 2.45 is accepted as being 145 then this would place Kleopatra III's first acquisition of the title in the very year when her father died and her uncle returned to Egypt and married her mother despite a possible engagement to Kleopatra III herself (cf. Justin 38.8.2 and Polybius 39.7). The acquisition of the title is, in any case, at the time of or soon after these events, which strongly implies that it may have been obtained by Kleopatra III as a recompense for the queenship denied her when her uncle married her mother rather than herself after having killed the legitimate heir to the throne and her only surviving brother, Neos Philopator, whom she could alternatively have expected to marry after the death of her elder brother Eupator. It seems that from her youth

Kleopatra III was not easily overlooked or deprived of the eminence which she felt to be justly hers and which she was to achieve by marrying her uncle despite his marriage to her mother.

Kleopatra III is also in these papyri called Θυγάτηρ, which raises the question of which king she is considered to be the daughter before she married Ptolemy VIII. In note 9 to P. Grenf. 2.15 the editors call her the daughter of Philometor, which is genealogically correct. However P.L. Bat.15 (p.148, note μ.) comments that *avant son mariage, Cléopâtre III est considérée la fille de Ptolémée VIII*. The comment is made with reference to the demotic papyri, P. Berl. 3113 of May 8th, 141, P. Berl. 3090 and 3091 of 7th September, 140 and P. Strasb. Wiss. Ges. 15, which is dated to August 18th, 137 but still employs the formulae used before the marriage of Kleopatra III to Ptolemy VIII. For these formulae still to be in use at so late a date is open to the varying interpretations of either scribal error or of the continuing existence of the priestess of the Daughter after the marriage, at what date this marriage took place is disputed but it is unlikely that it would have been as late as March, 137, the date suggested by P.L. Bat 15 (p.148, n.λ).

The Marriage of Kleopatra III and Ptolemy VIII.

Heinen (1974, 147-155) gives a detailed discussion of the chronology of the marriages of Ptolemy VIII by comparing Greek, demotic and hieroglyphic papyri and inscriptions and concludes (150) that the marriage of Kleopatra III to her uncle had taken place by September, 142. This conclusion is refuted by P.L. Bat 22 (pp.64-66) where a date between September, 140 and February, 139 is considered to be more in keeping with the terminology used in the hieroglyphic and demotic evidence. The point mainly at issue concerns Gauthier 309, no. IVA, a stele of the Serapeum, which is dated to February 18th, 142 and refers to Ptolemy "and his sister and wife", which must refer to Kleopatra II, and Gauthier 309, no. V, an inscription from the temple of Edfou which gives "Ptolemy and his

wife, Kleopatra" with no further details, and is dated to September, 10th, 142. Heinen has concluded that Gauthier 309, no. V must refer to Kleopatra III and therefore that the marriage had taken place by September, 142. However a demotic text from Thebes, P. Berl. dem. 3113 refers to priestesses at Ptolemais for Queen Kleopatra and for Kleopatra the Daughter and is dated to May 8th, 141 and two further demotic texts, P. Berl. dem. 3090 and 3091 also refer to these priestesses at September 7th, 140, indicating that at that time Ptolemy VIII was still married to Kleopatra II. By February 3rd to 12th, 139, however, C.Ord. Ptol. 47=P. Tebt. I.6 names King Ptolemy and Queen Kleopatra the sister and Queen Kleopatra the wife. The editors of P. L. Bat 22 (p.66) consider that, although badly preserved, this ordinance must concern Kleopatra III, and therefore furnishes a *terminus ante quem* for the marriage. In their discussion they conclude, therefore, that the suggestions of Heinen and of his anterior bibliography cited by them (p.64, n.1) are outweighed by P. Berl. Dem. 3113, 3090 and 3091 and C. Ord. Ptol.47=P.Tebt.I.6 and that the marriage of Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra III took place between early September, 140 and early February, 139, a date which will be followed here.

Given this chronology and that of Peremans and Van 't Dack no. 14517, which gives the date of birth for Kleopatra III as 150-155, then at the time of the marriage Kleopatra III would have been aged between sixteen and twenty years, in which case she can certainly be reckoned to have reached maturity, especially in the context of a society in which girls were often married at a much earlier age, whatever their social status. Vatin (1970, 74 and 76) considers that this marriage of uncle and niece was brought about by the will of the king. On the basis of Justin (38.8) others have also concluded that the marriage was against Kleopatra III's will and took place after she had been raped by Ptolemy VIII. Polybius' (39.7) implication of an earlier betrothal has seemed to some to mitigate the rape, Mahaffy (1899, 1287) after reporting that Ptolemy VIII "first violated and then

married his niece Kleopatra III" goes on to say *"Fortunately"* (my italics) Polybius.....has presented to us the fact that the young princess was already betrothed by her father to Euergetes". This remarkable comment is in the tradition which portrays Kleopatra III as a piece of passively negotiable property between her father and her uncle and as a pathetic rape victim forcibly espoused by her murderous uncle, but for Mahaffy her integrity is plainly of no account at all if, when raped, she was betrothed. The "rape then marriage" is widely reported. Livy (59), Justin (38.8), Orosius (*Ad. Pag.* 5.10.7) and Valerius Maximus (9. Cap. 2) all recount this sequence of events and there is certainly nothing to indicate that Ptolemy VIII was incapable of such a crime. Only the impression conveyed of Kleopatra III's forceful personality having already assured her recognition through worship by her own priestess and conferral of the title Basilissa, combined with the possibility that at the time of her marriage she was no longer a defenceless child but a strong-willed young woman, arouse the suspicion that she played a somewhat more active role than that of a rape victim in bringing this marriage about.

When Ptolemy VIII took over the throne and married Kleopatra II the traditional succession was thrown out of line. After Ptolemy VI 's death, leaving Neos Philopator already appointed as joint ruler, the expectation of Kleopatra III must have been that her brother would rule and that she would marry him and become Queen of Egypt. To then find that her uncle returned to Egypt, seized the throne, murdered her only surviving brother and married her mother, thereby continuing for Kleopatra II an office which she had already held for some twenty five years, first with both of her brothers and then with each of them in turn, probably infuriated Kleopatra III. Alternatively, if she had indeed been betrothed to her uncle for some nine years then the affront would have been even greater and to find herself still relegated to second place with her mother still queen perhaps even more infuriating. Given this situation the conjecture imposes itself that the

"rape" may have been very carefully publicised in order to give grounds for a marriage which may well have been in accordance with the wishes of both uncle and niece. Had the princess been forcibly attacked by her uncle totally against her will then concern for her marriageability, lost with the public loss of her virginity, would, no doubt, have kept the crime very well hidden. Having been "raped" however, and this being known, the only possible husband for her was then the man who raped her and thus was able to make her queen. The wide dissemination of the rape story and the fact that it was allowed to reach so many historians increases the suspicion that the event was carefully staged and deliberately publicised, it is doubtful that such a sensational tale would have spread had the court not wished it so.²

Whatever the path by which the story of the rape reached the various historians it seems not to have been contradicted by Kleopatra II, the person to whom the marriage represented the greatest threat. Livy (59) and Justin (38.8) both state that Ptolemy VIII divorced Kleopatra II, a statement clarified by Livy who says that the divorce took place after the rape and marriage to *filia eius virgine*. No further details are given but Vatin (1970, 74) has suggested that in marrying his niece Ptolemy VIII sought *à neutraliser l'influence de Cléopâtre II*, an interesting suggestion and a consideration perhaps of more importance to Ptolemy VIII than simple lust. If this were so then he would presumably have wished on his re-marriage to repudiate his marriage to his sister, which in any case would have been considered in the Greek world to have been automatically annulled by the second marriage, as occurred with Ptolemy I's marriages first to Artakama then to Eurydike and then to Berenike. The continued survival of Kleopatra II at this time is a strong indication of her impregnability. Ptolemy VIII was seemingly able to murder her son, already placed upon the throne by his father, with no obvious repercussions from the court or from the people, that he did not also murder his sister indicates that he needed her support and that of her partisans both on his

return and on his marriage to her daughter. The position of the king may not, then, have been totally enviable, caught between his forceful and powerful sister and her equally forceful daughter whose ambition for power was no less than that of her mother, it was necessary for him to placate them both . The survival and continued eminence of Kleopatra II raises again the question of whether widowed Ptolemaic queens had some kind of right or interest in the succession. When combined with the possibility of elder daughters also having some such interest, a conjecture which receives surprising support from Mahaffy's (1899, 187) conclusion that in the absence of full brothers Kleopatra III was the legitimate heiress to the throne, the principal reason for Ptolemy VIII's marriages to both mother and daughter might be seen in his awareness of such rights and consequent resolve to acquire them for himself through these marriages, thus legitimising as far as possible his seizure of the throne from Neos Philopator, the king appointed to rule by the previous king, his father. It is undeniable that Ptolemy VIII continued to rule for some time with two queens, a situation which he would probably have preferred to avoid had it been possible to do so, as, no doubt would both of those queens.

CHAPTER 3 - QUEEN CONSORT

The marriage of Kleopatra III to Ptolemy VIII lasted for some twenty four years, from 140/39 to the death of the king in 116 (Samuel, 1962, 7), during the whole of this time Ptolemy VIII, Kleopatra II and Kleopatra III ruled Egypt together. As the period is quite well documented by the ancient historians it has been given some modern attention concerned to assess the character and political acumen of Ptolemy VIII. The role played by Kleopatra II during these years has also been noted, but little comment has been made upon the effect of the events and tensions of this long period of time upon the wife and daughter of those two. The specific involvement of Kleopatra III in the affairs of the kingdom during this triad rule is not clearly discerned but in all areas of policy the influence of both queens, and especially that of Kleopatra III, must be reckoned with and appreciated. The king's new wife was not a woman to be easily ignored as a princess, and was even less so having finally become queen.

Participation in the ruling trio was a formative experience for Kleopatra III who developed in this time from a forceful girl into an even more forceful woman. The political manoeuvrings of her husband and mother provided her with the opportunity to learn from their methods and from their consequent successes and failures. Although in constant conflict with her mother she increased her personal influence so far during these years that on his death Ptolemy VIII willed the kingdom to her and she developed her own methods of dealing with the condition of second century Egypt. The events of this intervening period are, therefore, crucial to an appreciation of her later activities.

The Social Background and Administration of the Triad Rule.

It is to the mutual hatred of the two queens that Will (1966, 361f.) has attributed civil unrest in Alexandria, stemming from the popular perception of Kleopatra III being favoured by the king at the expense of her mother when the older queen was set aside by the new marriage. How far such a theory is tenable against other suggested causes for the disturbances, such as Roman intrigue or dissatisfaction with ruling foreign and domestic policies, is problematic. What is certain, however, is that civil unrest had existed in Egypt for some considerable time, and did not slacken during the reign of Ptolemy VIII. The condition of Egypt during that reign and the measures adopted to deal with it brought about the circumstances in which Kleopatra III was to govern after her husband's death and in which she developed her personal cult.

Rebellion in Egypt had formed part of the atmosphere in which Kleopatra III grew up. At about the time of her birth, in the late 160's, native revolts broke out in Upper and Lower Egypt led by the half Greek/half Egyptian Dionysios Petosarapis, called by Diodorus (31.15a) "one of the friends of Ptolemy", who, despising both the brothers, Ptolemies VI and VIII, sought power for himself. In the 160's fear of violence in times of disturbance led some to the extreme of taking refuge in the Serapeum, as shown in petitions such as those of U.P.Z. 1.8 of 161 and 1.10 of 160 which illustrate the uncertainty of daily existence in the Egypt of the time. Earlier on O.G.I.S. 90 of 196, the Rosetta Stone decree, testifies to continuing disruption throughout Egypt.

Within the royal household itself palace and domestic revolts had occurred in 246, at the end of the reign of Ptolemy II (Turner, 1984, 159/60). Diodorus (31.17b) tells of outbreaks of revolution in the Thebaid, which, around 206, led to a long period of Egyptian rule in Thebes. Such rebellions have been attributed to the outbreak of nationalistic fervour said by Polybius (5.107) to have been the

outcome of successful native Egyptian participation in the battle of Raphia in 218. The national consciousness seen by Polybius contributed to this discontent, but the increasing pressure of a political system which exploited the population was also involved in such disturbances. By the mid second century exploitation through royal monopolies, forced labour, requisitions, inequitable taxation and illegal extortions by officials together with foreign wars and their aftermath of inflation, lost manpower and lost trade and revenue, all helped to disrupt the people and countryside, with farms vacated and irrigation and agriculture neglected. Currency crises and debasement had made the lot of the people even harder to bear (Segrè, 1942, 192f.). Royal revenues also declined as the wealth built up by Ptolemies I and II was dissipated after Ptolemy III during the reigns of a succession of regents and minors (Broughton, 1942, 329 and cf. Broughton, 1985, 115/6) and king and populace grew poorer together. The dynastic conflict between Ptolemies VI and VIII and the aftermath of Antiochos' invasions with their cost to the treasury in defence and plunder during a long period of great instability from 180 to 145, contributed markedly to the state of the kingdom.

In the welter of grievances religious issues also played their part. Eddy (1961, 296) has considered the long lived, widespread and determined revolts to have stemmed from religious passions manifested in a fight to preserve the traditional religion by expelling foreigners who polluted the land with false gods. Although the native religion was allowed to continue it was ultimately under the supervision of the Ptolemaic bureaucracy, as in Memphis where the Egyptian priests were subordinate to the crown appointees, an *epistates ton hieron* and, below him, an *epistates* of the *serapeum*. Ptah was lord of the necropolis but royal officials presided over his priests, and the whole temple structure came under the secular authority of the *oikonomoi* of the city of Memphis; royal

appointees had overriding authority in both cultic and secular spheres (Crawford, 1983, 16-24 and cf. Thompson, 1988, 109-114 on the political subtleties of this).

The supervision and control of the native religion in this great religious centre, capital of the Old Kingdom and with a large mixed Greek and Egyptian population, displays both a continuing tolerance of and a politic curb upon a potentially dangerous social force which was likely to burst forth at any time. The pharaohs of Egypt and their law were regarded as divine; Greek imperialism had attacked this divinity and resistance to the Greeks necessarily, therefore, contained a religious element. In the concept of religious superiority racial superiority had an integral and inseparable place, as Herodotus (2.2, 35-41 and 91) and Diodorus (1.84 and 86) have noted. Some Greek acceptance of this can be seen, indeed, in the idealisation of Egyptian religious fraternities which was not unknown among later Greeks (Chaeromon, Fragment 10, though cf. Theocritus 17.5,71 for the contemporary eulogistic view of Ptolemaic divinity).

As with all forms of imperialism, racial tension was inevitable and Egyptian resistance involved as well the view that in exploiting the country and its people in harsh economic systems the Greeks had offended against Ma'at, the concept of justice and morality upheld and shared by Isis. Through the dissemination of myth and legend (Diodorus 1.29, 2.96, 2.98), through messianic prophecies such as the Demotic Chronicle (P.Dem. Paris 215 and cf. Eddy, 1961,290/1) and the Oracle of the Potter (P.Oxy 22.2332), with its description of the wretched and suffering condition of Egypt made whole through the coming of a king sent by Re and established by Isis, and through active revolts sections of the native people declared their continuing opposition to the Ptolemies and their rule.

Despite all of this, however, in what Françoise Dunand (1973, 75) has called the *renouveau indigène* the various social, political and economic causes which have been offered have also been questioned, as has the actual extent of the

hostility (Westermann 1937/8, 270-272). By the time of the joint rule of Ptolemy VIII, Kleopatra II and Kleopatra III a response to native unrest had come in the increasing Egyptianisation of the administration and a process of syncretism and assimilation had gradually taken place through all social levels as Egyptian influence grew. The documents and coinage give evidence of an increasing awareness by the court of the need to conciliate the native population, an awareness already shown in the coinage of Ptolemy VI where Kleopatra I appears as Isis (Poole, 1963, lix, 78, nos. 1-6, pl.17.7 and 79, nos. 9-12, pl. 18.9) a depiction of that queen which was continued by Ptolemy VIII (Poole, 1963, 89, nos. 6-12, pl. 21.3, and 93/4, nos. 67-77, pl. 22.5).

The increasing Egyptianisation of the Greek forces during the marriage of Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II can be seen in an inscription from Kom Ombo (I.G.P. 88) where Greek soldiers place the Egyptian god Aroeres before Apollo in the dedication. Years of intermarriage had brought some cultural mingling among the mixed families of the soldier settlements; many Greek immigrants to Egypt were themselves peasants or soldiers and thus able to assimilate fairly readily with the rural native population (Tcherikover, 1979, 32/3).

While the lower class Greeks became Egyptianised, upper class Egyptians became Hellenised and local gods began to be interpreted in Hellenic terms (Quaegebeur, 1983, 305). In the administration increasing numbers of native Egyptians occupied posts in the bureaucracy, army and clergy as partisans of each side in dynastic quarrels sought native support through bribes, favours and concessions. Thus by infiltration and collaboration the native population took over to some extent the alien regime which had not been expelled by force. Side by side with the evidence of continuing disruption and rebellion it is clear that at some levels and in some areas the Greeks gained at least a degree of acceptance and some mutual tolerance existed between them and the Egyptian population. Not all Egyptians were prepared to rebel; as with any conquered

country sections of the population were prepared to co-exist, from necessity if for no other reason, and resistance fluctuated with geographical location and social status. As Cerfaux and Tondriau (1957, 210) have pointed out, Préaux, Westermann and Peremans have shown that it is a fallacy to exaggerate the hostility of the Egyptians, and from this comes the conclusion that the cultural mingling which did take place has not been sufficiently recognised, a view emphasised by Peremans (1978, 43-46) and supported by texts such as the Greek and demotic archives of Dionysios, son of Kephalas (P.L. Bat. 22), who lived towards the end of the second century.

By the middle of the second century Egypt had, therefore, become imbued with a Hellenism moderated and coloured by the customs of Egypt in a process of fusion which had had a century and a half in which to develop. In particular the Ptolemies and the native priesthood had by now become mutually dependent, a development to which such decrees as that of the bilingual priests of Canopus to Ptolemy III and Berenike II (O.G.I.S. 56) and the Rosetta Stone (O.G.I.S. 90) to Ptolemy V amply testify. Tcherikover (1979,15) has remarked that the alliance of the Ptolemies and the priests from Ptolemy V on strengthened as the Ptolemies came to see themselves as pharaohs, as the priests had always seen them. In the particular environment of second century Egypt this attitude is reflected in the administration of Ptolemy VIII, where the policies adopted to deal with a multi-racial population unevenly melded together in a country increasingly impoverished by conflict varied between techniques of force and conciliation.

In practical terms there were such politic exercises by Ptolemy VIII as the Decree of Amnesty (C.Ord. Ptol. 41/2 for text, editions and commentaries) issued in the king's name alone very soon after his return to Egypt in 145/4, after the death of Ptolemy VI.¹ Apart from such practical measures, however, Ptolemy VIII made considerable use of various forms of what can only be described as propaganda

in maintaining his rule in Egypt, particularly in attempts to gain the support of the native population.

It seems that the perception of the king as pharaoh extended to his representation in the dress of a pharaoh. D.B. Thompson (1973, 76 and 205 and pl. 68. 292, see Appendix H) lists a relief showing a king in the costume of a pharaoh with nemes head-dress and kilt and probably carrying an ankh, which she considers may well represent Ptolemy VIII. The Museum of the Burrell Collection (12th Glasgow, Scotland, holds a small figurine of a Ptolemaic king in Egyptian dress which is catalogued as Ptolemy VIII. That the king wore Egyptian dress is inferred by Justin (38.8) in his description of the visit of P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus Aemilianus to Alexandria, perhaps around 140/39, where the king's costume is described as being of transparent linen (cf. Diodorus 33.28b)². Diodorus (33.12) also says that the Egyptian populace cherished a deep hatred for Ptolemy VIII because of his brutality and lawless conduct; to try to mitigate resentment by appearing to be one with the people is a common political ploy.

Apart from his personal appearance, however, Ptolemy VIII took other measures to establish himself with the Egyptians, or, more particularly, with their most powerful element, the priesthood, in the building and decoration of temples to Egyptian gods. The construction and essential decoration of the temple of Tōd were completed between the middle of the second century and the end of the first century (Grenier 1982, 76); from 145 to 116, during the reign of Ptolemy VIII with Kleopatras II and III, a considerable portion of this was carried out. At the temple of Kom Ombo the administration was similarly involved in restoration and decoration (Gutbub 1982, 88/9). At the temple of Edfou a ritual scene dated to Ptolemy VIII depicts the offering of wine to Hathor, and in this uses a myth of the New Empire revived for Ptolemaic use (Kurth, 1982, 129-132). Hans Goedicke (see Goyon, 1986, 82-86) discusses in detail the representation of Horos at the temple of Philae, attributed to Ptolemy VIII under whom the ritual at this temple

centred on Isis and Horos. A dramatic re-enactment of the divine birth shown on the facade of the sanctuary depicts the recognition of the new born baby as the legitimate heir of the land. Goedicke sees this as an instance of the expression of Ptolemy VIII's monarchical theology in wishing to give a messianic character to Ptolemaic royal births and to the divine filiation of kings and the transmission of power. Whatever the motivation for the relief at the least it effectively demonstrates the unrestricted perpetuation of Egyptian mythology during the reign. The name of the son, Memphites, born to Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II, apparently during the king's Egyptian style coronation at Memphis (Diodorus 33.13), demonstrates a wish to gratify his Egyptian subjects and tends to uphold Goedicke's theory of legitimisation of the dynasty through association with Egyptian religion in its connection with the name of that great religious centre. Overall the triad rule of Ptolemy VIII, Kleopatra II and Kleopatra III seems to have dealt quite successfully with the threat from the indigenous population, at least until civil war broke out between the three.

The native Egyptians were not the only source of disruption within the kingdom, however. The Greek population became extremely hostile to Ptolemy VIII and towards this group little conciliation was practised. It has been suggested that the circumstances of his return to Egypt and usurpation of the throne properly belonging to Ptolemy VII brought about in Ptolemy VIII an anti-Greek attitude, at least to the extent of hostility towards those Greeks who had supported Kleopatra II, as well as enmity to the Jewish element of her supporters (Mittford, 1938, 297/8). The Greeks in Alexandria had a propensity for taking the affairs of the kingdom into their own hands, as they had shown in earlier years in proclaiming Ptolemy VIII king in Alexandria during Antiochos' invasion (Polybius 29.23) and expelling him again in 163 (Polybius 31.10). The volatility of the populace, comprised of Greeks from all over the Greek world who brought with them an array of religion, myth and poetry, brought a special ambience to the city from

which the Ptolemies ruled their kingdom. The welter of religious beliefs and legal systems corresponding to the ethnic variety of Greek immigrants coexisted in an atmosphere of intellectual eminence during the third century, which declined, however, by the mid second century with the fortunes of the Ptolemies and with the loss of empire which had occurred under the later rulers (Taubenschlag, 1983, 489).

The intellectual standards of the city were to suffer further under Ptolemy VIII even though he seems to have been a man of some cultivation, a pupil of Aristarchus and Aristobulus and one of whose many nicknames was Philologus (Fraser, 1972, 1.332 and Bouché-Leclercq, 1978, 3.81, n.1).³ Despite his erudition Menecles of Barca (F.H.G. 270 F9=Athenaeus 4.184) relates that this king expelled from the city the grammarians, philosophers, geometers, musicians, painters, gymnastic trainers, doctors and other skilled men shortly after his accession in 145.

Justin (38.8) says that the king, finding himself ruling in Alexandria over an empty city tried to fill the vacuum he had created with fresh immigrants. He appears not to have succeeded, however, but instead the Greek citizen body seems to have become gradually outnumbered by natives from the χώρα and immigrants from other countries such as Italy (Tcherikover, 1979, 32). The refusal of the intellectuals to return to the city, while it led to a cultural revival elsewhere (Athenaeus 4.184 and cf. Zalateo, 1980, 141-150) no doubt contributed to the poor opinion of the city expressed by Polybius (34.14) on his visit there during the reign of this king. The decline in the number and quality of Greek immigrants came not only from fear of outright persecution but also, it has been suggested, from the king's hostility to the use of ethnics and patronymics, which stemmed from his dislike of upper class Greeks (Mitford 1959, 110). With the change in population came changing religious attitudes, with less observance of Olympic cults and the increasing interaction of Egyptian deities, cults and burial forms in a

complex mesh of beliefs and practices held by a population of 'excitable and savage temper' (Fraser, 1972, 1. 296-300,805).

At about the same time Justin (38.8) says that after the murder of Ptolemy VII (Neos Philopator) Ptolemy VIII then had those subjects who had invited him back to Alexandria murdered also; perhaps he feared that they might wish to extract from him some reward for this in influence or office. Diodorus (33.6a) says that this king falsely accused many of plotting against him, put some to death, exiled others and seized their property. He also relates (33.20) that Galaestes, an Athamanian and friend of Ptolemy VI, was falsely accused of treason and stripped of his estates by Ptolemy VIII and so departed Egypt for Greece where he welcomed other exiles. Claiming that Ptolemy VI had entrusted to him a son of his and Kleopatra II's to be reared as heir to the throne, he placed a diadem on the boy's head and with a number of other exiles as partisans prepared to restore him to his father's kingdom. Who such a son might have been is not known, nor is the truth of Galaestes' claim, but the story is an indication of plots against Ptolemy VIII immediately upon his return to Egypt.

Valerius Maximus (9.2.5) tells of an occasion when the king's forces surrounded a gymnasium, killed everyone inside and then destroyed it. Orosius (5.9.15) dismisses the king as *incestis parricidiisque execrabilis*. In constitutional affairs it has been suggested that around 145 Ptolemy VIII may have abolished the Alexandrian ecclesia, as no such body existed when the Romans came to Alexandria (Fraser, 1972, 1.95 and 798).

From the amount of historical comment upon his brutality it is apparent that revolt was always simmering in Alexandria against Ptolemy VIII and in the general dissatisfaction with his rule it is very probable that his second wife was seen as more closely aligned with him than the first wife who had been rejected by him in

favour of her daughter. The hostility of the Alexandrians to Ptolemy VIII carried over to Kleopatra III in her struggles against her sons (Justin 39.3).

A further element in the maelstrom of second century Egypt was formed by the Jewish population of Alexandria, also liable to take forcible political action as in their support of Kleopatra II at the time of the return of Ptolemy VIII (Josephus *c.Ap.* 2.50-3).

The degree of exclusiveness from the rest of the Alexandrian population maintained by the Jews has been variously estimated. Mendels (1979, 131) in a discussion on the similarities and differences between the *Letter of Aristaeus* and the *Temple Scroll from Qumran* supports the logical conclusion that although the Jews remained in many ways unique they still assimilated to Greek ideas in many ways. They seem to have been favoured to some extent by the Ptolemies ever since Ptolemy I is reported to have settled Jewish prisoners who had served in the regular Ptolemaic army in early Jewish fortress settlements (Aristaeus 36 and 37 and cf. Chrest. Wilck, 334 and P.Tebt. I.793). Jewish communities were scattered throughout Egypt but the largest group formed a politeuma in Alexandria (C.Pap. Jud. I, p.6). While not apparently possessing citizenship they seem to have enjoyed equal rights with citizens and the fundamental right granted to them was probably the right to live according to the Torah, their ancestral law (C.Pap. Jud. I. p.7). Ptolemy IV seems to have shown some hostility to them because they refused to become adherents of his preferred deity, Dionysos (Cerfaux and Tondriau, 1957, 219) but by the mid second century their support seems to have become of importance to Ptolemy VI and Kleopatra II. Josephus (*c.Ap.* 2.49) says that these two entrusted their whole realm to the Jews, placing their army under the command of Onias and Dositheos, and while this is probably an exaggeration nevertheless Ptolemy VI was in need of allies other than the Greeks and Egyptians, who were divided in their support both for him and for Ptolemy VIII. Ptolemy VI was also the enemy of their arch persecutor,

Antiochos IV, Epiphanes (Schurer, 1973, 151-162) from whom Onias had fled with his supporters after the Maccabean revolt against the Seleucids and established an important Jewish centre at Leontopolis in the southern Delta with the co-operation of both Ptolemy VI and Kleopatra II (Josephus *A.J.* 3.1 and 2, *Wars* 1.1.1. and 7.10.3, *c.Ap.* 2.5). When Onias supported Kleopatra II after the death of Ptolemy VII the Jews earned the enmity of Ptolemy VIII and Josephus (*c.Ap.* 2. 53-55) attributes to Ptolemy VIII the tale of an attack by drunken elephants ordered by a Ptolemaic king against a group of Jews (Tcherikover, 1979, 282). Whether or not this was so, nevertheless Ptolemy VIII seems to have taken steps to improve relations, perhaps in the provisions of an amnesty granted the Jews on his marriage to Kleopatra II and at her insistence (C.Pap. Jud. I, 22). He may also have found he needed Jewish support because of his persecution of the Alexandrian Greeks. As he benefited the Egyptian temples, he seems also to have favoured those of the Jews, as the dedication of synagogues on his behalf testifies (S.B.. 5862, 7454 and C. Pap. Jud. I, 23, n.56). Kleopatra III was to make much use of Jewish forces during her reign (Josephus, 13.285).

The ambiguous and individual position of the Jewish community within the religious orbit of the kingdom can be seen in the Jewish attitude to the dynastic Alexander Cult. C. Pap. Jud. I. no.132, dated to 21st September, 164, is a letter from one Herodes to Onias and states in its preamble 'Herodes to Onias, greeting. King Ptolemy is well and King Ptolemy his brother and Queen Kleopatra his Sister and their children, and their affairs also are as usual'. The editors point out (p.245) that the prescript is unique in the known official correspondence and see this as evidence that the Onias to whom the letter is addressed is the founder of Leontopolis. The form of the prescript is also notable for its complete lack of allusion to the Alexander Cult titles of Ptolemies VI and VIII and Kleopatra II and in this illustrates the Jewish position and attitude to the Alexander Cult; respect is paid to the reigning monarchs and they are carefully

acknowledged *but they are not recognised as gods*. In the regular formula of synagogue dedications, ὑπὲρ the reigning king, the formula almost always avoids the use of Alexander Cult titles (Fraser, 1972, 1.283 and 2.437, n.770). The inference is that the Jews were uniquely favoured in being dispensed from observation of dynastic cult practice by their own religious beliefs, as to acknowledge any god but their own would be sacrilege for them (Bouché-Leclercq, 1978, 3.36). It may be that this favour was granted to them in return for their military support for Ptolemy VI.

The Alexander Cult in the Triad Reign.

Although the Jewish community may largely have been able to sidestep Alexander Cult observance the cult continued to be an important method for upholding the sovereignty of the rulers over the rest of their subjects.

In 145/4 the letter of Ptolemy VIII to the troops in Cyprus calls him only βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος ταῖς ἐν Κύπρῳ (C.Ord. Ptol. 41, l.16), but in the same year P.Gen. inv. 5, inédit (=P.Gen.II.87), provenance unknown but also dated to 145/4, already calls Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II θεοὶ Εὐεργέται, indicating that immediately upon his return to Egypt the king adopted this title for both himself and his new wife (Wehrli, 1974, 10). The title may not have been uniformly employed at this early date, however, as C.Ord. Ptol. 45-6, a letter to the Cyreneans apparently from Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II and tentatively dated to 144-141, is addressed only from King Ptolemy and Queen Kleopatra the Sister with no Alexander cult title. Otto and Bengtson (1938,48, n.2) suggest that Ptolemy VIII and *both* of his queens acquired this title at least from 31st December, 142, on the basis of P. dem. Merton I (cf. Glanville, 1933,34-41), but as Pestman has shown (P.L.Bat. 22, pp.64-66) in 142 Ptolemy VIII was still married to Kleopatra II, therefore the Beneficent Gods to whom P.dem. Merton I refers (l.2) cannot yet include all three, although it is evidence for the use of the title for Kleopatra II at this date. By at

least 140/39, however, at the time when Ptolemy VIII was married to Kleopatra III, the prescript of P.Tebt. I.6 reads (ll. 12/13) Βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος καὶ Βασίλισσα Κλεοπάτρα ἡ ἀδελφὴ καὶ Βασίλισσα Κλεοπάτρα ἡ γυνὴ and later (l.19) refers to all three together as the Θεοὶ Εὐεργέται. In P.Grenf. 2.15 of 139 the epithet is applied more specifically and the preamble reads (ll. 1-2) Βασιλευόντων Πτολεμαίου Θεοῦ εὐεργέτου τοῦ Πτολεμαίου καὶ Κλεοπάτρας Θεῶν ἐπιφανῶν, καὶ Βασιλίσης Κλεοπάτρας τῆς ἀδελφῆς καὶ Βασιλίσης Κλεοπάτρας τῆς γυναικὸς Θεῶν εὐεργετῶν.

Otto and Bengston (1938, 47ff.) conjecture that in taking the cult name of Ptolemy III the king intended to emulate Ptolemy III's Syrian conquests, and, even further, to make himself Βασιλεὺς τῆς Ασίας. Whether or not this is so, and apart from the titulature the evidence to support this suggestion is lacking, it is clear that, at the least, the adoption of this epithet at once tended towards reviving the memory of the successes of his ancestor, thereby reinforcing the concept of the long-established and victorious ruling house, and imbuing the present king with the reflected glory of the name. In becoming Euergetes Ptolemy VIII became Ptolemy III revived. For the Egyptian priests the attraction of the name of the king who brought back to Egypt the sacred objects stolen by the Persians is obvious, and its revival by Ptolemy VIII is a striking example of the good use made by that king of the art of propaganda and public relations. He may, perhaps, have been inspired in this instance by the name given to his murdered nephew, Neos Philopator (Ptolemy VII) in its emulation of Ptolemy IV, but even so the skilful appropriation of the name, and thus of the identity, of the earlier king who so significantly gained the gratitude and admiration of the Egyptian priests and presumably of the Egyptian people also, is notable for its political adroitness. In the extension of the name to *both* Kleopatras, for the name continued to be used for Kleopatra II even after the king's re-marriage, the repetition of the title which this frequently required insisted upon the beneficence

of all three and reinforced awareness of the identification of the new reign with the old. When it is considered as well that Euergetes was also an epithet for Osiris the usefulness of adopting the name in a ruling house whose subjects were predominantly Egyptian is apparent. Although Nock (1942, 217/8) is of the opinion that the use or revival of names and epithets in the dynastic cult was primarily directed to the Greek and not the native element of the population, in this instance the very significant Egyptian emphasis in the connotations of the chosen name firmly imply its selection for the benefit of Ptolemy VIII's Egyptian subjects, as well as the Greek.

In becoming part of the Θεοὶ Εὐεργέται on her remarriage Kleopatra II dissociated herself from her membership of the Θεοὶ Φιλομητόρες in which she had appeared with her previous husband. Ptolemy VI. P.Gen. inv. 5=P.Gen.II 87 not only shows Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II as Θεοὶ Εὐεργέται as early as 145/5 but already shows Ptolemy VI alone as Θεοῦ Φιλομήτορος; that king was to be given this solitary status thereafter. An interesting exception to this is seen, however, in P.Tebt. I.6 of 140/39 which reads (l.19) Θεῶν Φιλομητόρων and of which the editors (63, n.19) remark that the plural is incorrect as at this time Kleopatra II was included in the Θεοὶ Εὐεργέται. This may be, however, an instance of a moment in time where the 'peculiarities' of the prescripts, so often put down to exhaustion on the part of the scribes, in reality exactly mirror the situation at court. If the marriage of Ptolemy VIII to Kleopatra III had only just taken place at the time of this papyrus the terminology of the prescript could accurately represent a compromise between the two hostile queens. Eupator, the son of Kleopatra II and Ptolemy VI, is included and positioned before both the Philometores and the Euergetai, which gives him precedence over his parents who themselves then chronologically precede the Euergetai. Although her son has been included Kleopatra II has herself been returned to membership of the Philometores, while Kleopatra III alone is included with her husband in the

Euergetai. The victory of Kleopatra III over her mother which might be seen in this prescript was not to last, however. In P.Amh. 2.44 of 138/7 Ptolemy VI is alone again and both queens are members of the Euergetai, as lines 1 and 2 make very clear in separately granting each of them this title.

Although Kleopatra III's own inclusion in the Euergetai apparently took place immediately upon her marriage as the papyrus (C.Ord. Ptol. 47= P.Tebt 1.6, line 19) which furnishes the earliest date for this shows both the Philometores which must include Kleopatra II and the Euergetai which must include Kleopatra III, she was not always to be simply grouped with her mother and husband. Papyri such as P.Amh. 2.44 of 138/7 show her alone in the preamble which reads (ll.1-2) Βασιλευόντων Βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου καὶ Βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρας τῆς ἀδελφῆς Θεῶν Εὐεργετῶν τῶν Πτολεμαίου καὶ Κλεοπάτρας Θεῶν Επιφανῶν καὶ Κλεοπάτρας τῆς γυναικὸς Θεᾶς Εὐεργετίδος, the whole of which is repeated in lines 16 to 18. This formula appears also in P.Giessen 36.8 of the same year, a Greek translation of a demotic contract from the Thebaid, and in P.B.M. Eg. 10.622, a demotic contract of 137. This style could be variously interpreted, either as giving added lustre in a special individual listing or as excluding her in some fashion from the partnership of her uncle and mother as the Εὐεργεταί; it might also be argued that such instances could reflect scribal initiatives or the preferences of correspondents. Whatever the direct cause of this style, however, instances of this separate listing being given to the king, as in P.Grenf. 2.15, line I, seem to indicate that it is a particular honour. Such individual listing was to occur again for Kleopatra III during her reign with her son Ptolemy IX. The separate title seems also to indicate continuing dissension between the two queens as it serves to show very clearly that, should there be any doubt, both are now definitely included in the cult title of the king.

For Ptolemy VIII the situation must have had some difficulties. For the two women the assumption that, as Volkmann (1958, 36) has said "Mother and

daughter fought against each other with a hatred that was irreconcilable" seems justified. That during these years Kleopatra II was able to maintain precedence over her daughter in the prescripts and inscriptions of the time is testimony to her having and retaining an extraordinary hold over the other two, either because of her own powerful group of supporters within Egypt or outside, her own right to the throne, her strong personality or some combination of these factors. That she did so maintain her position is clear.

Although from the time of her marriage Kleopatra III is called *Βασίλισσα Κλεοπάτρα ἡ γυνή* her mother consistently precedes her as *Βασίλισσα Κλεοπάτρα ἡ ἀδελφή* throughout the joint rule, even after the civil war which erupted between the three at the end of their first decade together. Despite the wording of "Queen Kleopatra the sister", which implies that Kleopatra II had either been formally divorced or that her marriage to Ptolemy VIII was considered to have been annulled by his marriage to her daughter, not only the order in which the queens were ranked but the breadth of time and place over which this occurred throughout Egypt and the Empire is notable. I.G.P. 103 a.b. and c., the basis of an obelisk, is only one of several inscriptions from Philae listing the three as King Ptolemy and Queen Kleopatra the Sister and Queen Kleopatra the Wife. I.G.P. 118, a white marble base from Delos, uses the same order, as do I.G.P.123, one of several similar inscriptions from Cyprus, I.G.P. 107 from Ombos, I.G.P. 111 from Berenike on the Red Sea, I.G.P. 124 from Knodora, S.E.G. 30 no. 1573 from Amethous dated to 142-118, and Strack - Archiv. no. 5, an inscription from a temple in Medinet en Nahasch in the Fayûm. In the reliefs of the temple of Thoth at Kasr el-Agouz the king is accompanied in one instance by both queens (Quaegebeur, 1975, 20). In another apparent example of triple domestic felicity I.G.P. 104 from Kos records the honours granted by the three to Hieron, their friend and the tutor of their children; the three rulers are ranked in their usual order.

Specific dates cannot be ascribed to such inscriptions, but the evidence of the papyri shows how soon after the marriage of Kleopatra III and Ptolemy VIII this order of king, sister queen and then wife was established. C.Ord. Ptol. 47 = P.Tebt. 1.6, the earliest evidence for the marriage and dated to 3-12th February, 139, already employs the familiar order. At the end of the reign of Ptolemy VIII C.Ord. Ptol. 53 = P. Tebt. 1.5, the famous Amnesty Decree of 118 and possibly the most important document issued by the three, still maintains the precedence of Kleopatra II. The tenacity of this queen in clinging so firmly to her position could have afforded both a source of anger and a worthy example to her daughter who, during her reigns with her sons, was to consistently maintain her precedence over her own offspring in the protocols.

The expansion of Ptolemaic family cult outside Egypt during the joint reign of Ptolemy VIII, Kleopatra II and Kleopatra III is attested by S.E.G.18.727 (see Appendix D) an inscription from Cyrene which "reveals the establishment of a new cult of the reigning Ptolemies in the reigns of Euergetes II and the Cleopatras" (Fraser, 1958, 104). Its ascription to the reign of Ptolemy VIII during one or other of his periods of rule with both Kleopatra II and Kleopatra III is determined by line 5 which reads τῷ Βασιλεῦς καὶ τῶν Βασιλισσῶν καὶ τῶν τέκνων (Fraser, 1958, 101 and 102/3). In this inscription, for which Fraser's (1958, 102) impression is that "to judge by the hand, a date near 139 is more probable than one in the neighbourhood of 116", instructions are given for annual sacrifices with libations and prayers on behalf of the reigning sovereigns and their children, with the regulation that the decisions to perform these rituals be inscribed on stelai. Provisions are made for the administration of certain fields, as may be decided by the assembly, and for payments concerning these fields which have apparently been set aside in connection with the royal cult. The fields are probably to be leased and the revenues used for the upkeep of the royal cult. The inscription records celebrations which may have occurred in

response to a specific bequest, and, as Fraser (1958, 102 and n.2) suggests, these fields were most probably bequeathed by an individual for this purpose. Officials are to be appointed annually to supervise the fields as instructed by the assembly.

Whether the earlier period of joint rule, dating from 140/39 to about 132, or the later period, from about 124 to 116, is preferred as the date of this inscription it demonstrates at either of these times the dissemination of the family cult throughout the dependencies of Egypt and at least a superficial unity in the reign, with the three rulers and their children grouped together in apparent amity. It would be interesting to know just which of their children are included here, whether the sons of Kleopatra II by Ptolemy VI are recognised, which seems doubtful, or whether Memphites, her son by Ptolemy VIII, was surviving at the time of the inscription. Kleopatra III had herself given birth to five children by about 135, who had been named Ptolemy (Soter), Ptolemy Alexander, Kleopatra, Kleopatra Tryphaena and Kleopatra Selene (Peremans and Van 't Dack, nos.14519-21, 14554/5). The departure from tradition in calling their second son Alexander is notable and another instance of the concern of Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra III to link themselves with their illustrious predecessors, in this case not just with an earlier Ptolemy but with the deified Alexander himself. For the female line the succession of Kleopatras had by now given the name of the Syrian princess who was the first of that line an especially Ptolemaic sanctity almost equal to that of the name of Ptolemy.

The Dating of S.E.G. 9.5.

S.E.G. 9.5 (see Appendix E), a further Cyrenaic inscription which is of considerable interest for Alexander Cult ritual, has been much commented upon for the dating problem which it poses. The decree which this inscription records contains lengthy provisions for the regulation of the ritual of the dynastic

Alexander Cult in Cyrene, and from this, in view of Cyrene's importance to the Ptolemies, the manner in which the cult functioned in Alexandria, for which evidence is lacking, might be assumed. It is decreed that the priests and officials are to wear white and to offer sacrifices and libations, prayers and invocations in the agora for the health and welfare of the King, the Queen and their son Ptolemy in recognition of their bounty. The priests and priestesses are to open the temples, wreath them and offer sacrifices. Officials are to decorate the city buildings and sacrifice on behalf of the city to Βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίῳ καὶ Βασιλίῃσσι Κλεοπάτραι τῇ ἀδελφῇ Θεοῖς Σωτήρσι καὶ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτῶν Πτολεμαίῳ καὶ τοῖς γονεῦσι καὶ τοῖς προγόνοις αὐτῶν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Θεοῖς παῖσιν (ll.21-26). The magistrates and officials are to order the revenues and recover arrears of contributions. The area of dispute is over which "King Ptolemy and Queen Kleopatra Theoi Soteres" the decree concerns and to which date it can therefore be attributed.

The inscription includes a letter from a King Ptolemy and a Queen Kleopatra, the Sister, addressed to the Cyreneans and instructing them to include in their laws a royal ordinance prohibiting unlawful impounding of goods or imprisonments. The letter is dated year 9, 24 Gorpaios, 24 Phamenoth. It is in the combination of this date and the reference of the decree to the royal pair as Theoi Soteres that confusion arises. Préaux (1942,133-149) after analysing to which kings and their queens the circumstances of sovereignty over Cyrene in the ninth year of their reign while parents of a son could apply, concludes (139/140) that the inscription most probably refers to Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II. She explains (137) the designation of the royal couple as Theoi Soteres through the application of this title to Ptolemy VIII with an eponymous priestess at Ptolemais in the years 140 to 123 for Πτολεμαίου Εὐεργέτου καὶ Σωτήρος, an event noted by Otto and Bengston (1938,40-41) and Otto (1939, 17, n.3). Will (1966, 362) upholds the appropriation of this title by Ptolemy VIII and its identification with Ptolemy I in

addition to the king's assumption of the titles and identification with Ptolemy III. Jähne's (1982, 76-82) theory that Ptolemy VIII wished to emulate the policies of Ptolemy I also supports the likelihood of that king taking the cult name of the first Ptolemy. If Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II can be accepted as the Theoi Soteres of S.E.G. 9.5, however, a problem arises with the concordance of the Macedonian date of 14 Gorpaios with the Egyptian date of 24 Phamenôth in the ninth year of a reigning sovereign. This date cannot refer to Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II as they were not married until the king's twenty fifth year. Préaux sees in this an error on the part of the stonemason who should have written κθ instead of simply θ, which would then have placed the inscription in the twenty ninth year of a sovereign who, having a wife and son, ruled Cyrene at a time when 24 Gorpaios and 24 Phamenôth coincided. Such a combination in the reign of Ptolemy VIII would date the inscription to 28th March, 140. Préaux (1942, 140 and nn. 1 and 2) is, however, concerned that a problem would arise here that by that time Kleopatra III was married to the king and therefore should have been included in the formulae. However, if the marriage of Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra III took place between 7th September, 140 and 3rd to 12th February, 139 (on the evidence of P. dem. Berl. 3090 and 3091 and C.Ord. Ptol. 47 = P.Tebt. 1.6, cf. P.L. Bat 22, 66) then the danger of Préaux' theory being negated by the absence of Kleopatra III from the inscription is removed as she was not yet part of the joint rule at the date which Préaux offers.

Préaux gives further arguments in favour of dating the inscription to the reign of Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II on the basis of the tenor and style, but in her conclusions she is in disagreement with both Otto (1939, 16-27) and Fraser (1958, 114 and n.5). Fraser summarily dismisses Préaux' argument in favour of an earlier dating and supports Otto's conclusion that the inscription belongs to the reign of Kleopatra III and Ptolemy IX, Soter II. Ptolemy IX, Soter II was married and he and his wife, Kleopatra Selene, were the parents of sons. The

queen mentioned in the inscription is clearly not Kleopatra III as she is placed second and called Sister, a title never held by Kleopatra III who always preceded Ptolemy IX in the protocols and with whom she shared the title Philometores, not Soter. An ascription to 109/8 would, however, depend upon the assumption that Ptolemy IX was temporarily expelled from Egypt, in control of Cyrene at that time and married to Kleopatra Selene, while Justin (39.3) states that in his will Ptolemy VIII left Cyrene to his natural son Apion and not to Ptolemy IX. That Ptolemy IX *was* expelled from Egypt at this time is the argument of Otto and Bengston (1938, 160 ff and cf. 173 ff) Otto (1939, 16-17) and Fraser (1958, 114), but it is an argument based largely upon the ascription of S.E.G. 9.5 to 109/8.

As S.E.G. 18.727 belongs definitely to the reign of Ptolemy VIII, and possibly to a year between 140/39 and 132, the ascription of S.E.G. 9.5 to 140 would give an overall picture of the manner in which Ptolemaic family cult and dynastic Alexander Cult functioned in Cyrene at about the same time and would illustrate Ptolemy VIII's reliance upon cultic practice for the worship of himself and his family. In any case both inscriptions demonstrate the ritual attached to cult practice in Cyrene, which would no doubt have been elaborated in cult practice in Alexandria, and S.E.G. 18.727 alone shows the increased observance of the sanctity of Ptolemy VIII, Kleopatra II, Kleopatra III and their children in the formative years of Kleopatra III's participation in power. Whether S.E.G. 9.5 is ascribed to the reign of Ptolemy VIII or to that of Ptolemy IX and Kleopatra III it is in any case relevant to a time in which Kleopatra III was either preparing for power or had attained it. Its extensive provisions for elaborate Alexander Cult observance illumine the impact which must have been made upon those who carried out the rituals and those who watched the public recognition of the cult, and are appropriate to the awareness of the importance of dynastic worship shown by Kleopatra III throughout her career.

The Alexander Cult and The Civil War.

That the extraordinary reign of Ptolemy VIII and the two Kleopatras lasted for so long, although characterised by mutual hostility and increasing bloodshed, compels the conclusion that at no time during these years did it become either safe or wise for Ptolemy VIII or Kleopatra III to have Kleopatra II murdered and that therefore her survival was in some way necessary to their own political welfare. Forced, therefore, to co-exist, the personal relations of these three, the king who had previously married and fathered a child by the mother of his new wife, the queen rejected in favour of her daughter, and that daughter, now queen, but faced with the continued domination and participation of her mother in the new reign, were not harmonious. Nevertheless, despite the unrest and dissatisfaction in Egypt and the hostility between the two queens the first period of joint rule managed to continue for some nine years. However in 132/1 (Samuel 1962, 145/6) Kleopatra II succeeded in breaking away from the others and in establishing her own rule, which was recognised at least in Thebes. Three papyri (U.P.Z. 2.217, 224 and 225) are dated to the second year of Kleopatra II, when Ptolemy VIII was preparing to attack Thebes (U.P.Z. 2.12 and Wilcken, U.P.Z. 2, p.219). The second year of Kleopatra II and the fortieth year of Ptolemy VIII was 131/30. U.P.Z. 224 specifically equates year thirty nine (i.e. 132/1) with year one and therefore the queen's revolt must have begun in that year.

That Kleopatra II managed to set herself up as ruler and be recognised as such to even a limited extent was a truly remarkable feat and testifies to the amount of support which she was able to muster at court and among the population of Egypt. Much of this can probably be attributed to the cruelties of Ptolemy VIII outweighing his attempts to restore order and improve his image, it is probable that the bulk of the allies of Kleopatra II came from amongst the Greek

population which had suffered most from discrimination by the king. On breaking away from her ex-husband and daughter this remarkable woman apparently took a new cult title, calling herself Θεὰ Φιλομήτωρ Σώτειρα (cf. Nilsson, 1974, 164 and Otto and Bengtson, 1938, 61 and 140). How far throughout Egypt this title was recognised is doubtful, however, as it seems not to be attested in the demotic texts, (P.L.Bat. 15, p.62 and n.g.). Not only did Kleopatra II apparently succeed in establishing her independent rule, if only in a limited area and for a short while, but she also succeeded in temporarily ridding herself of Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra III as, probably in 131, they fled to Cyprus.

Justin (38.8) says that it was from fear of the people of Alexandria that Ptolemy VIII fled into voluntary exile, taking with him a son whom he had had by Kleopatra II and his wife, *matris paelice*. Livy (59) says that the king fled, being hated by his people because of his excessive cruelty, to Cyprus, after his palace had been set on fire by the populace. It was probably while in exile there and apparently in reprisal for Kleopatra II's having inaugurated her autonomous reign by a new title and a new dating that a new cult was instituted to Kleopatra III within the Alexander Cult. The remarkable institution of the ἱερός πῶλος Ὑσιδος μεγάλης μητρὸς Θεῶν appeared at this time and continued at least until 104 (Otto and Bengtson, 1938, 71ff. and Plaumann, 1913, 1434 on P. Leid. dem. 185 of 131/30, and cf. P.Leid. dem. 373a, line 2 of 130/29 for the earliest demotic reference; see also P.L. Bat. 24. 171-186). This priesthood, seemingly inaugurated in a swift response to the crisis of Kleopatra II's revolt and explicit statement of independence, may well have taken place at the instigation of both Kleopatra III and Ptolemy VIII. It clearly shows the importance attached to the propaganda value of the Alexander Cult.

The cult of the hieros polos gave to Kleopatra III the signal honour of the innovation of a cult to a queen administered by a male priest, as Isis had been ministered to by male priests. The reason for the recondite title of the priesthood,

which indicates some scholarship in its creation, is unknown but may possibly signify the youthfulness of its occupant (Plaumann, 1913, 1434-5). The priesthood appears in the prescripts directly after the priest of Alexander and the deified Ptolemies and before those of the apotheosised queens, the athlophoros of Berenike Euergetis, the kanephoros of Arsinoë Philadelphos and the priestess of Arsinoë Philopator, a precedence made more noticeable by its unusual terminology (P.Grenf. 1.25, P. Brussels E7155).

Otto and Bengtson (1938, 73) have found *geradezu alarmierend* the avoidance of the individual name of the queen in the replacement of the expected "Kleopatra" by "Isis, Great Mother of the Gods". All previous Ptolemies, with the sole exception of Alexander himself, had been admitted into the cult under their own personal cult names and had taken the prefix Theos or Thea to emphasise their divinity. In appearing directly as the goddess without the title of Thea and without the use of her own name Kleopatra III gave herself an unprecedented rank of supreme divinity. The replacement of the name of the queen by that of the goddess represented a total identification of goddess and queen in the greatest possible secularisation of religion, through which the divinisation of the monarchy has been considered to take its *höchst möglichen Form* (Nilsson, 1974, 64). In using only the name of the goddess Kleopatra III appears as the epiphany of Isis, a significant step forward in her personal divinity with an assimilation designed to promote religious fervour and support for the royal pair in presenting the queen with the attributes of the goddess incarnate.

The Isis with whom Kleopatra III identified as "Great Mother of the Gods" presents the queen with the multiple aspects of the Hellenised Isis bearing the title of Kybele, the Phrygian mother goddess. Otto and Bengtson (1938, 80) see this borrowing of Kybele's title as stemming from the court rather than from popular interest as there are few indications of her cult in Egypt but frequent references to the Mother in Alexandrian poetry. Isis herself was called "great" and "mother of

the god" (Horos), but she could not be "mother of the gods" other than in an honorific sense or through identification with another goddess (Nock, 1942, 221). Before Ptolemaic times Isis had assimilated oriental elements from the Syrian Astarte and had blended with Hathor, the daughter of the sun and the necropolis goddess associated with the night sky; Herodotos (2.156) identified her with Demeter through her chthonic aspects (cf. Thompson, 1973, 58 and Troy, 1986, 66). Under the earlier Ptolemies the ancient Egyptian aspects of Isis as the wife of Osiris and Mother of Horos which were venerated by the Egyptians, were taken up by the Greeks in a cult aspects of which were progressively adopted by the Egyptians, as the Greeks had assimilated Egyptian ritual (Dunand, 1973, 79). The Hellenised Isis with whom earlier Ptolemaic queens had identified had also assimilated aspects of other goddesses. As the wife of Sarapis rather than Osiris Isis was able to assimilate to Aphrodite, Artemis, Demeter and Dikaioyne as the goddess of women, wisdom, death, salvation and justice. Demeter had been served by a ministrant called "The Foal" in Messenia and Laconia (Otto and Bengston, 1938, 88/9). Diodorus (1.25) tells of Isis' identification with Demeter as a healer and mother who holds the secrets of immortality and with Thesmophoros, Selène and Hera, while Chaeromon (Fr. 17D) says that the Greek Demeter had the same powers as Isis in nourishing and raising the fruits of the earth.

As Demeter established the laws for the Greeks so Isis established the law and dispensed justice for mankind (Diodorus, 1.14), and in this identification an important political aspect of Kleopatra III's new priesthood is seen. Diodorus (1.75) has commented upon the great respect of the Egyptians for the law and their dislike of corruption, saying that they chose the best of their number as judges. In identifying so completely with Isis, Kleopatra gave a conscious imitation of the role of Isis which was of enormous psychological import in a time of civil war and extended the earlier Egyptianising policies of the triad rule in

amnesties, temple building and decoration, the possible wearing of Egyptian dress by the king and the naming of the child Memphites. In a great leap forward which was still a logical progression from past policy Kleopatra III now *became* Isis herself, an identity the easier to assume as she, like Isis, was a mother, and of not one but two sons. Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra III needed Egyptian support to return to Egypt and the presentation of the queen in her new identity as the Hellenistic Isis, who represented the Ma'at, the concept of justice and morality personified by Isis, but whose kindness and tenderness were always evident, was intended to achieve this and also, in appearing in a special light to the Greek population of Alexandria, to outshine Kleopatra II in her newfound identity as the goddess Philometor Soteira.

As Kleopatra III's appearance as Isis was a progression from the earlier political policy of the triad rule it was also a progression from the appearance of earlier Ptolemaic queens as Isis, identifications with whom are found for Berenike I, Arsinoë II, Berenike II and possibly Arsinoë III and Kleopatra I (Tondriau, 1948c, 14-25). The association of Berenike II as Isis μήτηρ Θεῶν is found in a mid third century inscription from Krokodilopolis (Otto and Bengston, 1938, 84, Nilsson, 1974, 165) and in column 2, 6d. of P. Petrie 3.1 which reads Ὑλισδος μητρὸς θεῶν Βερενίκης. Kleopatra III expanded her own identification by including a reference to Kybele in the use of her title as *Great Mother*.

This notable cult was to be perpetuated by the queen during her reign and was uniquely her own. Despite attributions to Kleopatra II (Dunand 1970, 41 and 177) there is no evidence to associate this cult with any other Ptolemaic queen than Kleopatra III (cf. Plaumann, 1913, 1435, Otto and Bengston, 1938, 72). In the inauguration of this form of worship the dignity and divinity of Kleopatra III were enormously elevated above those of her mother and her image promoted as being of far greater sanctity than that of her mother, the cult was thus another weapon in the continuing war between the two in their quest for dominance over

each other and for the adherence of their subjects. In taking the title of her first husband, Philometor, and that of the founder of the dynasty, Soter, Kleopatra II had presented herself as at once identified with the great Ptolemy I and as totally repudiating her second husband and his title of Euergetes. As well, in taking Philometor's title she had allied herself with her mother, Kleopatra I, in whose honour the title had first been instituted. She thus stated in precise terms her view of herself as a worthy successor to Soter and as a faithful wife, implying in this that her second marriage had indeed been forced upon her, and making plain that she personified the continuity and greatness of the dynasty free from any association with Ptolemy VIII and his second wife. This exercise in personal propaganda was now far outdone by that of Kleopatra III.

At about the same time as that at which Kleopatra III presented herself as the personification of Isis Ptolemy VIII appears to have taken the name of Tryphon (P.L. Bat. 15, p.62 and n.h, P.Berl. Dem. 3113a of 1322/1 and 131/130). Bouché-Leclerq (1978, 3.81, n.1 and cf. 4.322/3) notes that what he calls *le sobriquet injurieux*, with its connotations of decadence, may have been applied to the king by those Egyptians who did not now recognise his authority nor that of Kleopatra III. However Otto and Bengtson (1938, 47 ff.) conclude (49 and n.3) that in adopting this epithet Ptolemy VIII again associated himself with Ptolemy III, Euergetes I, by whom the name was also held (cf. Will 1966, 362). Heinen (1978, 188) upholds this and the laudatory nature of the title expressing the *magnificence du souverain* rather than a pejorative implication. At the time when dissension between Ptolemy VIII, Kleopatra II and Kleopatra III was most evident their individual use of cultic terminology as propaganda is noteworthy.

It was also during the Cypriot exile that Ptolemy VIII, perhaps fearing that Kleopatra II would put their son, Memphites, on the throne with her, had the boy killed and his mutilated corpse brought to his mother on her birthday in Alexandria. According to Diodorus (34/5.14) Ptolemy VIII, after putting the boy to

death in Cyprus and mutilating the body, placed it in a chest and ordered one of his servants to convey it to Alexandria as the birthday of Kleopatra was approaching. He had made arrangements to place the chest before the palace on the eve of the occasion and when this was done and became known Kleopatra mourned καὶ τὸ πλῆθος παντελῶς ἀπεθριώθη πρὸς τὸν Πτολεμαῖον. This macabre story is echoed by Livy (59) who says that Ptolemy, in his anger at the people having given the crown to his sister Kleopatra, killed their son in Cyprus and sent the head, hands and feet to the child's mother. Justin (38.8) confuses the story somewhat in first saying that Ptolemy took the son whom he had had by his sister with him to Cyprus, and then that he next sent for his eldest son from Cyrene and put him to death. As the son by his sister *was*, as far as is known, his eldest son, the explanation may be that Memphites was first sent to Cyrene by his mother, who would presumably not have allowed Ptolemy VIII to take him to Cyprus in the first instance, and thence decoyed to Cyprus where he was killed. Again according to Justin (38.8) the murder was in retaliation for the people of Alexandria having pulled down the statues and images of the king, and when the body was sent to Kleopatra the nobility, presumably the Greeks at court, exhibited it to the people to show them what they could expect from their king.

Otto and Bengtson (1938, 61-2) suggest that Memphites was in some way turned against his mother at this time on the basis of O.G.I.S. 144, an inscription from Delos attributed to Memphites the dedication of which reads Βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος Βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου Εὐεργέτου Βασίλισσαν Κλεοπάτραν Εὐεργέτιν τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς μὲν γυναῖκα ἑαυτοῦ δὲ ἀνεψίαν, εὐχαριστίας ἕνεκεν τῆς εἰς αὐτὴν Ἀπόλλωνι Ἀρτέμιδι Λητοῖ (cf. Mitford, 1959, 114, n.69). The unusually explicit phrasing, specifying that the Queen Kleopatra in question is 'the wife of my father, my cousin' completely ignores the existence of his mother, Kleopatra II. Mitford (1959, 114) believes that Memphites was forced by Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra III to make this dedication before they killed him. Kleopatra III was also,

of course, Memphites' stepmother and half-sister as well as his cousin but no doubt this complication of relationships was best avoided in the text of the inscription. Bagnall (1972, 364), from this mire of relationships, attributes the inscription to Apion, the illegitimate son of Ptolemy VIII and therefore a cousin of Kleopatra III, and not to Memphites, her half-brother. However Memphites, as the son of her mother and of her uncle was both her half brother and her cousin; the attribution to him cannot, therefore, be contested on the ground of his relationship to Kleopatra III.

Given Ptolemy VIII's already well established reputation for cruelty the story of Memphites' murder is not beyond the bounds of credibility, if Memphites presented a threat to the king's retention of power it seems unlikely that he would have been allowed to live. The murder was quite possibly with the compliance of Kleopatra III, and makes even more intriguing the question of why Kleopatra II was still allowed to survive having declared herself sole queen. Both Diodorus (34/5.14) and Justin (38.8) testify that she had considerable support from the Alexandrians and at least some of the nobility but it seems unlikely that this could have saved her had she not still been needed in some way by Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra III. In the turmoil caused by civil war her death would seem especially desirable and perhaps easily arranged.

If Vatin's (1970,71) view that the marriage between Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II had been entered into in a compromise to avoid a civil war on the return of Ptolemy VIII in 145/5 has any substance, then the hopes for peace which this would imply were unfulfilled. The condition of Egypt was not improved by the renewed dynastic strife, reminiscent of that between Ptolemies VI and VIII; in the fortieth year of Ptolemy VIII (131/130) the papyri testify to widespread unrest, as in P.Tebt. I.72.45 which gives καὶ τῶν ἕως τοῦ λθ' (ἔτους) πρὸ τῶν τῆς ἀμειξίας. The return of Ptolemy VIII to Egypt from Cyprus at a time before 15th January, 130 (Samuel 1962, 147 citing Chrest. Wilck. 1.10) did not alleviate the situation

as the King and his ex-wife fought for control of the kingdom. Chrest. Wilck. 1.10 of 130 recounts the approach of the king's general Paos to Hermonthis in the Pathyrite nome with an army to conquer the mobs raging there and to treat them as rebels. Mitford (1959, 103) tends to the opinion that Kleopatra III and their children did not return until 127/6, the year in which Otto and Bengston (1938, 99) place the recapture of Alexandria. Diodorus (34/5.20) tells of the recapture of Alexandria by the king's general Hegelochus, which apparently refers to this period. Protocols continue to reflect the reality of the situation as in P.S.I. 1016. of 129 where lines 16-19 list only one queen with Ptolemy VIII, Κλεοπάτρας τῆς γυναικὸς Θεᾶς Εὐεργέτιδος; there is now no mention of Kleopatra II under any title and this papyrus gives no special honours for Kleopatra III. In the year 127 B.G.U.3.993 still shows only Queen Kleopatra the Wife, Goddess Euergetes and again with no special honours. The omission of the hieros polos at this time could reflect some difficulty in gaining general acceptance of Kleopatra III as the personification of Isis; the omission of Kleopatra II indicates the length of time which passed before any reconciliation took place.

Unable to maintain herself in power in Alexandria after the return of her brother Kleopatra II sent ambassadors to ask for aid from Demetrios, King of Syria (Justin 38.9). In return for his promise to make war on Egypt Kleopatra II promised him the kingdom as a reward, according to Justin (39.1). If this is true then it was a treasonous promise, no doubt liable to non-fulfilment should the queen ever again find herself in a position to rule alone but indicative of the lengths to which she was prepared to go to against her brother and daughter. A rebellion in Syria prevented Demetrios from attacking Egypt, however, and Kleopatra II, perhaps fearing the anger of even those who had previously supported her at her having treated with Demetrios, fled into Syria taking with her a great part of the wealth of Egypt (Justin 39.1). The depredations of Antiochos and the flights of Eulaeus and Linaeus and of Kleopatra II, taking with them whatever they could from the

treasury, must severely have affected the Egyptian economy of the second century. Ptolemy VIII succeeded in negating any threat from Demetrios by sending an Egyptian army with a pretender to the Syrian throne, Alexander Zabina, who defeated Demetrios but in turn became a threat to Egypt and necessitated the despatch of yet another Egyptian army, this time to defeat him (Justin 39.11 and 39.8), the cost of these exercises no doubt contributing to the further depletion of the Egyptian treasury.

Ptolemy VIII, Kleopatra II and Kleopatra III were reconciled from about 124 (Mitford 1959, 104 and Koenen, 1970, 62). Although Otto and Bengtson (1938, 103 ff.) find signs of interruptions in the prescripts from about November 123 to late 122, by January 121 all three are included and appear regularly from then on as the Theoi Euergetai. Yet again the question arises of Kleopatra II being allowed to continue to participate in the reign and why this should have been accepted. As Tarn (1939, 323) points out Ptolemy VIII *should* have murdered her and he suggests that, given that it was ambition that drew her back to Egypt, she must, nevertheless, have felt safe in returning and perhaps an element in this feeling of security could be found in Rome having guaranteed her life. The influence of Rome in the affairs of Egypt at this time is rarely overt but always to be reckoned with.

From the time of the reconciliation the trio continued to rule over their troubled country as the Theoi Euergetai. C.Ord. Ptol. 51-2 (=O.G.I.S. 137-139) give two letters, dated to 124-116 with the three again appearing as King Ptolemy and Queen Kleopatra the Sister and Queen Kleopatra the Wife, the Beneficent Gods, sent to the Strategos of the Thebaid with orders to exempt the priests of Isis at the temple of Philae from the cost of provisions for visiting functionaries and troops. Apart from demonstrating in this instance a continuing concern by all three to maintain good relations with the Egyptian priests, such documents are remarkable for the consistency with which the Alexander Cult terminology which

they employ reflects the changing relationship between Ptolemy VIII and the two Kleopatras.

A further indication of this accurate reflection in the prescripts of the hostilities of the joint rule is seen in the appearance and non-appearance of the sons of Kleopatra II and Ptolemy VI, Eupator and Neos Philopator. Eupator is allowed to appear quite frequently, as in P.S.I. 13.1311.16 of 137/6 and is included also in the demotic papyri, as in P.B.M. Eg. 10.622 of 137. During the time of the civil war his name continues to appear, as in P.S.I. 1016.2 of 129, B.G.U. 993 of 127, and P.S.I. 14.1402.4 of 125/4. Although at this time of civil war and dynastic strife these could be genuine cases of scribal error, nevertheless, over the years which ensued from the reconciliation until the death of Ptolemy VIII the name of this son continues to be seen quite often in the demotic as well as Greek papyri, as in P.L. Bat. 19.3 of 118, from Pathyris, or P. Pestman Recueil, 10 of 119 from Djême and such appearances imply that at least there was no specific injunction laid upon his inclusion. For Neos Philopator however, no such latitude was allowed at this time and no certain mention of him appears before the death of Ptolemy VIII. The inclusion of Eupator during the triad rule shows some concession to Kleopatra II's maternal pride but also that Eupator was not considered to have been of as much importance as his brother, having neither reigned alone nor been murdered by Ptolemy VIII for the threat he presented.

Koenen (1970, 63, n.4) has seen in the apparently posthumous portrayal of the murdered Memphites as the god Euergetes in the temple of Edfou a possible temporary restoration of that prince to the Alexander Cult, being understood there as a member of the Theoi Euergetai for an indefinable period of time with Ptolemy VIII, Kleopatra II and Kleopatra III (cf. Otto and Bengtson, 1938, 106, n.2). This would only have been accomplished by considerable pressure from Kleopatra II and as Memphites is at no time specifically mentioned by name in the protocols, as are both Eupator and Neos Philopator on occasions, the

assumption of his inclusion in the Theoi Euergetai seems doubtful, especially in view of his murder by Ptolemy VIII. If Memphites can, indeed, be considered to have been a member of the Euergetai at some stage then such membership was definitely rescinded after the death of Ptolemy VIII in 116, when the prescripts begin to show that king alone as Theos Euergetes (P. Grenf. 1.25 of 114). The records of the sons of Kleopatra II illustrate the importance of the prescripts for demonstrating the status of Alexander Cult members in their inclusion or exclusion and in the order in which they are placed. Inclusion and exclusion of family members in the prescripts was to be frequently used by Kleopatra III as a weapon in later dynastic struggles.

Unrest and disruption continued throughout the countryside after the return of Kleopatra II. Rostovtzeff (1972, 2.874) discussing the extensive disturbances in the years 123 to 118, with particular reference to P.Gizeh Museum inv. no. 10351 and the strife between the neighbouring towns of Gebelên and Hermonthis, comments that the many documents of the period reflect the impression produced by the amixia on the minds of the people (cf. Volkmann, 1958, 40f.). Koenen (1959, 103-119) discusses the possibility of an attempt at this time to proclaim a native Egyptian as an alternate king in the Thebaid. In response to the condition of the country, brought about by years of civil war, dynastic strife and the maladministration consequent upon unstable rule, a decree of amnesty was promulgated.

Administration after the Civil War and the Reputation of Ptolemy VIII.

C.Ord. Ptol.53=P.Tebt. I.5, the Amnesty Decree of 121/118, is particularly well preserved and has been the subject of a great deal of comment. The decree intervened against arbitrary acts by officials, remitted the guilty and lowered taxes. Significant concessions were made by the Greek rulers to their native subjects; P.Tebt. I. p.54, n.207 discusses the importance of the regulation of lines

207-20 of this papyrus, which decrees that disputes between Egyptians and Greeks will be heard by either Egyptian or Greek judges, depending upon what language the contract is written in, thus limiting the previous incursions of the Greek judges upon the powers of their native counterparts.

Although the crown was further impoverished and administration less controlled as a result of some of its provisions this decree nevertheless represented a careful and detailed attempt to stabilise the country, dispense justice and restore order. How far decrees such as this and those from the beginning of the joint rule, such as P. Tebt. I.6 of 140/39, a response by the king and both queens to a petition from the priests of a temple to either Arsinoë or Berenike ordering government officials to see that the revenues of the priests are not disturbed, can be attributed solely to Ptolemy VIII or what share in them may have belonged to either of the two queens cannot be determined. In particular the land settlements of the Amnesty Decree of 121/118 may well represent the efforts of both Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II to satisfy their respective adherents, while the safeguarding of the revenues of temples to members of the Alexander Cult has an obvious appeal for all three rulers. As far as their effect upon the reputation of any of the three is concerned, however, historians have tended to award whatever praise is due for the reforms of 121/118 to the king alone. Mahaffy (1899, 184 -7 and 202f.), lost in admiration for Ptolemy VIII's foreign policy, his ability to control his womenfolk and his dispensation of justice to all found it impossible to believe that Justin's assertions of murder could conceivably be true of this civilised man who published the edict of indulgences. Ptolemy VIII found warm support also from the editors of the Tebtunis Papyri (Vol. I, p.20), who found the evidence of that volume and "the really excellent list of reforms introduced by Evergetes II" still more in his favour. Their commendation is, however, largely based on the misapprehension that Justin's story of the assassination of Neos Philopator is chronologically impossible so, therefore, his other accusations of cruelty and

murder by the king cannot be believed. (P. Tebt. I. 553/4). As the existence of this prince has now been established there is no longer any chronological reason to doubt this story nor the estimation of the historians of the excessive cruelty of this king (Justin 38.8, Livy 59, Diodorus 33.22). Given that the decree is issued in the names of all three there is no obvious reason to doubt the contribution of the two queens to its provisions or arbitrarily to attribute to the king alone the wisdom and goodwill of its edicts.

That Ptolemy VIII was cruel does not necessarily mean, however, that he was stupid nor that it was impossible for him to be an astute politician.; the length of time over which this king managed to rule Egypt despite the many vicissitudes of his reigns does demonstrate at least a talent for survival. Bagnall (1976, 56) has spoken admiringly of the skill of many of the moves made by Ptolemy VIII in his reorganisation of the army in 142, in which units of troops became based on ethnic groups, thus preventing independent action by any one group without weakening the army's ability to act against external enemies. The king's military skills are seen much earlier than this in his strategic and decisive action against the rebels in Cyrene (Polybius, 31.18) and his effect upon Cypriot political, religious and military affairs during his rule there has been considered to have been beneficial (Mitford, 1959,112). Rostovtzeff (1972, 873) has called him "a clever politician, resourceful, courageous and energetic, though utterly devoid of scruple and moral sense, and unusually cruel and cynical". His second wife whose political mentor he probably was, at least to some extent, by reason of his much greater age and experience in ruling, was to demonstrate similar military and political skills. Through all the propaganda devices available to him Ptolemy VIII seems to have made an orchestrated attempt to enhance his image in the eyes of his subjects despite his depredations upon them; such a course of action would presumably have made a distinct impression upon his wife, who may even have been involved in its production, and which she was later to emulate.

Ptolemy VIII and Rome.

The overall policy by which Ptolemy VIII acted during his reign has been variously considered either markedly pro-Egyptian, as strongly urged by Mahaffy (1899, 195ff.) or, as Bevan (1968, 322/3) concluded, not more so than that of any other Ptolemaic king but making only the concessions to the native population which were forced upon him, or that both his domestic and foreign policies were in general largely determined in response to Roman influence (Jähne, 1982, 76-82). During the strife between Ptolemy VI and Ptolemy VIII both had made a series of embassies to Rome pleading for support, and Roman intervention at that time took a definite form; in response to the embassies of the brothers Rome established Ptolemy VIII in Cyprus (Polybius, 31.10) and then re-established him there after the revolt against him (Polybius, 31.17 and 18, 33.10). There is a suggestion that Rome helped Ptolemy VIII gain the Egyptian throne after the death of his brother (Josephus, *c. Ap.* 2), and Otto (1939, 352) goes so far as to see both the installation of Ptolemy VIII on the Egyptian throne and his marriage with Kleopatra II as having taken place at the direction of Rome in order, through the inevitable hostility which would ensue in such a marriage, to keep the kingdom as divided as it had been all through the reign of Ptolemy VI. That Rome's eastern policy at this time was aimed only at keeping the states weak and divided but not yet conquered is the view of Polybius (31.10) in stating that in acceding to Ptolemy VIII's request for the Romans to assign Cyprus to him this coincided with their own interests, and that in availing themselves of the mistakes of others they effectively built up their own power while seeming to do others a favour. Diodorus (31.33) is of the opinion that Ptolemy VI did not kill Ptolemy VIII at this time at least partly from fear of Rome.

It is quite possible that Ptolemy VIII was aware that the assistance given him by the Romans was not wholly altruistic, but he seems also to have been aware that

Roman power was now so great that it must be conciliated. Certainly visiting Roman noblemen were well entertained, perhaps incautiously so for Diodorus (33.28b) says that when Scipio Africanus Aemilianus and his fellow ambassadors went to Alexandria to survey the entire kingdom the king welcomed them with great pomp, held lavish banquets for them and showed them his palace and other royal treasures. They went on to survey the land and the cities, the general excellence of the country, its strong defensive position and natural advantages. It can safely be assumed that the advantages of adding such a territory to the Roman empire did not escape them.

Jähne (1982, 76-82) considers that through necessity, being constrained by Rome to the north, Ptolemy VIII returned to the policy of Ptolemy I, whose principal concern had been the maintenance of the territory of Egypt. It was the pressure of Rome, therefore which produced the ostensibly pro-Egyptian policy apparent during the triad rule and turned attention from the more independent policies of Ptolemy VI towards conserving the territory already held by cultivating the priesthood and the native Egyptians. The theory that Ptolemy VIII turned back to the policies of Ptolemy I receives support from his assumption of this title with an eponymous priestess at Ptolemais in the years 140 to 123 for Πτολεμαίου Εὐεργέτου καὶ Σωτήρος. (Otto and Bengtson, 1938, 40-41 and Otto, 1939, 17, n.3). That all the Ptolemies respected the work of the founder of the dynasty is clear from the coinage, the head of Ptolemy Soter I appeared repeatedly on coins until the collapse of the dynasty. Under Ptolemy VIII numerous silver coins showing the head of Ptolemy I, diademed and wearing the aegis, appear throughout the reign from Egypt, Cyrene and Cyprus (Poole 1963, 89-98). Representations of Ptolemy VIII himself do not, however, appear; the coinage preponderantly shows Ptolemy I, sometimes varied by the head of Zeus Ammon, diademed or by the Kleopatras. In all the long list of the coins of Ptolemy VIII the king himself is recognised only on the reverse in the lettering ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ with

the depiction of an eagle on a thunderbolt. That the great bulk of the coins bear the head of Ptolemy I is evidence in itself of the concern of Ptolemy VIII to associate his rule with that of the founder of the dynasty. It represents a conscious attempt to visualise, through almost the only medium which would reach his subjects at large, which was in everyday use and of essential interest to all those who handled it throughout Egypt and beyond, that fusion of internal and external policies with those of Ptolemy I which Jähne has discerned. The coins of Ptolemy VIII differ quite markedly from those of his predecessor, Ptolemy VI (Poole, 1963, 78-83) which are at least much concerned with Kleopatra I and with Zeus Ammon as they are with Ptolemy I. Only after the death of Kleopatra I do the coins of that reign show the head of Ptolemy I familiar from earlier years (Poole, 1963, 83).

The influence of Rome upon Ptolemy VIII can also be seen in the first of his wills (S.E.G. 9.7). This will may have been drawn up around 161/160, when Ptolemy VIII was conducting his frequent embassies to Rome, and been designed to secure Roman support for his claim to Cyprus. The opening states that a copy of the will has been sent to Rome, it then goes on to state very decidedly that he wishes vengeance against those who tried to deprive him of his kingdom and life and proceeds to bequeath his kingdom to the Romans if any mortal fate should prevent him from leaving heirs to the throne, his friendship and alliance with whom he has always preserved with sincerity (cf. Polybius, 33.11). He entrusts Rome with the task of protecting his interests and defending him against his enemies. He then calls upon the Roman god, Capitoline Jupiter, with Helios and Apollo Archegetes, the founder of Cyrene, to witness his arrangements; these are the gods with whom he has deposited the original document.

That the will was inscribed on stone means that it was a public document and its publication probably intended as a threat to Ptolemy VI should any more assassination attempts be made, a threat which quite possibly extended to

Kleopatra II. This text is apparently the earliest example of a will in which a king bequeathed his kingdom to Rome, doubtless establishing a precedent for others, and Braund (1983, 21) has pointed to the likelihood of such a will being interpreted under Roman legal practice, despite its inappropriate terminology. The will was never to be executed, however; it was revoked by another, later will.

The Inheritance of Kleopatra III.

When Ptolemy VIII died on 28th June , 116 (Samuel, 1962, 7, and cf. Otto and Bengston, 1938, 112-114) he left the kingdom of Egypt to his wife and to whichever of her two sons *she should choose* to rule with her. This extraordinary testament, completely overriding the usual Ptolemaic system of primogeniture, went far to ensuring that Egypt would once again be subjected to all the ills of dynastic strife. The kingdom which had been left to Kleopatra III was now in decline and faced with the external threat looming from Rome against which the Hellenistic kingdoms had failed to unite but had instead fought amongst themselves. The Ptolemies themselves had also failed to unite and through their dynastic feuds had impoverished the kingdom. The long feud which Kleopatra III had conducted with her mother was almost over but new conflicts were to begin, this time between Kleopatra III and her sons, Ptolemies IX and X. In the struggles with her sons Kleopatra III was to make increasing use of religious propaganda in order to uphold her superiority over them.