

CHAPTER 4 - QUEEN REGNANT. PART I

At the death of Ptolemy VIII on 28th June, 116 both of his queens were still living. It was Kleopatra III, however, who emerged as the final victor in the long conflict between these two women for "Ptolemy, king of Egypt, died, leaving the kingdom of Egypt to his wife, and one of her two sons, whichever she herself should choose; as if the condition of Egypt would be more quiet than that of Syria had been, when the mother, by electing one of her sons, would make the other her enemy." (Justin, 39.3, cf. Porphyry F.G.H. 260, 2 (8)).

The Will of Ptolemy VIII.

Justin's succinct comment upon Ptolemy VIII's extraordinary will encapsulates the troubles which were to come to Egypt because of its terms and conditions; this will is not the least intriguing element of the remarkable career of Kleopatra III. Earlier Ptolemies had usually succeeded to the throne in accordance with primogeniture with the sole exceptions to the rule being Ptolemy II as the eldest son of the second wife of Ptolemy I and Ptolemy VIII himself, who had gained the kingship in 145 through the murder of the legitimate heir, his nephew Neos Philopator. When Ptolemy VIII died he and Kleopatra III had two living sons, Ptolemy Soter II, born in 142 (Peremans and Van 't Dack, no.14554) and Ptolemy Alexander, born about 141 (Peremans and Van 't Dack, no.14555), both of whom were now of an age to be able to rule in their own right without a regent. That Ptolemy VIII should will the kingdom to his wife and to whichever son she herself chose to rule with her testified not only to his view of Egypt as a personal possession of which he had the giving but also to his belief in the ability of the queen to rule. The unfortunate element lay in the necessity for a male ruler to share the throne with her.

The king's conviction that he had the disposition of his kingdom was not new. In his earlier will leaving Cyrenaica to the Romans (S.E.G. 9.7) he had assumed his right to dispose of that territory and in this had also set a precedent for later Hellenistic rulers such as Attalos III of Pergamum, Ptolemy Apion and Ptolemy XI, Alexander II, to will their territories to Rome in return for Roman protection (Justin, 36.4, 39.5, Livy, *Epit.* 58, Orosius 5.8, Kouvelas, 1972, 300-304, Braund, 1983, 17-27). As the concept of female hereditary rights in the Ptolemaic kingdom emanated from the practices of pharaonic Egypt so too does pharaonic custom, in which private wills by husband or wife freely disposed of property ((Harris, 1971, 321), seem to have influenced the eighth Ptolemy in his enthusiastic espousal of testamentary territorial disposal. Whether or no he had the legal right to do this becomes a purely technical question, however, as, whether or no she was entitled to do so by any kind of legal or hereditary right, Kleopatra III did not hesitate to take over the throne of Egypt after her husband's death in company with first one and then the other of her sons, and no evidence exists of any attempt to impede her in this by anyone other than her mother who seems to have succeeded in gaining a share of power for a short time.

Apart from the legality of the situation comes the intriguing question of why Ptolemy VIII should have given the principal rule of the kingdom to his wife rather than to either of his sons. According to Porphyry (F.G.H. 260.2 [8]), whose version differs slightly from that of Justin, the kingdom was left to Kleopatra and both sons, with no mention of her right of choice between them. In view of the alternation of these two with her in the rule, however, the version of Justin appears to be correct in stating that she did have the power to choose whichever she preferred. Why Ptolemy VIII should so have arranged affairs can only be surmised but the inference has usually been drawn that he did so because of the pressure exerted upon him by Kleopatra III to ensure the continuation and escalation of her personal power.

To Bevan (1968,326) it seemed that this "strange will" showed Euergetes II more eager to gratify individuals "made dear to him by his lusts" than to safeguard the integrity of his kingdom. Bouché-Leclercq (1978, 2.85) sees the last act of the king as one of complaisance for the ambitious Kleopatra III and a political error, and Will (1966,369) as probably having been done in order secure peace in his old age. All three historians assume in their comments a patronising and stereotypical scenario of a hapless elderly man at the mercy of his lusts and a scheming young wife, quite disregarding their earlier views of Ptolemy VIII as a merciless, indomitable tyrant not at all noted for the weakness of his character throughout a reign totalling some fifty four years. Given that in all that time Ptolemy VIII had frequently shown a great deal of political awareness in confrontations with his brother and sister and in ingratiating himself with such a powerful ally as Rome, it might more logically have been assumed that he made this will of his own volition through having a better opinion of the abilities of his wife than of those of either of his sons. Having been married to Kleopatra III for some twenty four years ample time had elapsed for the king to form a judgment of her political acumen and, no doubt, for his "lusts" to diminish.

The contention has also been made that this will merely recognised the political equality of queens which had been gained by Kleopatra II and that after her the succession legally belonged to a queen who survived her husband, with the proviso that a male relation had to be included in government (see Vatin, 1970, 85 citing Taubenschlag, *The Law of Graeco-Roman Egypt*, 564). This is not borne out, however, by evidence of such a system operating among succeeding generations of Ptolemies. Such a suggestion seems, indeed, to imply that only necessity induced Ptolemy VIII to make such a will and again to discount any possibility of his having deliberately chosen to leave Egypt principally in the most capable hands available.

Mahaffy (1899, 207) makes surprisingly little comment upon the will of Ptolemy VIII, remarking only that for "some reason we cannot fathom" Cyrene was bequeathed to Ptolemy Apion, the natural son of the king by his mistress Eirene, the disposition of Egypt itself principally to a woman having apparently rendered him wordless. Rostovtzeff (1962, 874/5) finds in the will an inevitable basis for further trouble, which in view of later events is difficult to dispute. Fraser (1972, 1.123) on noting the provisions of the will does at least, if somewhat ambiguously, recognise the importance of Kleopatra III as "almost the most remarkable of the queens who dominate Ptolemaic history"

Before the death of the king the elder son, Soter, had been sent to Cyprus as governor (Pausanias, 1.8.6) perhaps deliberately so in order to get him out of Egypt. The bequest of Cyrene to Ptolemy Apion (Justin, 39.5) meant virtually a tripartite division of the kingdom. As Kleopatra III preferred her younger son, Alexander, as co-ruler because, according to Pausanias (1.9.1) she saw him as more malleable than the elder, and did not recall Soter after the death of his father, the provisions of the will effectively provided for the widow and all three sons. In this division of property Bouché-Leclercq (1978, 3.99/100) has recognised that equal rights for the male heirs are assured; he comments as well *d'y ajouter encore, au nom du droit égyptien, une aptitude égale pour les femmes.*

The interesting, if problematical, question of any *droit égyptien* affecting the hereditary rights of Ptolemaic queens occurs again in this situation where the major share in the rule of the kingdom devolved upon a woman. In the case of Kleopatra III and Ptolemy VIII whatever hereditary rights to the throne the queen held as the eldest surviving child of Ptolemy VI and Kleopatra II after the death of her brothers Eupator and Neos Philopator, had earlier been absorbed in her marriage to her uncle. Perhaps, leaving her a widow with no brother to marry

after having murdered both Neos Philopator, her full brother, and Memphites, her half brother, Ptolemy VIII considered that she was entitled to a pre-eminent share in the kingdom in her own right and this also accounts to some extent for the disposition made by him.

Although the Ptolemies were Greek it may also be that the legal position of Egyptian women in C2/1 B.C. Egypt in some way affected Kleopatra III's position as inheritor, quite apart from any royal hereditary rights derived through Pharaonic/Ptolemaic tradition. Egyptian women frequently appear in the papyri making petitions, lending and borrowing money, buying and selling land, as lessors and lessees, liable to taxes, able to inherit and bequeath property, although Greek women could apparently exercise their rights only through a legal guardian. P. Gizeh 10388 of 123 (the 47th year of Ptolemy VIII) is interesting for its similarities with the will of the king, though from much lower in the social scale. This will, of Pachnoubis, son of Taskos, from Pathyris, makes Pachnoubis' Persian wife the principal heir to his property, almost entirely disinheriting his sons.¹

The Situation of Kleopatra III at the Death of Ptolemy VIII.

According to Mahaffy (1899, 206/7) Ptolemy VIII left behind him a safe and flourishing empire with no danger offering either from Syria or Rome as both were occupied with their own internal problems. This statement presents, however, much too comfortable a picture of the state of the kingdom inherited by his wife and sons. The great days of the Ptolemaic empire were over and Kleopatra III was faced with an increasingly impoverished and beleaguered realm, diminished by the apportionment of Cyprus to Soter and of Cyrene to Apion. Mahaffy (1899, 208) has seen the separation of Cyprus and Cyrene as fortunate in making these provinces safer from "liberation" and absorption by Rome and the kingdom of Egypt, as a more homogeneous unit, also safer from

that rapacious republic. The separation might, however, more easily be seen significantly to have weakened what was left of the empire by breaking it apart.

The wealth built up by the first two Ptolemies had been depleted by foreign and civil war with resultant inflation. At his death in 283 Ptolemy Soter had left his son a collection of territories including the Cyrenaica, Cyprus, Phoenicia, Palestine, Coele-Syria and various parts of Asia Minor and the Greek islands, all in differing states of dependency. (Theocritus 17, nn. to ll.86-90). By 145, at the death of Ptolemy VI, only Cyprus and Cyrene remained in Ptolemaic hands (cf. Polybius 5.34 on Ptolemy IV's lack of care for the empire and Bagnall, 1976, 1 ff.). By 116 the history of Egypt as an independent mistress of her destiny has been considered by Bouché-Leclercq (1978, 2.87 and 89) finally to have been ended by the reign of Ptolemy VIII, leaving the rest of Ptolemaic history as only a prolonged agony of a ruined dynasty wracked by incest and debauchery and impoverished in blood revitalised only in the intrusion and influence of women into government.

As well as a seriously diminished empire Kleopatra III also inherited from her husband a country torn by factionalism of all kinds, a seething mixture of races, customs and creeds, with a depleted treasury and power base from which to govern this maelstrom. Will (1966, 371) sees the Egypt of this time as perishing from the inside under the effect of the moral degeneracy of its sovereigns and the slow but irremediable disaffection of the population, no ruler having been capable of restoring and maintaining a proper balance between Alexandria and the countryside.

The racial conflicts exacerbated by Ptolemy VIII's treatment of the Greek population were compounded by the distress brought to all the people by the civil war with Kleopatra II, which had also diminished whatever goodwill Ptolemy VIII had gained from his Egyptian subjects through propaganda, amnesties and

concessions. Préaux (1938, 345-354) has seen in the Amnesty Decree of 118 a reaction to the increasing decentralisation of power into the hands of the bureaucracy as the country declined and the people rebelled. She cites P. Tebt I.5, ll. 44-8 and P. Tebt. I.124, ll. 25 ff. as evidence of the kleruchs gaining hereditary rights to their land during the reign of Ptolemy VIII, while the temples were repaid for their services during the civil war with vast tracts of land and immunity from taxes (348, n.1). The extensive grants of land to native troops settled in the Fayûm (P.Tebt. I.5, ll.44-8) indicate that after the revolt of 132 both Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II endowed the native troops with kleroi as a means of conciliating them and rewarding them for their support during the civil war. Bagnall (1976, 3f.) has pointed out that the distribution of the soldiers through the nomes as kleruchs instead of keeping them under arms led to a situation where a military structure developed throughout Egypt, diminishing the authority of the regular bureaucrats. The military thus came to constitute a state within a state and from the increasing alienation of land from the crown came the general lessening of the power of the king.

The multi-racial composition of the civil service, military and garrison of household troops which had taken place by 116 also made the task of keeping command of the chaotic city and countryside more complex than it had been for earlier rulers (Fraser, 1972, 87/8). Added to all of this the queen possessed only a controlling interest in a co-rulership with one of her sons, and not the full sovereignty she would undoubtedly have preferred and perhaps insisted upon had Ptolemy VIII been as much her victim as some modern historians have chosen to consider him. She was also, after the intervention of the people of Alexandria possibly incited by her mother, forced to rule with the son she least wished to have alongside her, and was not allowed to exercise the choice which had been given her in the terms of Ptolemy VIII's will.

The Choice of Co-Ruler and the Alexandrian Influence.

Whatever the rights of inheritance possessed by the queen the possibility of her being allowed to rule alone, even had the kingdom been left entirely to her, was slight. It may have been Ptolemy VIII's awareness of this rather than any unwillingness on his part to leave her as sole ruler which caused him to associate with her in his will her choice of their sons to rule with her; as Koenen (1970, 65) has remarked the lone rule of a woman was not to be tolerated by the Greeks. The short time in which Kleopatra II apparently reigned alone had resulted from a civil war situation and her death shortly after that of Ptolemy VIII removed any possibility of the two queens reigning together, even had they or the people permitted such an unlikely combination two reigning queens would undoubtedly have been considered even more undesirable than one. Although Pomeroy has claimed (1984, xix) that in Ptolemaic Egypt some queens "played the same role as kings. Enjoying equal status with males in the eyes of their subjects, they eliminated gender hierarchy for a brief period in classical antiquity" this must be considered a doubtful, however desirable, conclusion.

The assumption has been made that Kleopatra III did rule alone at the beginning of her reign as an inference from Strabo (2.99) *τελευτήραντος δ' ἐκείνου τὸν Βίον, Κλεοπάτρην τὴν γυναῖκα διαδέξασθαι τὴν ἀρχήν*, but it is an inference which cannot be considered justified (Pauly, 1921, 11, Col.745). The Greeks seem to have heeded most carefully the death bed warning of Antipater to the Macedonians never to permit a woman to hold first place in the kingdom (Diodorus 19.11) and although Kleopatra III may have had the power to prefer or dismiss either of her sons nevertheless one co-rulership or the other was her only real option. Remarriage, which would have diminished her personal power in reducing her again to the status of a consort, was unavailable to her in what

had by now become the Ptolemaic norm of brother/sister unions and for her to marry a foreign king would have meant her removal from the country of her own power to that of another, while marriage to one of lower rank than herself brought to Egypt as a consort for her would have been undesirable. Kleopatra III did nothing to imperil her new status by remarrying, as had her mother, but concentrated instead on establishing herself upon the throne with her favourite son, Alexander.

Soter's absence in Cyprus, where, according to Pausanias (1.8.6) it was at the urging of Kleopatra III that Euergetes had sent him, might have given the queen hope that her elder son's predictable fury at the loss of the inheritance he must have seen as his own by right of primogeniture would be contained and rendered harmless by distance. Any hope of effecting a peaceful transfer of power to Kleopatra III and Alexander with Soter virtually exiled and therefore helpless to interfere was not to be, however; once more the volatile population of Alexandria took matters into their own hands and forced the new queen to nominate Soter as co-ruler and not Alexander (Justin 39.3, Pausanias 1.9.2-3, Porphyry F.H.G. 3.721), perhaps, as Bouché-Leclercq (1978, 1.91) has suggested, with the idea of limiting future royal discord by upholding the rights of the older son's legitimate inheritance.

The tendency of the Alexandrians to exercise a determining rule in their own government has been seen by Otto and Bengtson (1938, 58, n.3) as an attenuated survival of the old prerogative of the Macedonian assembly. However few Greek citizens may have remained in Alexandria after the purges of Ptolemy VIII they were clearly still numerous enough to exercise a considerable influence in the city and continue the "Kingmaker" function exercised by the people over a long period of time. The earliest example of this came when, after the death of Ptolemy IV, the Macedonian troops took control of the boy king Ptolemy V and the Alexandrians slaughtered Agathocles and his

followers (Polybius 15. 25-36). During Antiochos' invasion of Egypt the Alexandrians had proclaimed Ptolemy VIII king in place of Ptolemy VI (Polybius 29.23-4); after offering the throne again to Ptolemy VIII on his brother's death they then changed their allegiance, no doubt in consequence of persecution by this king, and at the time of the civil war supported Kleopatra II (Justin 38.8). In now obliging Kleopatra III to nominate her older son as co-ruler rather than the younger one whom she preferred (Justin 39.3) they brought factionalism and civil war again to Egypt. Otto and Bengston (1938, 112 ff.) have made the interesting suggestion that in this instance the people were incited by Kleopatra II, in order to frustrate Kleopatra III's plan to reign with Alexander, which, though it cannot be proved, is not without the bounds of possibility and may even have been ultimately responsible for the death of that queen.

The Death of Kleopatra II.

The death of Ptolemy VIII has been firmly dated to 28th June, 116 by the interpretation of some lines of a stele at Edfou (Otto and Bengston, 1938, 112 ff.), but the news of this was not quickly known throughout the countryside. In Thebes it seems that the death was still unknown some twenty three days later (Louvre Ostrakon 8218 and cf. Samuel, 1962, 7 and 147/8) and even at 27th November of that year his successor was still unknown at Pathyris (P. Lond. inv. 2850). Although slowness of communication can account for such posthumous dates for the king there is a clear probability that immediately after his death dynastic strife ensued between Kleopatra II, Kleopatra III, Soter and Alexander. Not only distance and the difficulty of obtaining news need account for considerable gaps in time before the name of Ptolemy VIII disappeared from prescripts outside Alexandria, it may well be that political instability due to faction fighting within the family he left behind him played a considerable part in the confusion over who held power and who was to be shown in the prescripts.

Detail is scarce, but given that Kleopatra II was certainly still alive as late as 4th October, 117 (P.Ryl.dem. 3.18 and cf. Samuel, 1962, 148 on the tentative ascription by Mooren (1975/6, 411-417) of Inscriptions de Philae I, No. 64 to 117), it seems that she outlived Ptolemy VIII, and, given the terms of the will, that a predictable period of struggle took place principally between mother and daughter.

The prescript of the demotic papyrus P.Ryl. dem. 3.20 from Gebelein reads year 2, Phaophi 9 (29th October, 116) of the Queen Kleopatra and the Queen Kleopatra together with the King Ptolemy, her son the God Philometor Soter. This prescript is supported by several authorities, particularly Otto and Bengston (1938, 112-144 and cf. P.Ashm. p. 60, Samuel, 1962, 148, P.L. Bat. 15, pp.64, 66 and 150 and P. Tebt. I.5, p.32, n.4) and if accepted at face value and not as the product of scribal error, as maintained by Fraser (1961, 146 and n. 29), it is evidence of a new triple rule between mother, daughter and elder son after the death of the king. In the absence of clear evidence negating it there can be no valid reason to doubt the prescript, if the listing of the three rulers is scribal error then it is an error of a quite remarkable kind in so explicitly naming both queens and a son of one of them. Two Greek papyri, P.Rein Gr. 1.31 and 1.30 = P.L.Bat 22, nos. 26 and 34, are, unfortunately, less explicit. These two are dated respectively year 2, Thoth 16 and 7 (6th October and 27th September, 116) but do not name the rulers of this new reign, an omission which is in itself significant, suggesting that at least in Hermopolis, their provenance, some confusion existed as to exactly who was included. As the editors of P.L. Bat. 22 (p.67) point out, at this period the first year of a new Ptolemaic reign was commonly dated from the death of the former king to the end of the Egyptian year (i.e. 21st September to 20th September). This accounts for the mention of a year 2 in both the demotic and Greek papyri, as the time considered to be the first year, dating from the death of the king on 28th June, 116, would have finished before

any of these three papyri were written. P. Lond. inv. 2850 dated year 2, Hathyr 8 (27th November, 116) while seemingly attesting to the survival of Kleopatra II at that time simply adds to the confusion in listing this year 2 as being that of Euergetes II (*sic*), Kleopatra II and Kleopatra III. As Ptolemy VIII was certainly dead by then this is, as Skeat (1969, 35) remarks, "a graphic illustration of the confusion of the times". That the confusion resulted from a struggle for power between the surviving Ptolemies seems the logical conclusion in a dynasty always torn by such struggles in its later years.

Any new rule of three was to be short lived, however. The earliest firm date for the rule of Kleopatra III without the participation of Kleopatra II is 6th April, 115, given by two demotic papyri, P.Cair. dem. 30.602 and 30.603 listing the new priests and priestess for that year and numerous splendid titles for Kleopatra III. These papyri are dated year 2 of Queen Kleopatra and Ptolemy the Gods Philometores, there is no mention in this of Kleopatra II who seems certainly to have been dead at the latest by that date. There is at most a slight possibility of her recognition in inclusion in the Theoi Euergetai listed with the other deified Ptolemies, but without her name being specifically mentioned this seems unlikely. The opening address makes it clear that the rule of Kleopatra II and Ptolemy IX Soter has begun, therefore the likelihood is that the Theoi Euergetai include only Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra III. This prescript comes almost a year after Ptolemy VIII 's decease; clearly the ascendancy of Kleopatra III, if not easily accomplished, was by then firmly established and the will of Ptolemy VIII established in fact, whether or no it was legally valid.

The last prescripts to mention Kleopatra II are P.Ryl. dem. 3.20 of 29th October, 116 and P. Lond. inv. 2850 of 27th November, 116. As this last also names the year as being year 2 of Ptolemy VIII who had now been dead for five months its veracity is doubtful. The closest approximation of the time of her death is, then, that it probably occurred sometime during or soon after November 116,

although Otto and Bengston (1938,146) extend the time frame somewhat to place her death somewhere between December, 116 and March, 115 (see also P.Ashm. p. 60, in agreement with Otto and Bengston). Mitford (1959,116) says that she was "liquidated" but, while such a final solution is not inconceivable, there is no real evidence of this. Mahaffy (1899, 208) predictably leans towards the theory that Kleopatra III had her mother eliminated even though he is unsure whether or not Kleopatra II survived at all after the death of Ptolemy VIII. Despite this uncertainty he states firmly that if she did survive "she was surely murdered as soon as possible by the rival queen her daughter; for though Euergetes managed to live and reign with them both, when he was gone, Egypt would not contain them together for one moment."

It must be conceded that the death of her mother would have removed one obstacle from Kleopatra III's acquisition of power, and if Kleopatra II had indeed succeeded in inciting the people of Alexandria to foil Kleopatra III's plans for Alexander to rule with her then she may well have been tempted to rid herself of her forceful mother once and for all. If so, apart from any question of filial piety, such an action would also show a certain ingratitude for to some extent the eminence achieved by Kleopatra III can be seen as the outcome of the status achieved first by her grandmother and then by her mother. When Kleopatra II disappears from the records she would have been about sixty five years old, having been born in 180 (Peremans and Van 't Dack, no. 14516). In this relatively long life she had reigned as queen for some fifty four years, since 170 when she was first associated in the joint rule with her young husband and brother Ptolemy VI and her brother Ptolemy VIII (P.Ryl. 583). According to Macurdy (1932, 161) she established the principle of "Equal rights for Queens" in Egypt and, while this may be an overly enthusiastic perception of her achievement it is undeniable that Kleopatra II succeeded in maintaining her place as queen even after the death of her first husband and the remarriage of

her second, she was not set aside nor was she assassinated. There are indications that for a short period of time she succeeded in reigning alone as Queen Kleopatra Thea Philometor Soteira during the civil war of 130 in the 39th year of the reign of Ptolemy VIII (Otto and Bengston, 1938, 61 and 140, Nilsson, 1974, 164). Such a rule was short lived, held only by force and limited in its extent but nevertheless such an achievement is unique for a Ptolemaic queen. In her remarkable career she had already reigned as queen as the wife and sister of both Ptolemy VI and Ptolemy VIII; even after the exile which resulted from her defeat in the civil war she again regained a place in the rule and reigned jointly with Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra III until the death of that king; after his death it is possible that for a short while she reigned yet again this time with Kleopatra III and Ptolemy IX, Soter II. Little is known about Kleopatra II's activities in an administrative sense apart from her participation in the affairs of the kingdom recorded in the ordinances passed during her periods of co-rulership; she seems, however, to have owned ships used to transport grain (Pomeroy, 1984, 15) which indicates a practical interest in trade and economics.

Given that Kleopatra II played a determining role in Egyptian politics of the second century it might be expected that she would be well represented in the iconography, instead there is far less trace of her than there is of her mother, Kleopatra I. To some extent this circumstance might be attributed to the hostility of Kleopatra III extending to her mother in death as well as in life and resulting in the almost complete elimination of her memory from contemporary record, but this does not fully account for the almost total lack of representation of Kleopatra II in such areas as the coinage of her era. Female portraits in the coinage of Ptolemy VI belong to Kleopatra I, as do the majority of those in the coinage of Ptolemy VIII where only some few uncertain coins are attributed to either Kleopatra II or Kleopatra III (Poole, 1963, 98, nos. 127-131 and pl.23.10), the probability being that they represent the daughter rather than the mother. In the

case of Ptolemy VIII's coinage the preference for Kleopatra I may have come about as a diplomatic measure emanating from the discord between Kleopatra II and Kleopatra III

Thompson (1973, 93/4) finds only three possible representations of Kleopatra II among the oinochoai and faience portraits, any of which may equally well belong to Kleopatra III. The memory and history of Kleopatra II are, therefore, apart from some historical comment, perpetuated principally by the prescripts of the papyri up to the time of her death and in her inclusion in some few inscriptions with the brothers with whom she reigned. For Kleopatra II the record of the Alexander Cult titles which she held and which are preserved in the prescripts are a valuable source to amplify the brief recognition accorded her by the historians. The continuing importance of the Alexander Cult is apparent, therefore, not only in contemporary terms but in its value for the reconstruction of events.

The death of Kleopatra II appears to have taken place a little while before Kleopatra III's first recorded date as reigning queen with her son Soter, 6th April, 115 (P.Cairo dem. 30.602 and 30.603). In these prescripts the date is shown as being in year 2 of this reign, the first year having been placed to the Egyptian year, 21st September, 117 to 20th September, 116 in, as Samuel (1962, 149) remarks "the best Ptolemaic tradition".

Kleopatra III and Ptolemy IX

It has been suggested that the death of Kleopatra II also coincided with the divorce of Soter's first wife, Kleopatra IV, the eldest of his three sisters (Macurdy, 1932, 164). Justin (39.3) says that before Kleopatra III allowed Soter to share the throne she compelled him to divorce Kleopatra IV, whom he greatly loved, and marry his youngest sister, Kleopatra Selene.²

Clearly for the wife of her co-ruler to be an equally strong-minded woman as she herself could present a problem to Kleopatra III, and the subsequent career of Kleopatra IV shows her to have been fully as forceful as her mother.³ It may well have seemed to the queen that her youngest daughter would be more acceptable to her as the wife of her co-ruler in terms of status and rivalry and that because of this she was chosen as Soter's new wife. If, at the same time at which she sent away Kleopatra IV, the queen succeeded also in ridding herself of her mother then her own situation, despite having been forced to share her throne with Soter instead of Alexander, would have improved considerably; although compelled to accept Soter at least she would not have to cope with the warlike Kleopatra IV nor, any longer, with her ambitious and indomitable mother. The exact timing of all three of these events, the death of Kleopatra II, the recall of Soter and his divorce from Kleopatra IV, is uncertain but they complement each other well in the circumstance of this transition to power of the new rulers after the death of the old, so often a period of turmoil and death and no less likely to be so in the extraordinary situation resulting from the will of Ptolemy VIII. (Turner, 1984, 138) has observed that "The moments of transfer of power are flashpoints in the history of personal rule; they offer dangerous moments of weakness, to be seized by revolutionaries at home or enemies abroad; round the apparent candidates for the succession parties form, motivated by self-interest and conflicting policies", although this comment refers to the situation of 283 and the accession of Ptolemy II it could equally well be applied to 116 and the accession of Kleopatra III.

Of the relationship between Kleopatra III and Soter II Pausanias (I.8.6) says that no other king was known to be so hated by his mother and attributes this hatred (I.9.1) to the likelihood of her finding the younger one to be more subservient. Whether or no she would have found Alexander more subservient, and later events make this doubtful, the queen was able to induce a good deal of

subservience in Soter. Not only did she, at the very start of their reign, compel him to divorce his first wife before he was allowed to share the throne but she succeeded in maintaining this dominance over him throughout their association.

That this first divorce for Soter should have been found necessary resulted from the unusual circumstance of his having been the only Ptolemaic crown prince known to have married before his accession. Mahaffy (1899, 211) has suggested that crown princes did not marry as children born to them before they became king could not inherit, and it would seem that some such reason must account for the lack of early marriages in the dynasty. Kleopatra III's dominance of her older son is seen, however, not only in the divorce of his eldest sister and marriage to the youngest but also in her later insistence that he divorce this second wife also (Justin 39.4). Vatin (1970, 6/7) has seen the sole juridical foundation for Hellenistic royal marriage to have resided in the will of the king and if this is so then it is clear that in ordering the marriages of her children Kleopatra III was able to exercise this kingly function without apparent let or hindrance, becoming, therefore, the "living Law" in willing and sanctioning the marriage and divorce of her sons and daughters as she so chose; in this alone it is clear that the true monarch of Egypt was mother, not son. No doubt the ensuing ceremonies were conducted with great splendour in order to legitimise and confirm the new union, although little information on the ritual and conduct of such occasions can be gleaned from the sources (Vatin, 1970, 78/9 for a hypothetical reconstruction of such events). The unfortunate Selene, Soter's second wife, seems to have played no part whatever as queen, her name does not appear in the prescripts or inscriptions except possibly as Queen Kleopatra the Sister in S.E.G. 9.5 from Cyrene, if the date of this can be accepted as 109/8 (cf. Bevan, 1968, 327 and White, 1971, 258). The exclusion of Soter's wife from the prescripts is in marked contrast to the inclusion of Kleopatra III in the

prescripts of the period of the triad rule with her mother and husband and further demonstrates the dominance of Kleopatra III over her son and his wife.

The discord created between her sons in Kleopatra III's choice of Alexander rather than his older brother might be seen as politically motivated in order to ensure her own control by effectively counteracting any pact between the two, but, nevertheless, by the terms of the will it was a choice she was compelled to make even though she was not allowed its fulfilment. When the people of Alexandria forced the return of Soter from Cyprus to Egypt in 116/5 (Justin, 39.3, Pausanias, 1.9. 2-3, Porphyry, F.H.G. 3.721) the queen sent Alexander in turn to Cyprus, where he proclaimed himself king in 114/13, in order, Pausanias says, to intimidate Soter (Mitford, 1959, 119 ff and O.G.I.S. no. 181).

The joint reign of Kleopatra III and Ptolemy IX, Soter II lasted for some nine years but finally collapsed in 107. The latest date for the joint rule comes from B.G.U. 996, a papyrus from Pathyris which is dated to 23rd October of that year. As Samuel (1962,151) has noted the provincial provenance of this papyrus means that the joint reign could actually have ended before that date and the news had not yet reached the countryside. The situation in Alexandria had taken a familiar turn and the Alexandrians, incited this time by Kleopatra III herself who produced wounded eunuchs whom she showed to the crowd as evidence of an attempt on her life by her son, rioted against Soter and rushed to kill him; Soter fled by sea, and Alexander was brought back from Cyprus as co-ruler (Pausanias, 1.9.1, Justin, 39.3 and 4).

The cause for conflict between Kleopatra III and Soter at this time might be found in Josephus' report (A.J. 13.278) that Soter sent six thousand men to aid Antiochos Kyzikenos in the defence of the Greeks of Samaria who were being besieged by a Jewish army under Hyrcanus, the High Priest, against the wishes of his mother and enraging her by this action. As Ferguson points out (1908,

343) Soter's first wife, Kleopatra IV, had by now married Kyzikenos, to whose part of the Seleucid empire Samaria belonged, so perhaps Soter had personal motives in doing this, and if Kleopatra III thought that Kleopatra IV was involved in Soter's decision this may also have accounted for her anger, or contributed to it. Macurdy (1932,165) comments on the situation in Syria that "Cleopatra III had spread war and ruin among her children," but they seem to have been quite capable of doing this unaided if Justin (39.3) on the murders of Kleopatra IV and Kleopatra Tryphaena can be accepted. In any case Soter's decidedly pro-Greek action in sending help to Antiochos Kyzikenos and the Greeks of Samaria had made him more firmly his mother's enemy as Kleopatra III, like her husband in this regard, maintained rather a pro-Egyptian than pro-Greek stance.

A different reason for the anger of the queen is offered by Porphyry (F.H.G. 3.721) who says that Soter, after first appearing to be obedient to the wishes of his mother was therefore loved by her for a while, but when he put to death the friends of his parents he was deposed by his mother for cruelty and driven as a fugitive into Cyprus and the mother then sent for her younger son from Pelusium and proclaimed him sovereign together with herself. From Porphyry's account it appears that Soter, by eliminating the supporters of Kleopatra III, was preparing a coup against her and, therefore, that her appearance before the crowd with her wounded attendants may have been a genuine call for the help of the people in sending Soter out of Egypt. If Porphyry is correct Kleopatra III may well have had reason to fear for her own life. It was at this time of Soter's exile that she forced him to leave behind his second wife, Selene, who had by now born him two children (Justin, 39.4).

Soter's exile did not quell his mother's antipathy towards him, she went herself with an army to Cyprus to make war upon him there. Josephus (A.J. 13.285 and cf. Wilrich, 1901, 48 ff) relates that she appointed two Jewish generals, Chelkias and Ananias, and, having entrusted them with her army, totally relied upon them.

Most of her army deserted to Soter but the Jewish elements remained faithful to her because of the favour shown to Chelkias and Ananias (Strabo, F.H.G. 3.491). This pro-Jewish policy of Kleopatra III reversed the hostile attitude shown to the Jews early in the reign of Ptolemy VIII (Ferguson, 1908, 338 ff.) because of Jewish support for Kleopatra II, and illustrates her ability to develop her own policies and to choose those of the earlier administration which she wished to maintain. The Jews, being often the object of the continuing dislike of both Egyptians and Greeks (see e.g. S.B. 6.9564) never fully allied themselves with either of those groups. Their political and military usefulness having been perceived by this queen she secured their services to further her own interests, favouring them as her father, Ptolemy VI, had done (Josephus, *c.4* 2.49).

Soter succeeded in escaping from Cyprus, for which lapse on his part the queen executed one of her generals (Justin, 39.4) and removed the scene of the conflict to Syria, anticipating aid from Antiochos Kyzikenos. At this juncture Kleopatra III used Soter's second ex-wife, her daughter Selene, as a diplomatic weapon, sending her to Syria to marry Antiochos Grypos in order to secure his help against Soter (Justin 39.4).

Soter had taken an army of 30,000 men with him on leaving Cyprus and, further allying himself with Antiochos Kyzikenos, involved himself in the deliverance of Ptolemaïs from Alexander Jannaeus. (Josephus, *The Jewish War*, 1.86 and *A.J.* 13.328-359 for this and following). He waged so successful a campaign in Palestine, taking Ptolemaïs and Gaza, slaughtering thousands of Jewish soldiers and committing appalling atrocities on Jewish women and children, according to Josephus (*A.J.* 13.345), that Kleopatra III seeing her son becoming increasingly powerful and ravaging Judaea feared that he would turn his attack to Egypt. With great courage and energy she herself set out against him with an army and navy under the command of the Jews Chelkias and Ananias, allying herself with Antiochos Grypos and Alexander Jannaeus. Prudently she also

sent much of her treasure, her will and her little grandsons to Cos for safekeeping in the sanctuary of Asklepios. This association of Kleopatra III with Cos, the birthplace of Ptolemy II and the site of worship of the Great Mother is interesting through its connection with the title of Great Mother of the Gods, under which the queen was worshipped as Isis in the Alexander Cult.

Kleopatra III also sent her son Alexander to sail towards Phoenicia, and she herself besieged Ptolemais, taking that city and earning expensive gifts and homage from Alexander Jannaeus thereby. Soter hurriedly fled again from his victorious mother and sailed for Egypt, thinking to gain control there in her absence. He failed in this and Kleopatra III sent part of her army back to Egypt to expel him by force. Though urged by some advisers to now invade and occupy Coele-Syria she refused to betray Alexander Jannaeus, according to Josephus from fear of Jewish reprisals against her (cf. Tcherikover, 1979, 283), but made a formal alliance with him. The queen then returned to Egypt having succeeded brilliantly in her military enterprise, not having killed Soter but prohibiting his return to Egypt during her lifetime. Soter returned to Cyprus and stayed there until his recall to Egypt after the death of Alexander, having been prevented by the swift military action taken by Kleopatra III from establishing himself in Judaea and invading Egypt from there.

The initiative and military skill of Kleopatra III in setting out from Egypt and defeating Soter's plans to establish himself in Judaea and Egypt has received only the most lukewarm comment. Bevan (1968, 330) says the vicissitudes of the war in Palestine "all ended in nothing", Soter went back to Cyprus and Kleopatra III to Egypt. That Soter went back to Cyprus and remained there, making no further attempt to gain or regain the kingdom by force is proof of his defeat and his fear of recommencing open hostilities against his mother. Had the queen not moved so decisively and fearlessly against him Soter might well have successfully invaded Egypt and disposed of her but instead she remained

the victor and Soter remained in exile and caused her no further trouble, hardly a nebulous outcome. Macurdy (1932, 138) also states that Kleopatra III returned to Egypt "without having accomplished anything" against either Antiochos Kyzikenos or his ally Soter II, a statement which is patently erroneous; in swiftly accomplishing the reversal of Soter's victories in Judaea Kleopatra III had struck a significant blow at both of these men, as witnessed by the homage offered her by Alexander Jannaeus. Bouché-Leclercq (1978, 2.100) remarks upon her imprudence in taking the fleet, the army and Alexander, her co-ruler, out of Egypt all at the same time, thus leaving the country defenceless. However no figures exist to establish the number of troops which the queen took and what were left, or whether she quite denuded the standing armies at Alexandria and the Delta (Rice, 1983, 124/5 on Ptolemaic armed forces), while to remove Alexander from Egypt in her absence seems a wise move aimed at preventing him from assuming power there while she was away. Her decisions were, in any case, justified by the result as Soter was not welcomed back by the people in her absence, thus proving her faith in their continued rejection of him and loyalty to herself; what may seem rash is vindicated by the outcome.

Despite the death of one of her generals, Chelkias, while pursuing Soter in Coele-Syria (Josephus, *A.J.* 13.351) Kleopatra III decisively accomplished military victory at Ptolemais, prudently decided against extending her forces any further in an attempt to conquer Coele-Syria and withdrew in good order to Egypt. She did not, however, retrieve her grandson nor all of the treasure which she had deposited at Cos. Josephus, (*A.J.* 14.112) says that this was later taken from the sanctuary by Mithridates, who also brought up a son of Alexander left there by Kleopatra III (Appian, 12.23). That she left this child and a considerable amount of treasure at the sanctuary (Paton and Hicks, 1891, xxxviii) implies that this was done as an insurance against future contingencies, leaving a future heir to the throne should this be necessary. The long alliance of

Cos with the Ptolemies (Theocritus, 17.59/60) made this a sensible choice for the safekeeping of the children and of the wealth important to the future of Egypt. The mention of the treasure having included a chlamys which had once belonged to Alexander the Great indicates considerable forethought in securing the safety of this powerful talisman. Some depletion of the treasury held within Egypt resulted, however, from the non-reclamation of the treasure at Cos by either Kleopatra III or Alexander (Broughton, 1942, 330).

Apart from decisively containing Soter in Cyprus the military exploits of the queen may well have consolidated her power in increasing the loyalty to her of the army. Macurdy (1932, 232/3) has commented upon the Macedonian tradition of royal women actively engaged in warfare. Austin (1986, 464) has commented upon the need for Hellenistic kings to show themselves as active and successful military figures in order to keep the allegiance of their troops, upon which their power rested, as well as the practical inspiration to loyalty of the booty to be gained in war. If this were so for kings, how much more necessary would it be for a queen to inspire loyalty within the army. Perhaps Kleopatra III's daring in going personally and successfully to war against Soter so impressed the armies remaining in Egypt that they remained faithful to her and Alexander and did not support Soter in his attempts to return to the throne in their absence.

Kleopatra III has not only, however, been undeservedly seen as militarily ineffectual by historians over many years but has also been singled out for some personal abuse over the events of her war with Soter. For daring to wage war against her son (Will, 1966, 370) refers to *la vindicte maternelle*. Levy (1950-1, 131) says that Soter was chased from the throne by *sa terrible mère*. Sharpe (1838, 168/9) calls her "this cruel, overbearing woman" passing over the terrible cruelties of Soter which are reported by Josephus. Mitford (1959, 104) laments "the relentless figure of this woman whose thirst for power brought her house

and kingdom to impotence" but finds Soter's passion for blood sports to be admirable evidence of his heroic and manly character (113/4). The prolonged exile of Soter brought about by the armed exploits of Kleopatra III as "warrior queen" and his reputation in Cyprus have been extensively discussed, notably by T.B. Mitford (1959, 94-131) who finds both Soter and Kleopatra II to have been highly esteemed in that island in contrast to Kleopatra III (116), even though there is evidence of a cult to Kleopatra III as Aphrodite in that island (O.G.I.S. 159 and Arch. f. Pap. 13.38). Bouché-Leclercq (1978, 2.95) pities him in his exile *pour un crime qu'il n'avait pas commis*, presumably referring to Kleopatra III's accusation against him of attempted assassination. As there is no means of establishing the truth or falsehood of this allegation with any certainty such pity might be unwarranted. His further comment that Soter's ten years of sovereignty in Egypt had been for him *un véritable esclavage* (2.95) is an apt illustration, if true, of the ineffectualness of that king.

The Alexander Cult in the Joint Reign of Kleopatra III and Ptolemy IX, Soter II.

Bagnall (1972, 364 ff. and 1976, 27 ff.) has argued that Soter was in control of Cyrene at the time of his final expulsion from Egypt and may have retained control there until as late as 102 when, with military help from Kleopatra III, he was replaced by Ptolemy Apion, the illegitimate son of Ptolemy VIII. Justin (39.5.2) has stated, however, that Ptolemy VIII left Cyrene to Apion in his will. This early tenure of Cyrene by Apion from 116/5 has been disputed by Otto and Bengtson (1938, 118, n.1 and 175, n.1) as well as Bagnall but their suggestion of Cyrene's control by Soter during his expulsion is a source of ongoing dispute not clearly supported by evidence from the sources.

Otto and Bengtson (1938, 173 ff.), Otto (1939, 16-17) and Fraser (1958, 114) have also argued, largely upon the ascription of S.E.G. 9.5 to 109/8, that before

this final expulsion Soter was briefly expelled from Egypt and took up residence in Cyrene in April, 108, together with his wife Kleopatra Selene. If their arguments are accepted, and the issue is controversial, this brief residence in Cyrene and attribution of the Cyrenaean decree, the royal letter and rescript of S.E.G. 9.5, to the year 109/8 and not to 140 as suggested by Préaux (1942, 140) means that the description given there of the conduct of the Alexander Cult in Cyrene becomes more closely associated with the time of Kleopatra III's greatest influence. The elaborate ceremony of sacrifice, libation and prayer offered by white-robed priests and officials in garlanded temples and city buildings is for the health and welfare of King Ptolemy, Queen Kleopatra the Sister, Saviour Gods, and their son Ptolemy. Clearly this queen is not Kleopatra III, who always took precedence over Soter in the prescripts and with whom she took the Alexander cult title of Philometores, not Soter, but would instead refer to his wife Selene. As well, as Vatin (1970,75) has noted, when a queen is more powerful than a king, as in the case of Kleopatra III and Ptolemy IX, she is never given the title of Sister. Certainty upon the date of the inscription is impossible to attain, although Préaux' arguments for an earlier date might be found more convincing, but given a period of only some thirty years between the dates assigned (140 or 109/8) the probability is that, in any case, the cult ritual would not appreciably have altered in such a time span and that the description of the Cyrenaean ritual given in S.E.G. 9.5 could be called upon to illuminate the manner in which the cult was celebrated in Alexandria over this period of time. The need to extrapolate from this single inscription is an unfortunate by-product of the accidents of survival but it is undeniable that the ritual conduct of the cult in the capital would hardly be less elaborate than that of Cyrene. Fraser (1972,1.222) is cautious upon the possibility of cult rituals in other territories reflecting those at Alexandria, in the manner in which Bouché-Leclercq (1978, 3.44) has suggested, but given that the control of Cyrene was in Egyptian hands

at this time and the amount of traffic between the two territories some similarity must surely be allowed.

The importance of elaborate spectacles in upholding the image of the sanctity of the Ptolemies before their subjects must be appreciated in accounting for the unswerving adherence of the dynasty to the promotion and dissemination of the ritual and formulae of the cult so peculiarly their own. From the beginning of their joint reign Kleopatra III and Ptolemy Soter II appeared as the Theoi Philometores Soteres in both demotic and Greek protocols. P.Ashm. dem. 3 from Hawara is dated to 116/5 and begins (1) Regnal year 2 Pharmouthi day three of the Kings Kleopatra and Ptolemy her son the Gods Philometores Soteres, the title also given to them both in P.Cair. dem. 30.602/3 of 116/5 (but cf. P.Ashm. p. 60 where this title is attributed to Soter alone). The earliest of the Greek protocols, P. Rein. I.30 and 31 = P.L. Bat. 22. 34 and 26, are dated to 27th September, 116 and 6th October, 116. They state in the text that this is year two of the new reign but do not name the sovereigns. However P. Fay. 11, dated about 115, is a petition to Queen Kleopatra and King Ptolemy the Gods Philometores Soteres and C.Ord. Ptol. 57/8 of April, 115, two letters from Kleopatra III and Soter to the priests of Chnum at Elephantine, give the royal pair this title as do two further letters, C.Ord. Ptol. 59/60 of August/September, 115. At the end of the joint reign such documents as P.Rein. I.20 = P.L. Bat. 22.17 of 16th December, 108 still call the royal pair by the same title, with the queen still taking precedence over her son (P.L. Bat.15, pp.160 - 163).

Occasional variations to this standard formula do occur, however. The rare instance of P.Tebt. I.7 of 114, an edict regulating the judgment of corrupt officials, is prefaced simply *Βασιλέων προσταζάντων* with no qualifying title. Such variations may indicate dissension between the pair on a titulature acceptable to them both. A further indication of this, and of Soter's steadily decreasing status before his expulsion, may be seen in P. Rein.Dem. 2 = P.L. Bat. 22.2 (p.93,n.b)

where the editors remark that the king's name is not written as a royal name but in the fashion of an unimportant stranger.

Having been forced to accept Soter as her co-ruler in place of Alexander the choice of "Mother-loving" for the title shared by Soter has interesting connotations, perhaps even implying a certain grim humour on the part of the queen. Undoubtedly the principal reason for this title was to proclaim the solidarity of the regime in the repetition of the title adopted by Ptolemy VI in tribute to Kleopatra I, it may also, however, have brought some satisfaction to the queen in imposing it upon the son whose co-rulership she had tried to prevent. Pausanias (1.8.6) says that no other king was known to be so hated by his mother and that Soter was given the surname Philometor in mockery (cf. Mitford, 1959, 118). The inclusion of the name Soter is, of course, a further assertion of the links with the dynasty's founder espoused and publicised by Ptolemy VIII and a further illustration of the queen's practice of continuing from that earlier joint reign what policies she found useful. Ptolemy IX's liking for the name Soter and repudiation of Philometor when possible for him to do so can be seen when, as king in Cyprus, he is called only King Ptolemy, the God Soter (Mitford, 1959, 117/8 and n. 81).

Throughout the joint reign Kleopatra III preceded her son in the prescripts. In the considerable volume of both Greek and demotic papyri and in inscriptions both within and without Egypt, as in Arch.f. Pap. 13.15 from Cyprus, she is invariably given the first place, dating is always by the reign of Queen Kleopatra and King Ptolemy, a significant indication of her dominance in the co-rulership.

In the coinage, however, Soter retained the pre-eminent position. Silver coins from Cyprus for the years 116 to 114 show the familiar head of Ptolemy I diademed and wearing the aegis on the obverse and, on the reverse, ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ with a single eagle on a thunderbolt (Poole, 1963,

104, nos. 1-4 and pl.26.1 and 2). Two copper coins from Cyprus, however, recognise the queen in showing two eagles on a thunderbolt with the letter K between the legs of the nearer eagle (Poole, 1963,105, nos. 5 and 6 and pl. 26.3). A similar style was maintained in Egypt; silver coins from Alexandrian mints for the years 117/6 to 111 do not recognise the queen in any way (Poole,1963, 105, nos. 7-19 and pl. 26.4-6). Later silver coins from Alexandria, dated by Poole from 110/9 to 108/7 (108, nos. 59-64 and pls.26.12 and 27.1 and 2) are similar to those of 117/6-111 and do not recognise the queen at all. Copper coins from Alexandria, however, show on the obverse ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΗΣ ΚΛΕΟΠΑΤΡΑΣ with the head of Zeus Ammon diademed and on the reverse ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ with two eagles on a thunderbolt and a double cornucopia (Poole, 1963, 106, nos. 20-23 and pl. 26.7). Other copper coins of uncertain mints are of similar style but without inscription or monogram (Poole, 1963, 106, nos. 24-35 and pl. 26.8).

From the Cyrenaica there are copper coins with a similar style of Zeus Ammon but without inscription on the obverse and, on the reverse, ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ with two eagles and symbols which include an apple branch and a double cornucopia surmounted by two stars (Poole,1963, 107, nos. 36-48 and pl. 26.9 and 10, and 108, nos. 57/8 and pl. 26.12). Alternatively the obverse shows ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ with the headdress of Isis, globe, horns, plumes and ears of corn bound with fillet (Poole,1963,.107, nos. 49-56 and pl. 26.11). Given Kleopatra III's consistent supremacy within the listings of the prescripts it is notable that she makes a less frequent and less direct appearance within the coinage of her reign with Soter, an appearance which is, nevertheless, far more consistent than was to be the case in her future joint rule with Alexander.

That the queen tolerated the greater recognition of Soter than herself within the coinage may have been a *quid pro quo* for the increasing honours she acquired

for herself within the Alexander Cult. Apart from the title of Philometores Soteris shared with Soter it is at this period that the deification of the queen within the cult reaches greater heights than ever before. It is significant that this escalation took place at the time when Soter himself held the Alexander priesthood, a post which he may earlier briefly have been given in 135/4 as a child of seven or eight during the reign of Ptolemy VIII (cf. Glanville and Skeat, 1954, 55 and n.47, Otto and Bengtson, 1938, 126 and P.L. Bat. 24.156 on P. Tebt. 3.810) and for which Ptolemy VIII's having himself acted as priest of Apollo in Cyrene (Athenaeus, 12.549) may have served as an example. A more direct precedent for Soter's Alexander priesthood as an adult can be seen in the possible Alexander priesthood of Eupator in 158/7 (P.L. Bat. 24.133), but Eupator was, as Soter had been in 135/4, only crown prince and not king. That now, and for the first time, the king himself should be at once a god within the cult and his own priest and priest of all the deified Ptolemies, including his mother, was a remarkable innovation and may indicate that Kleopatra III had to permit this palliative to her son in their forced co-existence, giving him the supreme religious office of the dynasty in return for her precedence within the prescripts and her increasing honours within the cult. It is also possible that in permitting Soter's elevation to the priesthood she saw the establishment of a precedent which would later permit her own occupation of that office.

The consistency of Soter's tenure of the office is, however, uncertain. Mitford (1959, 116 and n.76) is of the opinion that Soter held the office *"throughout the whole of his reign*, with the exception of a few weeks in the autumn of 112", a contention which is apparently supported by P.L.Bat. 24 nos. 175 to 182 for the period 116/5 to 109/8 with the exception of no. 180 for the year 111/110. However several Greek papyri of the period such as P.L. Bat 22. 21 of the year 113, 13 of 112, 22 of 111, 14 of 110 and 15/16 of 109 as well as demotic papyri such as P.L.Bat.22.1 of 110 and 2 of 109 do not name the Alexander priest at all.

Prescripts such as P. Grenf. I.27 of 109 and P.Adler G.5 of 28th May, 108 and demotic papyri such as P.Pestman Recueil 2.4 of 14th February, 108 and 5 of 109/8 also omit the name of the Alexander priest, reflecting the often doubtful nature of Soter's occupancy. The editors of P.L. Bat 22 (86, n. b) have noted this and suggest *Il se peut que le roi n'ait exercé cette fonction que nominale et qu'il y ait eu, chaque année, quelqu'un d'autre qui fût affecté de manière plus effective à cette fonction*. That Soter held the post at all may indicate some determination on his part to uphold his own dignity against his mother; late in their joint reign, however, his hold upon the post seems to have become ever more tenuous. As the reign progressed Kleopatra III may have become increasingly resentful of Soter's occupation of the supreme office of the Alexander Cult and disputes concerning this perhaps became more frequent.

Soter's absence as Alexander priest from the late prescripts and from those such as P.L.Bat 22.17 and P.Pestman Recueil 2.4 and 2.6, all of the year 108, and, in particular, the dating of P. Rein Gr. I.22, which names Alexander after Kleopatra in the dating formula, to 30th October, 110, has led to the conjecture by Otto and Bengston (1938, 160 ff. and 173 ff.) that in the years 110/109 and 109/8 Alexander twice succeeded in returning to Egypt and ousting his brother for brief periods of time. This theory is accepted by both Skeat (1969, 36) and Samuel (1962, 149/50) and, in 1967, was accepted by Pestman in P.L. Bat.15 (p.66). Mitford (1959,115-117), however, disagrees with this, finding the actual recall of Alexander unlikely and difficult to reconcile with his analysis of the evidence of inscriptions from Cyprus on Alexander's strategia there. Similarly the editors of P.L. Bat. 22 (Boswinkel and Pestman) have, in 1982, found this putative return of Alexander doubtful and have dated P.Rein Gr. 1.22 = P.L. Bat 22.18 to October/November, 107 (see P.L. Bat. 22, pp.220-221), that is after Alexander's permanent recall to Egypt and co-rulership with his mother. Similarly P.S.I. 9.1018, also dated to 110/109 by earlier authorities, is now

dated by Boswinkel and Pestman to 107. They suggest that the eighth year by which both of these papyri are dated, and which has led to their attribution to the eighth year of Soter's reign (110/9) is simply a lapse from the system of double dating which existed during the joint reign of Kleopatra III and Ptolemy X, Alexander II and refers to the eighth year of Alexander (107/6), who counted his regnal years from the beginning of his control of Cyprus in 114/3 (Porphyry, F.H.G. 260, 2.8 and cf. Samuel, 1962, 151). During that reign double dating by the total of their individual regnal years gave two separate regnal years to the prescripts. The arguments of Mitford, Boswinkel and Pestman are convincing enough to disprove Alexander's conjectured return on the basis of the uncertain dating of the papyri which is unsupported by evidence from the historical sources or the inscriptions.

The eminence of Kleopatra III within the Alexander Cult steadily increased during her reign with Soter. The office of the priesthood of the Sacred Foal of Isis, Great Mother of the Gods, which had been instituted in her honour in 131/30, during the civil war with her mother, is consistently present in the prescripts from 116/5 (P.L. Bat. 24.175-186). Moreover this priesthood continues to take precedence over those of the apotheosised queens, the athlophoros of Berenike Euergetis, the kanephoros of Arsinoë Philadelphos and the priestess of Arsinoë Philopator and, as in P.Grenf. I.25 and 2.20 of 114 and P. Lond. 880 of 113, the priest of Kleopatra III appears directly after the priest of Alexander. This downgrading of the status of the earlier queens and elevation of that of the reigning queen continued into the joint reign with Alexander, as in P. Brussels 7155 of 107/6.

The service of her own priest was not the only special honour for Kleopatra III within the ritual of the Alexander cult at this period. She also instituted for her personal worship not just one but three priestesses, a Στεφανηφόρος, a Φωσφόρος and another ἱέρεια. These offices, the first female eponymous priestesses for

almost one hundred years, were instituted very early in the reign with Soter, as P. Cair. dem. 30602/3 of 116/5 and P. Ashm. D.3 of the same year, attest (cf. P.L. Bat. 15, p.152, no. 6). These three priestesses also continued into the joint reign with Alexander (P.Brussels E7155/6 of 107/6, P.Pestman Recueil 2.4,5 and 6 of 109/8 and cf. P.L. Bat. 15, p.155, nos.6 and 7) and joined with the priest of the Sacred Foal in taking precedence over those of the earlier queens (P.L. Bat. 22.13 of 112 and P.L. Bat. 22.22 of 111), a circumstance of which Bouché-Leclercq (1978, 3.37) has remarked *prime toutes les reines d'antan et ne leur laisse que la place de l'ombre à côté de la lumière*. Inconsistencies do occur, however, as in P. Grenf. 1.25 and 2.20 of 114 where the Hieros Polos is present but no priestesses are listed for Kleopatra III, although the priestesses of the earlier queens appear in their usual place. Whether such instances are simply scribal exhaustion, or whether they reflect more of the constant striving for eminence between the queen and her son leading from time to time to a partial exclusion of the cultic honours paid to her, cannot now be known.

The institution of these offices in the queen's honour continues to illustrate Kleopatra III's use of the Alexander Cult to define her own status. The stephanophoros, who bore a crown in the queen's name in the ritual processions, was a noteworthy innovation, such recognition not having previously been accorded a Ptolemaic queen. This processional function echoes the symbolism of the crowns borne in the Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphos in honour of that king and most especially in honour of Ptolemy I, Soter (Kallixenos 202B).

The inauguration of the φωφόρος or bearer of the sacred fire in the name of the queen, is possibly even more striking. The ritual significance of fire as purification and the existence and bearing of a pure flame had impressive links with the past, both to the ancient Egyptians who, as Diodorus says (I.12) called the fire Hephaestus, holding him to be a great god who contributed much to the

birth and development of all things, and to the Persian kings. The fire that was borne before the Achmaenid kings accords with the kingly glory described in the Avesta (Yasht 19) as like a flame, illuminating the true sovereign and making him strong and great (Taylor, 1975, 254 and nn. 28 and 30). Alexander's association with fire, familiar from the fire of Hestia in Greek religious tradition, is seen in Diodorus (18.61) where fire burns on the altar before his throne in Eumenes' Alexander-tent. The cult of the sacred flame as a symbol of eternity which is found in Hellenistic courts goes back through Alexander to the Persian kings. The torch processions of ancient Egypt and the torches of the Grand Procession of Ptolemy II reach forward to the torch processions of Rome. Tondrau (1948c, 27, no. 2) sees in the creation of the *phosphoros* the possibility of an identification by the queen with Artemis, although Artemis, like Athena a powerful virgin, is a less likely identification for the married and widowed queen than those with Isis and Aphrodite which she is known to have adopted. The probability of the sprinkling of the processional fire with frankincense, closely associated with Aphrodite, and the marriage of Aphrodite with the fire god Hephaestus link the *φωσφόρος* with that goddess, with whom Kleopatra identified in Cyprus and was to identify in Egypt at the start of her reign with Ptolemy X (O.G.I.S. 159, Arch. f. Pap. 13.38 and P. Brussels E7155 and see also Burkert, 1990, 52, and 154). Fragrant shrines, such as those which Theocritus (17. ll.122-4) says that Ptolemy II founded for his parents, probably formed an important part of the ritual which the *phosphoros* helped to celebrate in honour of Kleopatra III and the Alexander Cult. The ritual functions and the objects borne by the priestesses of Kleopatra III have more impressive connotations of kingship, eternity and divinity than the baskets of flowers or fruit borne by the *kanephoros* of Arsinoë Philadelphos or the prizes borne by the *athlophoros* of Berenike Euergetis.

As well as three priestesses to serve her Kleopatra III gained further Alexander Cult titles. In the new office of the priestess of Βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρας Φιλομήτορος Σωτείρας Δικαιοσύνης Νικηφόρου the queen was now portrayed as loving her mother, as a saviour, as the emblem of righteousness and as the bringer of victory. In Kleopatra III's assumption of the title held briefly by her mother during the time of civil war, Queen Kleopatra Philometor Soteira, she equates herself with the status gained by her mother at the height of her career and links herself to her father through his Alexander Cult title of Philometor and with the founder of the dynasty.

As Dikaiosyne Nikephoros Kleopatra III identified even more closely with Isis in adopting the attributes of that goddess, as Isis and Pharaoh together gave victory and represented Justice and Order in the Egyptian concept of the Ma'at which was central to Egyptian kingship. Isis wears the feather of the Ma'at attached to the double crowns of the South and North and in one of her aspects is identified with one of the two Ma'at goddesses who were the personification of physical and moral law, order, truth and justice. (Budge, 1969, II.203, 205). Dikaiosyne represents Isis as the incarnation of justice. Nikephoros, which is an epithet of Isis in her victory over Set, was to have a strong correlation for Kleopatra in later years in her victories over Soter in Syria; at the time of the institution of this title, however, her victories over him were the more subtle ones of higher public status and recognition as the senior partner in their joint rule. The acquisition of these titles has a wider aim as well in their appeal to the loyalty and gratitude of the people at a time of dynastic turbulence and reflect the common desire of monarchs to assume the virtues of the gods and to appear before their subjects as deities. Nikephoros had been adopted by Antiochos IV (Morkholm, 1966, 97), and also by Ptolemies IV, V and VIII and was to be used by both of Kleopatra III's sons (I.G.P. 65-9). The reappearance of the priesthood of the Sacred Foal together with the assumption of the titles Nikephoros and

Dikaiosyne just after the death of Ptolemy VIII significantly equate Kleopatra III with the concept of Isis as the widowed Queen of Egypt who never remarried, reigned with complete respect for the law and surpassed all sovereigns in benevolences to her subjects (Diodorus, 1.22). These titles held an appeal for the Greek population, however, as well as the Egyptian. The Greek personification of Justice, Dike, is the daughter of Zeus; Athena carries the small winged figure of Nike, Victory, in her hand (Burkert, 1990, 185). Ptolemy VI had earlier taken the epithet of Dikaiosyne (P. Grenf. 2.15, P. Adler I) and so, through her new titles of Philometor and Dikaiosyne, Kleopatra III could also be seen to honour both her father and her mother, as a dutiful daughter should, thereby setting an example of filial piety to her sons. The widespread acceptance of Kleopatra III's identification with Isis is maintained by Otto and Bengston (1938, 1-22) through their painstaking restoration of an inscription of 110/9 from Koptos as a dedication to Kleopatra III as that goddess.

The acquisition by Kleopatra III early in her reign with Soter of three priestesses and a series of new titles has not gone unremarked by modern historians. Otto and Bengston (1938, 153) find the wholesale creation of the priestesses, immediately after the death of Kleopatra II, to be an outrageous and ruthless innovation and to indicate, perhaps even more than the new titles, the boundless rule of *der ehrgeizigen Frau* with her mania to surpass all of her predecessors and by that to manipulate her own image. Bouché-Leclercq (1978, 3.56) finds her *insatiable d'honneurs* Welles (1940, 280) sees in the adoption of these titles merely the stealing and appropriation of her mother's past honours. Nock (1942, 217-9) rather more perceptively, however, sees in this "accumulation of epithets to the point of resembling a hymn" and this new hierarchy of annual priesthoods a device to use the desire for distinction as a reinforcement of loyalty comparable with the provincial priesthoods and the municipal sevirate of the Roman Empire.

Further notable recognition of Kleopatra III appears during the co-rulership with Soter in the occasional appearance of a reference to her in the prescripts quite alone as the Goddess Philometor *before* her listing with her son in the Gods Philometor Soter. During her reign with Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II, Kleopatra III had appeared alone in the prescripts as the Goddess Euergetes (e.g. P. Amh. 2.44 of 138/7). At the end of her reign with Soter the same distinction appears, as in P. Pestman Recueil 2.4, 5 and 6 of 109/108, of which the editors (45, n.c) remark that Kleopatra III is, in effect, the first woman to receive this honour. The prestige which this illustrates is, like so many of Kleopatra III's honours, unprecedented for a Ptolemaic queen.

The capacity for the protocols to reflect the political realities of their time is further illustrated in the exclusion of Kleopatra II from the listings after her death. The removal of Kleopatra II from the protocols seems at first to be at variance with Kleopatra III's adoption of the epithet Philometor. This apparent anomaly underlines, however, not only the strength of Kleopatra III's desire to impose the name upon her son but also her wish to link herself with her father, who was first to hold this title in recognition of Kleopatra I, her grandmother. At the same time, in adopting the name held briefly by her mother during the time of civil war, Kleopatra III succeeded in further blurring the recollection and recognition of that Queen Kleopatra Philometor Soteira, who is no longer distinctively Kleopatra II but instead is now absorbed into the titulature of her daughter, a circumstance which caused historians some confusion for a considerable time after the deaths of both women. To adopt this title Kleopatra III resigned her previous recognition as one of the Gods Euergetai, leaving Ptolemy VIII as the sole incumbent of this designation. For Kleopatra III to have continued to be recognised in the plural of this title with her husband could have led to a confusion in which her mother may have been thought still to have been honoured as one of the beneficent gods; by renouncing this name Kleopatra III

made its singular construction in the prescripts clearly applicable only to Ptolemy VIII and not to his first wife.

This complete and unequivocal removal of Kleopatra II from the prescripts did no begin immediately upon her death, P. Cair. dem. 30.602/3 of 116/5 show Ptolemy VI alone as the God Philometor but the plural Gods Euergetai are listed for Ptolemy VIII, which could include both of his wives. After 115, however, numerous papyri list both of the husbands of Kleopatra II, Ptolemies VI and VIII, alone, leaving no room thereby for the assumption that Kleopatra II is any longer included with either of them in the Alexander cult.⁴ The consistency of this is very remarkable; in Ptolemaic history there are few occurrences which have such plentiful evidence as the eradication of the memory of Kleopatra II. In an era for which the precarious evidence of one or two prescripts must often be called upon to obtain any detailed reconstruction of events the evidence of the wish of Kleopatra III to eliminate the name of Kleopatra II is far too abundant to be denied. This circumstance illumines the hostility of Kleopatra III towards the mother who had tried to usurp her proper place as queen consort and who had doggedly clung to a power no longer rightfully hers even after the marriage of her daughter to the mother's erstwhile husband. In proscribing the recognition of Kleopatra II in contemporary documents her memory was virtually obliterated; without the appearance of her name before the people in daily exchange her existence was no longer recognised other than in the recollection of her personal adherents.

That this *damnatio memoriae* was carried out so completely must have required a considerable bureaucratic exercise to ensure scribal awareness and compliance. It illustrates very well the efficiency of the court in disseminating throughout the countryside its preferred version of affairs and contradicts the view that the prescripts of the papyri are too prone to human error to be a generally reliable source. The accurate reflection by the prescripts of the political

situation at Alexandria can also be seen during the reign of Kleopatra III in their frequent inclusion of Neos Philopator as a member of the Alexander cult. This was the brother to whom Kleopatra III would, in the normal course of events, have been married, and with whom, as the rightful heir to the throne of Ptolemy VI, she would have reigned as unchallenged queen had not Ptolemy VIII returned to Egypt, killed Neos Philopator and married Kleopatra II.⁵ From 116/5 through to 108 Neos Philopator is consistently reinstated in his rightful place within the cult in contrast to the years of Ptolemy VIII's reign when his name was not allowed to appear, a continuing inclusion which implies his warm recollection by Kleopatra III. Eupator, the elder of the brothers of Kleopatra III, whose death around 150 (Peremans and Van 't Dack, no.14549) had left Neos Philopator as the only remaining son and heir of Ptolemy VI and Kleopatra II, does appear in the earlier as well as the later prescripts of the period, unlike his murdered brother.⁶ This, however, is understandable as by his early demise Eupator had successfully avoided arousing the hostility of Ptolemy VIII, perhaps the only reliable method for an heir apparent to accomplish this.

The Outcome of the First Joint Rule.

By the time of Soter's banishment in 107, therefore, Kleopatra III had succeeded in maintaining the supremacy of her rule over the kingdom she had inherited, despite the multifarious problems inherited with it. She had done this by an adroit combination of military strategy and political/religious initiatives designed to elevate and maintain her status over that of her son. That she had succeeded so far despite the handicap of her sex and, in her unmarried state, without the presence of a significant male ally, is a remarkable achievement but it must be admitted, however, that the power of Egypt had by now declined greatly from the days of the first Ptolemies and that it came no closer to regaining its former glories during this reign. Nevertheless, in the reign of her father Livy (46.21) has described both Ptolemy VI of Egypt and Demetrius of Syria in Rome at the same

time to beg the Roman Senate for the restoration of their kingdoms. Whether, faced with the looming presence of this new and overwhelming power any Ptolemy, however great a genius, could have made Egypt truly strong again, must be open to doubt; under Kleopatra III it at least remained free and she herself was forced to no such humiliating embassies.

CHAPTER 5 - QUEEN REGNANT. PART 2

After Soter's defeat and withdrawal to Cyprus Justin (39.4) says that Kleopatra III sent messengers to Alexander to recall him to the country. Porphyry (F.G.H. 3.721) also says that Kleopatra III sent for Alexander from Pelusium and proclaimed him sovereign together with herself. It is apparent from this that Kleopatra III made no attempt to reign alone after ridding herself of Soter but voluntarily restored Alexander as her co-ruler.

The first date for the reign of Kleopatra III and Ptolemy X, Alexander II, is found in P. L. Bat.22.18=P.Rein Gr. I.22 of 30th October/2nd November, 107 from Akôrios. Allowing time for the news to reach the countryside it could well be that Soter was actually removed from the throne before the beginning of the eleventh year, that is by 19th September, 107 (cf. Porphyry, F.G.H. 260.2 (8) and Samuel, 1962, 151). With the accession of Alexander the system of double dating sometimes used in the co-rulership with Soter (P.L. Bat 19, 22) was consistently applied. Dating by the regnal years of both sovereigns the first year of the joint reign was, therefore, recorded as the eleventh of Kleopatra and the eighth of Alexander, who counted his regnal years from the beginning of his control of Cyprus in 114/3 (Porphyry, F.H.G. 260, 2.8 and cf. Samuel, 1962, 151). As King of Cyprus silver coins of Alexander from various mints for the years 114/3 to 106 are similar to those of Soter, showing on the obverse the head of Ptolemy I, diademed and wearing the aegis, with, on the reverse, the words ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ, the eagle and thunderbolt, sceptre or palm-branch (Poole, 1963, 110-111, nos. 1-16, pl. 27.5-11). Alexander thus clearly stated his concept of dynastic continuity strengthening his own position and his view of himself as a complete Ptolemaic king in Cyprus with all those traditional attributes of Ptolemaic kings which were commonly depicted in the coinage. Although denied the rule of Egypt for some

years, Alexander's perception of his sovereignty as worthy of record from the beginning of his rule in Cyprus and not merely from his return to Egypt indicates a self-confidence and assertiveness likely to prove troublesome in a co-ruler. Alexander's silver coinage in Egypt for the joint reign continued the style of the Cypriot coinage, with no reference to Kleopatra III other than in showing the dates of both sovereigns (Poole, 1963, 112, nos. 18-28, pl. 28.1-2); no copper coins are extant to compare with their recognition of Kleopatra III in the reigns of Soter and Ptolemy VIII. Silver coins minted in Alexandria after the death of Kleopatra III give the dates only of Alexander while continuing the Cypriot style (Poole, 1963, 113, nos. 29-48, pl. 28.3-5).

Clearly, then, Alexander was able to maintain a supremacy over Kleopatra III in the coinage of the reign at least equal to that of Soter. It must be noted, however, that if the copper coins did recognise the queen then, despite their lesser value, their wider distribution would have afforded her an advantage. In evaluating the importance of her absence from the gold and silver coinage not only the accidents of survival, but the question of distribution must be considered; copper coins handled by most of the population may be a more valuable propaganda source than silver and gold handled only by the wealthy. Nevertheless it cannot be denied that Kleopatra III's appearance in what is known of the coinage of both joint reigns is not extensive. It may be that her preferred method of impinging her status upon the consciousness of the people was so firmly directed to the prescripts of everyday documents, which could accommodate her numerous titles and give a widespread and detailed awareness of her many honours, that she was willing to allow her sons preference in the coinage. Alternatively the accidents of survival may account for the appearance of the coinage, a deliberate policy of removing coins bearing her name being difficult to implement.

The insistence of Kleopatra III on dominating the prescripts of the papyri is as clear in her reign with Alexander as it had been with Soter. As King of Cyprus

Alexander was honoured as King Ptolemy, the God Alexander (O.G.I. 181 and cf. Mitford, 1959, 120). In having been so fortuitously given the name of Alexander as well as that of Ptolemy he outshone his older brother, who bore the name only of the dynasty's founder; in becoming the God Alexander he identified with the conqueror of the known world so revered by the Ptolemies through their principal and most personal cult. Also in Cyprus Alexander had maintained himself in considerable state, complete with courtiers and chancellery (Mitford, 1959, 120 and 122), and in his insistence on numbering his regnal years from 114/3 was clearly resolved that this kingship would not be overlooked, indicating a determination on his return to Egypt not to be relegated to an inferior position by his mother. His success in this, though greater than that of his brother, was, nevertheless, incomplete.

The Alexander Cult in the Joint Reign of Kleopatra III and Ptolemy X, Alexander I.

In the diverse nomenclature of the new reign Alexander was more able than his brother had been to maintain a specific recognition of his own identity, again due to his good fortune in having been called Alexander. The restored prescript of P. Brussels E7155 = P. Ashm. Gr. 49 of 107/6 (see Appendices F and G), a private agreement on the provisions of a will made shortly after Alexander's return to Egypt, addresses the rulers as Βασιλευόντων Κλεοπάτρας Θεᾶς Εὐεργέτιδος καὶ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Ἀλεξάνδρου Θεῶν Φιλομητέρων ἔτους ἑνδεκάτου τοῦ καὶ ῥυδίου. As a safe length of time has elapsed since the death of her mother Kleopatra III has returned to her earlier title of Euergetis, now hers alone, but still shares the title of Philometores with her son. She thus continues the "mother-loving" aspect which she held with Soter, retains the premier position in the appearance of her name before that of her son and increases her recognition by again appearing as "Benefactor". Alexander, perhaps, like Soter, under compulsion, appears as "mother-loving" and is placed after his mother; he

nevertheless maintains a stronger recognition than had Soter, who appeared simply as one of the Gods Philometores Soteris with no identification beyond that of the usual "King Ptolemy". Alexander is, indeed, the first in the long line of Ptolemies to be identified in the prescripts by a name other than "King Ptolemy". The individual recognition thus accorded him does not, however, outweigh his mother's supremacy in holding two cult titles and the first place and it may well be, indeed, that this specific recognition of Alexander was intended rather to make it clear that a new reign had begun than to grant him increased status.

The combinations of titles written for Kleopatra III and Alexander vary widely, however. P.Grenf. 2.23(a) of 107 calls them collectively the Gods Philometores; in the demotic papyri P.Cair. dem. 31079 and 31254, both of 106/5, initially call the queen alone the Goddess Euergetis and Alexander alone the God Philometor, not until later in the text is she also called the Goddess Philometor. Despite these variations, however, there is the unchanging appearance of the queen's name in first place, usually qualified by two honorifics, with Alexander's name in second place, bearing the title of Philometor and singled out as Ptolemy Alexander. No new cult titles are devised for the pair, once again continuity and tradition are upheld by the adoption of the titles of earlier rulers.

As in the joint reign with Soter, so during the reign with Alexander there are instances of Kleopatra III appearing in splendid isolation from her co-ruler, for example in the special mention of her alone as the Goddess Philometor in line 4 of P. Ashm. Gr. 49 = P. Brussels E7155 of 107/6.

A characteristic of the papyri of both joint reigns is the use of βασιλευόντων, the present active masculine plural participle, genitive of time, of βασιλεύω, to denote the double rule. This is seen, for example in P.Adler G5 of 108 for the reign with Soter and in P. Brussels E7155 of 107/6 for the reign with Alexander. This rare formula, the function of which as a title is not accurately known

(Koenen, 1970, 72), is usually translated "In the (joint) reigning of". The expression stands alone and is not grammatically connected to the rest of the sentence, forming a commanding prelude to what follows. Its use has clearly been introduced to distinguish the rule of Kleopatra with each of her sons from earlier reigns, in which the queen of the time participated only as a consort and not as queen regnant.

During the co-rulership with Alexander it is also notable that Ptolemy IX, Soter II is swiftly excluded from the prescripts and, therefore, from recognition as a god in the Alexander Cult. The Greek papyrus, P. Brussels E7155 of 107/6, written very shortly after Alexander's return to Egypt, gives no listing for Soter; it is now Kleopatra III and Alexander who appear as the Gods Philometores. In the demotic papyri Soter is similarly excluded very early in the new joint reign, as in P.Cair.dem 31.079 and 31.254 of 106/5. Kleopatra III's use of the Alexander Cult as a weapon for banishing the memory of members of the dynasty by excluding them from deification with their ancestors was very quickly employed against her elder son.

P. Brussels E7155=P. Ashm. Gr. 49 of 107/6, the same papyrus which gives evidence of the cult titles chosen for the new ruling pair and of the removal of Soter from the list of deified Ptolemies at the start of the new reign, also testifies to a new and startling innovation in Kleopatra III's personal cult. At this time Kleopatra III significantly elevated her own status by introducing into the Alexander Cult the worship of Βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρας Θεᾶς Ἀφροδίτης, served by a second male priest, Helenos, son of either Apollonios or Apollodoros who holds office as priest of Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Aphrodite.¹ The new priest, receives marked recognition in being described as, "by the friendship of the father of the King, strategos and high priest of the island, nauarch and secretary of the naval forces of the realm, priest of Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Aphrodite, also called Philometor". The recognition accorded Helenos in the

recitation of his titles within the prescript of the papyrus is unprecedented; in emphasising the importance of Helenos in this fashion the intention is clearly to emphasise the importance of the new office which he holds as the priest of the queen. As Mitford suggests (1959, 124f.) the listing of both the insular and imperial offices of this newly appointed priest implies that at this time Cyprus was reunited with Egypt, with Helenos' authority as governor of the island increased. Mitford associates P. Brussels E7155 with his inscription no. 9 (= Arch. f. Pap.13.38 of uncertain date). The inscription comes from the pedestal of a statue to Ἑλενον τὸν συγγενῇ καὶ τροφέα τοῦ Βασιλέως καὶ στρατηγὸν καὶ ναύαρχον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς νήσου καὶ ἱερέα διὰ Βίου Βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρας Θεᾶς Ἀφροδίτης Εὐεργετίδος. The Helenos of the statue had been tutor to Alexander and the two were apparently close friends (cf. Mitford, 1959, 99 (5) and Koenen, 1970, 83 and nn. 41 and 42). The combination of P. Brussels E7155's implication of the reunification of Egypt and Cyprus and Arch. f. Pap.13.38's inclusion of Kleopatra III as Aphrodite has ramifications of a very political nature. Aphrodite's long association with Cyprus, the island where she stepped ashore from the foam which bore her over the sea and where her principal sanctuary at Paphos is regarded as the centre and origin of her cult and dates from the twelfth century, her aspect as Aphrodite Pandemos, which, in embracing the whole people links up with the eastern tradition of Ishtar's all-embracing political power, and her worship in several places by bodies of magistrates (Burkert, 1990, 52, 153-155 and nn. 35 and 6) together supply a profoundly political motive for Kleopatra III's worship as the goddess in that island. The extension of that worship to Egypt in the inauguration of the priesthood to the queen as Aphrodite held by Helenos is a logical progression from the Cypriot cult to the queen at this time of reunification. In addition, if Mitford's conclusion that the Helenos of the statue is the same as that of the papyrus is correct it shows that in inaugurating this priesthood in Alexandria and in appointing Helenos as Aphrodite priest in that city Kleopatra III at once elevated herself in appearing as the goddess outside of

Cyprus and made a conciliatory gesture to her son, to whom Helenos' presence in Alexandria as priest to the queen was no doubt pleasing.

With this appointment Kleopatra III is again served by a male priest and now by one whose illustrious rank and lineage is set out in detail. Again she appears directly as a goddess and is now the Greek goddess Aphrodite in addition to her incarnation as the Egyptian goddess Isis, whose priesthood of the Hieros Polos of Isis, the Great One is held in this same papyrus by Demetrios, son of Timodoros. As well as these two male priests the papyrus records that Kleopatra III is also served by the three priestesses, Thaubarion, daughter of Apollonios as chief priestess of Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis, Dionysarion, daughter of Heracleides as stephanophoros of Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis and Kleopatra, daughter of Kallikles as phosphoros of Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis also called Philometor.

The Greek papyri are not alone in listing extraordinary honours for Kleopatra III at the start of the new reign. P.Cair. dem. 31.079 and 31.254, both of 106/5, give the demotic version as, for Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis, a male priest of Queen Kleopatra Hathor the Goddess Philometor, a priestess of Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis Philometor, a priest of the Hieros Polos of Isis, Great Mother of the Gods, and a stephanophoros of Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis Philometor, Queen of Law, Queen of Victory, a title which is given twice in 31.254. Further offices are lost as the papyri are incomplete.

The prescript of P.Brussels E7155=P.Ashm.Gr.49 written at the very beginning of the joint rule of Kleopatra III and Ptolemy X, Alexander II acts as a proclamation of the new order. The detailed recounting of the honours already held by the queen and the addition of a new and most significant priesthood in her honour serve as a public notice of her eminence, of the banishment of Soter and of the installation of Alexander as co-ruler. The expulsion of Soter and her triumphant replacement

of him with Alexander, her original choice, was such an important event that it necessitated swift and proper recognition by some extraordinary pronouncement. To celebrate the new reign by inaugurating a priesthood for her own worship as the Goddess Aphrodite was a fitting reflection of the heights of personal power which Kleopatra III had now reached. In appearing as Aphrodite/Hathor the queen takes as daring a step as she had when during the civil war with her mother she identified herself with Isis and with Kybele as the Great Mother of the Gods.

This priesthood cannot be viewed simply in terms of a mania for self-aggrandisement, the prescript of this papyrus announces her triumph over one son and defines her status vis-a-vis that of the other. This information is conveyed not only to the people of Egypt and to the contemporary world but to Alexander as well; as her chosen co-ruler it was more necessary to acquaint him with her view of his position relative to her own than had been the case with Soter, who could not have failed to be aware of her feelings on the subject. In choosing the Alexander Cult as the means for establishing her precedence within the royal house and disseminating the official view to the outside world Otto and Bengtson (1938, 185) have commented that in the thesis of ruler cult as the greatest institution of royal propaganda for both religious and political purposes the concept of the prescripts as an instrument of this institution finds *glänzende Bestätigung* in the prescripts of 107/6.

The appointment of Helenos as her priest is of further interest. The inscription from Cyprus (Arch. f. Pap. 13.38) calls Helenos priest $\delta\alpha\ \beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, but this phrase, although also restored to the papyrus by the editors of P. Brussels E7155, is not accepted by the editor of P.Ash Gr. 49 The restoration is also doubted by Otto and Bengtson (1938, 157, n.3) on the ground that an eponymous priesthood for life is a contradiction in terms, but it is, however, accepted by Koenen (1970, 73, n.15) on the ground that P. Colon inv. nr. 5063= P.Köln. 2.81 of 105/4 refers in lines 9

and 11 to Theodoros as *ιερέως διὰ βίου*. Koenen's papyrus, however, postdates P. Brussels E7155=P.Ashm. Gr. 49 by two years and what was done in 105/4 does not necessarily apply to 107/6. As well, Theodoros in 105/4 is not priest of Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Aphrodite and Philometor but of Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis and Philometor Dikaiosyne Nikephoros, the identification with Aphrodite no longer obtains. A particularly long lacuna at the start of line 5 of P. Brussels E7155 has led to the controversy, but as P.Ashm Gr. 49 contains newly found fragments to the Brussels papyrus the version of this line which it offers and which excludes the possibility of the phrase *διὰ βίου* is probably the more correct.

While removing the lifelong nature of Helenos' appointment as the priest of Queen Kleopatra Aphrodite, however, the restoration adds another complication. The editor assumes that the Gods Philometores of the restored line 5 are Alexander and his wife (Berenike or a predecessor) as Kleopatra III is already shown alone in line 4 as the Goddess Philometor. However in P. Pestman Recueil 2.4=P.Brooklyn 37.1802 of 14th February, 108, at a time when Kleopatra III still reigned with Soter, she is shown alone in line 5 as the Goddess Philometor and then again in the same line together with Soter as the Gods Philometores Soteres. P. Brussels E7155=P.Ashm Gr. 49 belongs to a period of dynastic vicissitude at the very outset of a new reign. The title of the Goddess Euergetis had been resumed by Kleopatra III while Alexander, no doubt at his mother's urging and in order to present an appearance of stability in the new regime, retains his brother's title of Philometor, sharing this with his mother but without the second epithet, Soteres, peculiar to Ptolemy IX. The new reign with Alexander is clearly announced to the world in line 1 of the Brussels papyrus with its opening statement of *Βασιλευόντων Κλεοπάτρας Θεᾶς Εὐεργέτιδος καὶ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Ἀλεξάνδρου Θεῶν Φιλομητέρων ἔτους ἑνδεκάτου τοῦ καὶ ὀγδόου*, a statement which grants the queen two titles, gives Alexander's individual name,

the double date and the retention of the old title Philometores for the ruling pair. It is surely intended that this title should again refer to Kleopatra III and Alexander when repeated in line 5; it must be borne in mind that no mention of Soter is to be found in this papyrus. The likelihood of Kleopatra III permitting the inclusion of Alexander's wife under a title which she herself had adopted and was to retain for her own use for some ten years seems small indeed. Similarly the contention (P. Ashm. Gr.144, nn. A2-5 and 145), in support of the claim that the Gods Philometores of the restored line 5 are Alexander and Berenike, that in P. Vatican 22 of 16th January, 108, the Gods Philometores Soteres which are mentioned therein are Ptolemy Soter and his wife seems equally unlikely. This should also be taken as a second mention of Kleopatra III following her listing alone as the Goddess Philometor. In this way she dominated the prescripts of both joint reigns, not only in invariably preceding her sons in the opening lines but in the number of her inclusions in the later text. Shown first alone and then as part of the ruling duo she clearly became more equal than her co-ruler. P. Pestman Recueil (45c) remarks of papyrus 2.4 line 5 *// est frappant qu'une reine est mentionnée seule à cet endroit du protocole; Cléopâtre III est, en effet, la première femme à qui revient cet honneur. Dans ce même ordre d'idées, on remarque que, vers la fin de l'époque ptolémaïque, la reine occupe une position de plus en plus importante.*

The early association of Kleopatra III with Aphrodite can be seen in an inscription from Cyprus, O.G.I.S. 159=I.G.P.129, dated to before 131, which concerns Artemo, the daughter of Seleukos as priestess of Aphrodite of Paphia and the goddess Kleopatra. This implies a cult of Kleopatra III in that island probably at the time of the civil war when she fled there with her husband (Livy 59), a cult which continued for some time on the evidence of Mitford's (1959, 102) inscription no. 9 = Arch. f. Pap.13.38 of uncertain date but to Helenos as Governor of Cyprus, Tutor to the King and priest for life of Queen Kleopatra the

Goddess Aphrodite Euergetis. Further inscriptions from Cyprus, I.G.P. 119-121, are in honour of Aphrodite Paphia, but may belong to the reign of either the first or the second Euergetes. At Philae Kleopatra III and Ptolemy VIII, together as the Gods Euergetes, dedicated a temple to Hathor, who, in the inscription, is equated with Aphrodite (I.G.P. 103a=O.G.I.S. 142). Ptolemaic recognition of Aphrodite-Hathor is seen also in the dedication by Ptolemy IV of a temple to Hathor at Cusae, where she was equated by the Greeks with Aphrodite Ourania (S.E.G. 16.860). The worship of Aphrodite in Egypt in the time of the triple reign of Kleopatra II, Kleopatra III and Ptolemy VIII is seen in such papyri as P.L.Bat. 19.4 of 29th June, 126, a will from Pathyris which is witnessed by the local priest of Aphrodite (the Greek name for Hathor of Djeme).

In the duality of this new priesthood of the queen as the Goddess Aphrodite with the earlier priesthood of the queen as the Goddess Isis, Kleopatra III now assumed the identification of both the Greek and the Egyptian goddesses, a deity, therefore, fit for worship by the principal racial groups in Egypt. As Isis she appeared with the qualities attributed to that goddess as model wife and mother and teacher of the domestic arts, the role model of traditional womanhood imbued with the virtues of benevolence, tenderness, love, loyalty, sorrow and compassion. The identification of Isis with Hathor which was signified in her headdress featuring the cow horns of Hathor, in her appearance as a cow and at sites such as Dendera where Isis had her own sanctuary in the temple of Hathor, united the sexes in love and brought the perpetuation of life. In this identification Isis herself embodied the creative principle and governed the reproductive process; Isis featured as the goddess of love in Pyramid texts, funerary papyri and stelae (Michailides, 1956,206/7). In Isis-Hathor the Greeks, therefore, saw Aphrodite, and cults of Isis-Aphrodite existed at Alexandria, Delos and in Egyptian villages. (Heyob, 1975,44-50 and nn. 51-55 and Dunand, 1973, 84). As Aphrodite is Hathor this identification is the origin of Isis as the goddess of

love and joy, the protectress of women, an Isis who has evolved into the goddess of heaven, earth, water and love and whose kindness and tenderness is always evident (Michallides, 1956, 212). Figurines of Isis-Aphrodite have come from diverse regions of Egypt, some with Hellenistic style clothing, some in Egyptian style (Dunand, 1973, 81 and n.2 and 82). The priesthood of Kleopatra III as Aphrodite in the Greek prescripts and Hathor in the demotic prescripts now gave her the attributes of Aphrodite-Isis-Hathor. The identification of Isis and Demeter Thesmophoros, the goddess who brought civilisation to the Greeks with the knowledge of sowing and reaping and the introduction of law and marriage was clear to Herodotus (2.59, 156, 171). The association of a female ministrant to Demeter in Messenia and Laconia who was known as "The Foal" makes Kleopatra III's identification with both goddesses closer through her priesthood of the Sacred Foal of Isis, Great Mother of the Gods, which also encompasses Kybele in the use of her title Great Mother (I.G. 5.I.594 and cf. Otto and Bengston, 1938, 89 n.1) In the legend of Aphrodite and Anchises that goddess assumes traits of Kybele (Burkert, 1990, 154 and cf. 178). In the Greek identification of Isis-Aphrodite-Demeter (Dunand, 1973, 80) the recognition of Kleopatra III came through her two priesthoods, with the queen now the emblem of the virtues of five goddesses, Isis, Kybele, Demeter, Aphrodite and Hathor, representing all conceivable traditionally feminine virtues, aspects and gifts of love, beauty, joy, wifehood, motherhood, craft, creativity, cultivation, procreation, renewal, keeper of the law and justice, protectress of women and even goddess of the sea. In the institution of the phosphoros of Kleopatra III there is, as well, an indication of the queen's possible identification with Artemis, with whom Alexander, Ptolemy I and Ptolemy IV also identified (Tondriau, 1948c, 27, no.2 and 1948e, 41 and 2). Added to this the full title of the priesthood of Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Aphrodite and Philometor reveres her as a supreme example of filial piety. Although Nock (1942, 219, n.11) suggests that in this title she is called Aphrodite on one plane and Philometor on another, the close conjunction of the epithets

tends rather to infer that they are to be taken jointly to define the special attributes of the queen as at once divine and human. Fraser's comment (1972, I.240) that as Aphrodite Philometor the identification with the goddess is less complete than that with Isis in the priesthood of the Hieros Polos as the title Philometor preserves a human element, does not really take account of Kleopatra III's desire fully to display the virtues of both goddess and woman, thereby representing herself as a unique being, unprecedentedly divine but still human.

At the same time at which Kleopatra III acquired her priest of Kleopatra Aphrodite her son Alexander took over the important post of the priest of Alexander, becoming in this, as had his brother Soter, the priest of Alexander, of all the deified Ptolemies whose remembrance was allowed within the cult and also of his mother and himself. In the same Greek prescript which introduces the Aphrodite priest Alexander is introduced as Alexander priest in 107/6. He held this post again in 106/5 (P.L.Bat 22.19 and 20=P.Rein Gr. 1. 23 and 24) and for at least part of 105 (P.L. Bat. 22.19 and 20 of 9th and 10th January, 105).

In 106/5 the titles of the royal pair underwent further modification. The prescript of P.L. Bat.22.19, dated 9th January, 105, reads "In the reign of Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Philometor Soteira and King Ptolemy called Alexander, the God Philometor". One day later, on 10th January, 105, P.L. Bat.22.20 reads "In the reign of Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis and Philometor Soteira and Ptolemy called Alexander, her son, the God Philometor Soter". Both of these papyri elaborate on the prescript of P. Brussels E7155, of 107/6, where the pair are initially called more simply Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis and Ptolemy called Alexander, the God Philometor. In 106/5 the epithet "Soter" is again revived, as it had been for Kleopatra III in 116/5 during the reign with Soter, this time at first only for the queen but very soon after for Alexander as well. While the possibility of confusion on the part of the scribes must always be considered, nevertheless, given the extraordinary accuracy which can so often be seen in the prescripts'

reflection of the political exigencies of the period, the distinct possibility of an escalating battle between mother and son being reflected in the honorifics acquired by each of them cannot be overlooked. The mention of the two as the Gods Philometor Soter continues, as in P.Adler G.7 of July 104, but is not consistent. Kleopatra III alternates in this reign as the Goddess Euergetis or the Goddess Philometor or the Goddess Philometor Soteira or the Goddess Euergetis and Philometor or the Goddess Euergetis and Philometor Soteira. Alexander appears in 107 simply as "Ptolemy, her son, called Alexander" (P.L. Bat.22.18= P.Rein Gr.22) but progresses over time to "King Ptolemy called Alexander ", usually qualified by the addition of the God Philometor or the God Philometor Soter. An unusual demotic prescript, P.L. Bat.22 dem.6 = P.Rein dem.6 of 13th October, 106, calls the two "Queen Kleopatra and King Ptolemy able to live eternally", with no further qualification.

A further notable alteration in the usual form of the prescripts can occasionally be seen during the reign with Alexander. Although the full listing of the deified Ptolemies and their priests and priestesses still occurs, as in P.Brussels E 7155, there is at times the substitution for this of phrases such as τῶν κοινῶν τῶν ὄντων ἐν' Αλεξανδρείαι. This occurs at the time of Alexander's recall and is seen in papyri such as P.L. Bat.22.18=P. gr.Rein. I.22 of 30th October/2nd November, 107; as the editors (225, n.2) note the word κοινῶν poses both the problems of its case, whether it is genitive of οἱ κοινοί or of τὰ κοινά and who or what is "common"? Their conclusion, however, that this refers to the names and titles of the eponymous priests seems unarguable and in this instance the collective mention of the clergy is no doubt due to the absence of an appointee to the Alexander priesthood between Soter's flight and Alexander's return. However in P.Tebt. I.166, dated to 107-101 but probably around 106/5 as Alexander is called Philometor Soter and is named as the Alexander priest, the expression used is τῶν ἄλλων κοινῶν τῶν γραφομένων ἐν' Αλεξανδρείαι. In P.L. Bat.22.19 and 20= P.

gr.Rein. 1.23 and 24 of 9th and 10th January, 105 Alexander is also named as the Alexander priest but after the listing of the deified Ptolemies the phrase τῶν ὄντων καὶ οὐσῶν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείαι is used (cf. P.L. Bat.22, p.235, n.8). Such papyri, giving the name of Alexander as Alexander priest but giving no mention of the honours of Kleopatra III, are rare but possibly significant. Catch-all phrases obviously overcome the tediousness of repeatedly listing the multifarious priesthoods of the queen. They may also reflect a situation where Alexander's hostility to his mother provoked a policy of neither recognising nor ignoring her honours but simply of circumventing them by means of a euphemism, a policy to which the queen may have reacted by making her most revolutionary inroad into the Alexander Cult ; in the year 105/4 she herself became the Alexander priest.

Kleopatra III - Queen, Goddess and Priest.

It is hard to overestimate the sensational nature of Kleopatra III's action in assuming the office of Alexander priest when the importance and hitherto exclusively masculine occupancy of the priesthood are considered. The first known "Alexander" priest was Menelaos, the brother of Ptolemy I (P. Eleph. 2) of whom, however, the papyrus states only ἐφ' ἱερέως Μενελάου τοῦ Λαάγου not that he was priest of Alexander; the earliest papyrus to state a priesthood "of" Alexander is P.Petrie III. 52 b, dated ca. 267/6 which gives ἐφ' ἱερέως Πτολεπίδου τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου. Menelaos held office for four years as the priesthood was not, at that time, eponymous; by 284, however the name of the priest was used for dating purposes in Greek and demotic legal documents, along with the regnal year, throughout Egypt.² This honour was given in the Greek republics only to heads of State and was, it has been observed (Bouché-Leclercq, 1978, 3.42/3), envied of their consuls by the Roman emperors. In Alexandria the priest may have served a dual function as exegete of the city, who, as head of the municipality, was responsible among other tasks for the administration of the royal domain, the production of oil, and the interpretation of the statutes. As priest

he ratified the liturgy and monitored the sacred rites and the introduction of the royal couples into the Alexander Cult, he may also have been priest-president of the *μουσείον*; for his services he received a talent from the treasury. The insignia of the office was apparently a golden crown and purple robe, the priest was exempt from duties to the State which involved payment and his family may have been ennobled. Some element of heredity may have influenced the selection for office together with the preference of the sovereign for the occupant of "*ce poste, enviable*" (Cerfaux and Tondriau, 1957, 191/2, Pseudo-Callisthenes 3.58 and cf. Bouché-Leclercq, 1978, 3.161 and 2), but although the first priest Menelaos, was the brother of the king, the position was not invariably given to relations but often to senior court officials (Fraser, 1972, 1.222/3).

In ruling Egypt the Ptolemies were faced with an attitude to divinity new to them, where the Greeks approached their gods as friends visiting friends the Egyptians instead approached their gods as subjects; consequently the role of the priest became more important as an intermediary, a conductor of rites, only through whom could offerings be accepted. This Egyptian attitude is seen in the importance attached by the Ptolemies to the priesthood of the dynastic cult.³ When the members of the dynasty themselves took over the role of Alexander priest, first as crown prince with Eupator in 158/7 (P.B.M. Eg. 10561 and cf. P.L. Bat. 24.133) and Soter in 135/4 (P.Tebt. 3.810 and cf. P.L. Bat. 24.156) its importance to the dynasty was emphasised. This emphasis further increased with Soter's assumption of the priesthood as King Ptolemy IX in 116/5 (P.Cair. dem. 30.602 and 30.603 and cf. P.L. Bat. 24.175) although the eponymity of the office vanished with Soter's intermittent tenure over some eight years. That the king now held the priesthood echoes the role of the pharaohs who, as sacral kings, also acted as high priest because they filled naturally the place of intercessor between gods and man (Bleeker, 1959, 261).

Priestesses, on the other hand, filled much more lowly roles within the Alexander Cult as they did within the indigenous religion. While there is evidence of Jewish women acting as functional synagogue heads in the Roman and Byzantine period from 27 B.C. to possibly the sixth century A.D. in Egypt, Asia Minor and Palestine (Broton, 1982) the position of priestesses of Isis in Egypt, of whom there were far fewer than priests, differed markedly from this. Although in the later period the priestesses of Isis were known as *hierodia* or *sacerdos*, indicating that they participated in the higher priesthood, there is no known instance of a woman as chief priest in temple; instead there was considerable female involvement in the musical and processional aspects of Isiac ceremonies. (Heyob, 1975, 95-99). Similarly the priestesses of the Ptolemaic queens in the Alexander Cult have titles which indicate a processional function and there is no evidence of their taking part in the ritual at a more elevated level or being fortunate enough to acquire any perquisites similar to those of the Alexander priest. For Kleopatra III to associate herself with an inferior group would have been unthinkable; she did not, therefore, become the priestess but the priest of Alexander and the deified Ptolemies

P.Köln 2.81

The evidence for this is found in P. Köln 2.81 = S.B.10.10763 = P. Colon. inv. nr. 5063 of 105/4. Although the existence of a single, frail fragment of a damaged papyrus seems a precarious basis for establishing the occurrence of a radical event of considerable religious and political importance this textual evidence, though slight, cannot be argued away. The validity of the papyrus, to which attention was drawn by Ludwig Koenen in 1970, is not in doubt and Kleopatra III's priesthood of Alexander is fully accepted (cf. Koenen, 1970, P.Ashm. Vol. I, 144 and P. Pestman Recueil, 45, n.c.). The condition of this papyrus, the recto of a palimpsest cut from a larger sheet taken from a mummy casing, in itself poses a

problem. As only the top and sides of the papyrus remain and the central part of the text is missing the purpose of the document cannot be ascertained and its provenance is also unknown. The original papyrus was obviously much longer but whether it was an official communication from the court or some private document is no longer possible to say. As a palimpsest its origin as an official proclamation might be doubted, unless the earlier inscription, wiped out before its re-use, was a version of this same prescript but one in which the scribe had erred, erased the writing and begun again. The verso was also at one time covered in writing which has now been erased (Koenen, 1970, 68). The rarity of such a complete protocol at this period is emphasised in comparison with more plentiful texts which give only the formulaic ἐφ' ἱερέων καὶ ἱερειῶν (e.g. P. Grenf. 2.23, l. 1, Col. 2, of 107). The fortunate survival of the only other detailed prescript of the period, P.Brussels E7155, has been attributed to its possibly having been preserved in the archives of a bureau of registration as it appears to have some official stamp applied (Préaux, 1938, 151). P. Köln 2.81 survived its use for a mummy casing; its original purpose and provenance remain a mystery.

P. KOLN.2.81 Aktpräskript

Inv. 5063r
105/104 v. Chr.

17,8 × 11 cm

Herkunft unbekannt

* L. Koenen, ZPE 5, 1970, 61–84; SB X 10763.

- 1 Βασιλεόντων Κλεοπάτρα; θεᾶ; Εὐεργέτιδος τῆς καὶ Φιλο-
μή[τ]ορος Δικαιοσύνης Νικηφόρου καὶ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ <καὶ> Ἀλεξάν-
[δρου]
- θεοῦ Φιλομήτορος; ἔτους γ' τοῦ καὶ ι', ἱερατενούσης βασι-
- 4 λίσσης Κλεοπάτρα; θεᾶ; Εὐεργέτιδος; τῆς καὶ Φιλομήτορος;
Δικαιοσύνης Νικηφόρου Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ θεῶν Σωτήρων
καὶ θεῶν Ἀδελφῶν καὶ θεῶν Εὐεργετῶν καὶ θεῶν Φιλοπατόρων
καὶ θεῶν Ἐπιφανῶν καὶ θεοῦ Εὐπάτορος; καὶ θεοῦ Φιλομήτορος;
8 καὶ θε[ο]ῦ Νέου Φιλοπάτορος; καὶ θεοῦ Εὐεργέτου καὶ θεῶν
Φιλομητόρων, ἱερέως διὰ βίου βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρας
θεᾶς Εὐεργέτιδος τῆς καὶ Φιλομήτορος; Δικαιοσύνης
Νικηφόρου Θεοδώρου τοῦ Σελεύκου . . . εἰουσι[. . . .]ν
- 12 καὶ ἔξηγητοῦ, ἱερέως βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρα; θε[ᾶ; Εὐεργ-]
γέτιδος τ[ῆς καὶ] Φ[ιλο]μήτορος Δικαιοσύνης Νικηφ[όρου]
Μνημοσύνης τῆς Νικάνορος, ἱεροῦ πώλ[ου] Ἰσιδ[ος μητροδ-]
θεῶν μεγάλ[ης Δ]ημητρείου τοῦ Θεοδ[ώρου, ἱερέως Ἀρσι-]
16 [νόης Φιλοπάτορος] Ὀλ[υμ]πίδος; [τῆς] Σελεύκ[ου, στεφανηφόρου]
[βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρας] θε[ᾶ; Εὐεργέτιδος; — — —

The prescript of the papyrus opens (ll.1-5) "In the reign of Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis who is also Philometor Dikaiosyne Nikephoros and Ptolemy who is Alexander the God Philometor in the year 13 and 10 **ἱερατευούσης** Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis who is also Philometor Dikaiosyne Nikephoros of Alexander.

The use of the present active feminine singular genitive participle **ἱερατευούσης** is very subtle. The participle is feminine, necessarily so as it refers to Kleopatra III and its alternate usage would be confusing; it does not however call her a priestess, as would **ἱερεία** which is used later in the document for the priestesses of the queen.⁴ The outright use of the directly masculine terminology **ἐφ' ἱερέως** (which, in its use of the masculine singular genitive of time translates as "in the time of the priest" and is commonly used for the priest of Alexander as, for example, in P. Brussels E7155 when referring to Ptolemy Alexander) would obviously be inappropriate when applied to a woman and might well confuse the reader into assuming that someone other than the queen was Alexander priest. This formula has not, however, as it so easily could, been changed to **ἐφ' ἱερείας** or "in the time of the priestess", instead, by the use of the feminine participle of the ambivalent masculine/feminine verb **ἱερατεύω** - **ἱερητεύω** the sentence (ll. 3, 4 and 5) **ἱερατευούσης Βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρας Θεᾶς Εὐεργέτιδος τῆς καὶ Φιλομήτορος Δικαιοσύνης Νικηφόρου Ἀλεξάνδρου** translates to read that the Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis and Philometor Dikaiosyne Nikephoros is "exercising the priesthood" of Alexander; in short that this traditionally male role has been taken by the queen herself. An Alexandrian inscription from the late Ptolemaic period (S.E.G. 2.849, S.B. 6670) uses the same form of expression for a male priest, Dorion, as **ὁ ἱερατεύσας Ἀλεξάνδρῳ** (Koenen, 1970, 75, n.18). In the ambivalence of the terminology Kleopatra III presents herself as a man as far as it is possible to do so within the linguistic structure, while still unequivocally relating the priesthood to herself as a woman.⁵ Although for a woman to take over such

a male office was unheard of there is no suggestion that the role of priest was in any way modified for the queen and the inference is, therefore, that she functioned in exactly the same fashion as did the kings. For Kleopatra III to take this action at this point of her career can only be seen as a political move directed against her son, Alexander, both in elevating herself and in preventing his access to this powerful position

The explicit statement of the papyrus is clear in the deliberate repetition of the full name and titles of Kleopatra III as the priest of Alexander within the first four lines of the papyrus. So emphatic is the statement made that it is clearly intended as a proclamation comparable to that of P. Brussels E7155, which announced to the world the removal of Soter, the co-rulership of Alexander and the worship of Kleopatra III as Aphrodite. The stress placed upon the queen's name and titles in their repetition within the first four lines of P. Köln. 2.81 is especially significant as during Soter's occupancy of the priesthood there occurs the curious and frequent omission of the name of the Alexander priest from the prescripts. Although the name of the priest cannot always be established in the earlier years of the Alexander Cult due to the accidents of survival (P.L. Bat. 24.122-174b for the period 169/8-117/6) this situation differs from that of Soter's reign where, although prescripts attesting to the king's occupancy of the priesthood can be found (P.L. Bat.24.175-182), several others do not give any name for the Alexander priest at all. This peculiarity is very evident in a body of Greek papyri such as P.L. Bat. 22.13-17 which cover the years 112 to 108 and give only ἐφ' ἱερέως τοῦ ὄντος ἐν' Ἀλεξανδρείαι' Ἀλεξάνδρου, a formula seen also in more diverse prescripts such as P. Grenf. I.27 of 109 and P. Adler G.5 of 28th May, 108. Demotic papyri such as P. Pestman Recueil 4 of 14th February, 108 and 5 of 109/8 also omit the name of the Alexander priest, reflecting not only the often doubtful nature of Soter's occupancy but also the identity of his replacement. The irregular nature of Soter's priesthood appears on three occasions during his

tenure when others appeared to have acted as Alexander priest in his place and the suggestion has been made that Soter held the office only nominally and did not effectively function in it (P.L. Bat. 22,p.86, n.b). There is evidence that in 112 the queen replaced him with Artemidoros, son of Sotion (O.G.I.S. 2.739 and cf. P.L. Bat.24.179), but this replacement was short lived and Soter again officiated from 111/110. However, in 109/8 (P.Pestman Recueil 2.6=P. Brooklyn 37.1796) there is mention of an unknown son of Soter perhaps associated with the king and actually fulfilling the obligations of the office (cf. P. Pestman Recueil, p.62, n.c and P.L. Bat.24.182). Again in 108/7 there is some evidence of yet another occupant (P.L. Bat. 24, p.36,H). During the reign with Alexander, however, when Kleopatra III decided that her co-ruler should no longer act as the priest of the dynastic cult she did not replace him with another member of the royal household but instead took the far more daring step of assuming the priesthood herself.

It is not only in the co-rulership of Kleopatra III and Soter that omissions of the name of the Alexander priest occur. In the time of her younger son's priesthood papyri such as P. Grenf. 2.23 of 107 use the phrase ἐφ' ἱερέων καὶ ἱερείων καὶ κανεφόρου τῶν ὄντων καὶ οὐσῶν instead of giving the name of Alexander as Alexander priest. Demotic papyri also employ such phrases in place of a full listing, as in P.L.Bat. 22. dem. 5 and 7=P.dem.Rein. 5 and 7 of 28th/29th September, 106 and October/November, 106, where the prescripts reads simply "in the reign of Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis and Philometor and Ptolemy her son, called Alexander, the God Philometor and under the *n/hb* at Alexandria" (cf. P.L. Bat. 22, p.111, n.c.) In so emphatically announcing her own name with full titlature as the Alexander priest, therefore, Kleopatra III leaves no room for doubt on the question of who holds the post and publicly and explicitly declares that she has now removed her second son from that office, this time in favour of herself.

After announcing Kleopatra III's Alexander priesthood the papyrus goes on (II.5-9) to list those deified Ptolemies still present in the cult. These are the first five Ptolemies and their wives, the Gods Soteres, Adelphoi, Euergetai, Philopatores and Epiphaneis, who are followed by the unmarried God Eupator, Ptolemy VI alone as the God Philometor, the unmarried God Neos Philopator and Ptolemy VIII alone as the God Euergetes with Kleopatra III and Ptolemy X as the Gods Philometores concluding the list. Notable inclusions are the Gods Eupator and Neos Philopator. Notable exclusions are Kleopatra II and Ptolemy IX, Soter II. As both Ptolemy VI and Ptolemy VIII are listed alone as the Gods Philometor and Euergetes respectively, there is no room for the inclusion of Kleopatra II, and there is no mention whatsoever of Ptolemy IX. Neither of these are now, therefore, considered to be gods within the deified dynasty, their existence is officially negated and they are shut out from the deified family and neither remembered by them nor worshipped by their subjects. The inclusion of the Gods Philometores of II.8-9, Kleopatra III and Ptolemy X, Alexander, makes the queen at once a goddess within the cult and her own priest and the priest of her son in a continuity device linking the two with Ptolemy VI and excluding Kleopatra II. The omission of individuals from the protocols has a symbolism somewhat like that of the expunging of a name from the family bible of later centuries, the listing of this protocol perfectly illustrates which family members were acceptable to Kleopatra III as gods at this climactic stage of her career when she herself became their priest. The Alexander Cult protocol has become a weapon of propaganda for making known the honours of Kleopatra III and for dishonouring those who have offended her.

LI.9-11 then announce the name of a new priest serving the queen. The Aphrodite priesthood given to Helenos in 107/6 is no more and Helenos is no longer a member of the cult's clergy. The new priest now serves Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis who is also Philometor Dikaiosyne Nikephoros;

Kleopatra III has returned to her Isis-like attributes of Law-giver and Victory-bringer which were absent from P. Brussels E7155= P.Ashm. Gr. 49 of 107/6 in which she appeared as Aphrodite. The priest to whom this office is given is Theodoros son of Seleukos; Theodoros' priesthood is conferred διὰ βίου (l.9), unlike that of Helenos as Aphrodite priest in P. Ashm. Gr.49. Theodoros had been governor of Cyprus from 124-118, where he was στρατηγός, ναύαρχος and ἀρχιερεύς as his father, Seleukos, had been before him (I.G.P. 126-8, O.G.I.S. 160 and cf. Mitford, 1959, 105 and nn.30 -32 and Koenen, 1970, 79) Theodoros' governorship had preceded that of Helenos which took place ca. 118/7. The lacuna of line 11 probably concerns a title or office held by Theodoros, the suggestion has been made of τοῦ ἀστέιου στρατηγοῦ although this, while paleographically feasible, is unprecedented (P.Köln 2.81, 92, n. to line 11 and cf. Koenen, 1970, 69/70, n.11). Line 12, however, goes on to give Theodoros the title of ἐξηγητής (Koenen, 1970, 80 and n.31), a function which, if usually exercised by the Alexander priest, has here been removed from that office now held by the queen.

LI. 12-14 give the name of the priestess of Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis who is also Philometor Dikaiosyne Nikephoros, this is Mnemosyne, daughter of Nikanoros. LI.14-15 then give the name of the priest of the Sacred Foal of Isis, Mother of the Gods; this is Demetrios, who, according to the restoration of P. Köln 2.81 and S.B. 10.10763, accepted by Koenen, is the son of the Theodoros who has just become the priest of the queen and replaced Helenos. The editors of P.Ashm. Gr. 49 (145, n.8) do not, however, accept this restoration and consider the correct reading to be Timodoros, thereby negating Koenen's conjectured father and son priesthoods for Kleopatra III (and cf. P.L. Bat 24, 36, nn. 184b -186).

LI.15-16 give the name of the priestess of Arsinoë Philopator; this is Olympias the daughter of Seleukos, who is, therefore, the sister of Theodoros. Olympias and

Theodoros were also brother and sister of Artemo, an earlier priestess of Aphrodite of Paphia and Kleopatra III in Cyprus before 131 (O.G.I.S. 159).

LI.16-17 give the information that a stephanophoros of Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis is also listed but as the papyrus there becomes fragmented no further enlightenment is available on this or on the phosphoros who would normally be expected to appear.

A network of family relationships can be seen to exist between the priests and priestesses of the Alexander Cult at this time of Kleopatra III's greatest eminence. In 107/6 the prescript of P. Brussels E7155=P.Ashm.Gr. 49 gives Helenos, the son of Apollonios as the priest of Queen Kleopatra Aphrodite; Thaubarion, the daughter of Apollonios and therefore sister to Helenos, as the priestess of Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis; Demetrios, son of Timodoros, as priest of the Hieros Polos, as he was again in 106/5 and 105/4 (P.L. Bat.24.184b-186); Olympias, the daughter of Seleukos as the priestess of Arsinoë Philopator, a post she also held for the same three years during which Demetrios was Hieros Polos (this is the same Olympias who is the daughter of Seleukos, sister of Artemo, Kleopatra III's priestess in Cyprus, and of the newly appointed Theodoros of P. Köln 2.81); a daughter of Timodoros and therefore sister to Demetrios as kanephoros of Arsinoë Philadelphos, and Polykrateia, the daughter of Theodoros, as athlophoros of Berenike Euergetis. (P. Ashm. I, p.167).

In 116/5 two other daughters of Theodoros, Aretinê and Theodôris, held the posts of stephanophoros and phosphoros of Kleopatra III, while their aunt and sister of Theodoros, Artemo, was priestess of Arsinoë Philopator (P.L. Bat 24, 35, n.175 and n.a) The same Mnemosyne, daughter of Nikanor, who is the priestess of Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis who is also Philometor Dikaiosyne Nikephoros in 105/4 was the priestess of the queen also in 116/5 (P.Cair.dem. 30.602 and 30.603, l. 4).

Peremans (1973, 62) has commented upon the name Thaubarion for a daughter of Apollodoros(Apollonios) and priestess to Kleopatra III in 107/6. As the priestess was undoubtedly Greek this seems to be a Greek derivation from an authentic Egyptian name and is interesting in its implication of the "Egyptianising" of even the most upper-class Greek families.

Given the paucity of the sources the survival of what remains of this text is most fortuitous evidence of the time at which Kleopatra III apparently reached the summit of her career. Only in this papyrus is she shown alone in the opening lines as the Goddess Euergetis who is also Philometor Dikaiosyne Nikephoros, that is as the ruling beneficent goddess, a title she shared with her husband and which descended to them from Ptolemy III and Berenike II; as the mother-loving goddess, continuing the title she shared with her elder son and effacing her mother, and as the law giver and bringer of victory. Alexander's name follows hers and he is also shown as the mother-loving god, in her honour. Following the double date of 13 and 10, in which the rule of the queen is the longer, comes the declaration of her Alexander priesthood of all the deified Ptolemies including her self and her son as the Gods Philometores, for which her titles of the Goddess Euergetis who is also Philometor Dikaiosyne Nikephoros are again listed. Then comes the inauguration of a new priest in her honour, the eminent Theodoros son of Seleukos who serves Kleopatra III with her full titles of the Goddess Euergetis who is also Philometor Dikaiosyne Nikephoros listed yet again. Following Theodoros comes Mnemosyne daughter of Nikanor as priestess of Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis who is also Philometor Dikaiosyne Nikephoros. The queen's priest, Demetrios, of the Sacred Foal of Isis Great Mother of the Gods honours her as the incarnation of Isis, and, after the priestess of Arsinoë Philopator, Olympias, the sister of Theodoros, comes the stephanophoros of Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis, whose further titles and priestesses are then lost. Kleopatra III is seen here repeatedly honoured by her

full titles, holder of the most important religious office for the dynasty and supported by her long-time adherents in religious offices dedicated to her worship. P. Köln. 2.81 exhibits the height of Kleopatra III's influence and has consequently aroused conjecture that she was now preparing to rule alone.

The evidence of this papyrus, the long involvement of Kleopatra III with the priests and priestesses who held office at the time of her own Alexander priesthood and with other members of their families, and the replacement of Alexander's adherent Helenos with her own confidante, Theodoros, are indications of the coup which Koenen (1970, 84) suggests was now being formed to enable the queen to take over the sole rule of the kingdom. Koenen proposes that Alexandrian opposition to Kleopatra III's representation of herself as the incarnation of Aphrodite caused her to renounce that priesthood and that her opposition to Alexander was also instrumental in doing away with it and dispensing with the services of his ally, Helenos, at the same time. In renouncing her appearance as Aphrodite the queen returned to her earlier epithets of *Dikaiosyne Nikephoros* under which Theodoros' new priesthood was conducted. It is Koenen's contention that in view of this the expectation is raised that Kleopatra III would shortly try to rule alone and that a coup was in preparation for such an attempt. Although in the light of her previous experience of Alexandrian insistence upon a male co-ruler this may seem doubtful, nevertheless the evidence of the papyrus and of the group of adherents surrounding the queen does tend to support a theory which is strengthened in the light of Alexander's flight from Egypt not long afterwards.

Despite the evidence of the power attained by Kleopatra III in 105/4 it must be admitted that there is no evidence to attest how fully or for how long she was able to maintain this eminence. In other papyri for the year 105, such as P.L. Bat.22.19=P.Rein Gr. 1.23 of January, 105, from Akôrios kômè, she is called only Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Philometor Soter and no priesthoods are listed for

her; this is also the case with P.Adler G.7 and 8, both of July, 104, from Gebelên. These papyri are provincial private contracts, however, and so might not necessarily give a full protocol if the current political situation caused confusion among the scribes.

Kleopatra III's assumption of the Alexander priesthood although an extraordinarily bold stroke may have been short-lived, the evidence upon this is scarce and confusing. Koenen (1970,77, n.24) suggests that she may also have held the priesthood earlier, in 108 at the end of her reign with Soter, and conjectures (64, n.6 and 75, n.20) that the mutilated prescript of P.Oxy. 14.1723, dated around that year, may have given evidence of this. As he notes (77, n.24) Sijpesteijn has commented that to have allowed Alexander's reinstatement as Alexander priest after 105/4 would very much have weakened her own position but the acute shortage of information upon the occupants of the Alexander priesthood after 105/4 gives a situation where only papyri such as P. Tebt. I.166 a mutilated agreement dated only to 107-1 can be called upon. The protocol which it gives opens Βασιλευόντων Κλεοπάτρας Θεᾶς Εὐεργέτιδος καὶ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Ἀλεξάνδρου θεῶν Φιλομητόρων Σωτήρων ἐφ' ἱερέως Πτολεμαίου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κοινῶν τῶν γραφομένων ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ. While Alexander is undoubtedly Alexander priest in this document the uncertainty of its dating cannot compel the use of this papyrus as evidence for his return to that priesthood after his mother's assumption of it in 105/4. Similarly P. Tebt. I.176, which also calls Alexander the Alexander priest, is quite undated and could be placed to any time between 107/6 and October, 101 (Koenen,72, n.22). This extraordinary dearth of information strongly suggests some form of censorship, that either the queen's tenure of the priesthood quickly ceased and/or that the recognition of her Alexander priesthood in the documents was discontinued. For example P. Fayum 12, dated ca 103, makes no mention of any priesthoods at all but reads simply Βασιλίσση Κλεοπάτρα Θεᾷ Εὐεργέτιδι καὶ Βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίῳ

ἐπικαλουμένῳ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ θεῷ Φιλομήτορι. By 101 another variation in the titles of the two appears in P.Lond. 882 where (translated from the demotic) they are shown as Βασιλευόντων Βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρας Θεᾶς Εὐεργέτιδος καὶ Βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου τοῦ καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου Θεοῦ Φιλομήτορος. This separation of titles, no longer presenting a joint face as the Gods Philometores, implies an increasing hostility between the two. Kleopatra III, however, still takes precedence and her son is still called mother-loving.

From the scant evidence of the historical sources the impression is given that Kleopatra III did manage to maintain her dominance of Alexander, at least for some years, as Justin (39.4.2) indicates that Alexander fled from Egypt from fear of her plots against him, an event which has been dated to 103/2 (Otto and Bengston, 1938, 190 and cf. Koenen, 1970, 65 and n.7 and 76). Alexander's flight would seem to support the theory that his deposition from the Alexander priesthood coupled with the entry into the priestly hierarchy of the queen's adherents indicates that Kleopatra III was grouping her forces for an attempt against him. The events for which P. Köln 2.81 is evidence may well be part of the "plots" which Justin mentions and which led first of all to Alexander's flight and then to the death of the queen.

The Death of Kleopatra III.

However capable Kleopatra III may have been of ruling Egypt alone she recalled Alexander to rule with her again after his flight (Justin, 39.4.2), she was probably forced to do this as her recall of him indicates that she needed his presence in Egypt. From Justin's rather convoluted passage of 39.4 only one event emerges clearly from the obscurity of the later years of the second joint reign and that is the death of the queen. In this passage Justin says that she was put to death by Alexander and Justin's statement is upheld in Athenaeus (12.550). Citing Posidonius, 47, on Alexander's huge weight Athenaeus very definitely qualifies

his reference to this fat man as being ὁ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ μητέρα αποκτείνας συμβασιλεύουσιν αὐτῷ. Pausanias (1.9.3) also clearly states that Κλεοπάτραν.....ἀποθανοῦσαν ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου ὃν αὐτὴ Βασιλεύειν ἔπραξεν Αἰγυπτίων and there seems no good reason to doubt this, although Mahaffy (1899, 221) disbelieves that Alexander was guilty of such a crime, a doubt echoed by Bevan (1968,331) and also voiced by Bouché-Leclercq (1978, 2.104). That Porphyry (F.G.H. 260, F2 (8), Eusebius I, 163-4,) does not mention the murder does not outweigh the unanimity of the other three sources, however, and Bouché-Leclercq's (1978, 2.106) contention that Alexander should have the benefit of the doubt and that the accusation was made against him by Kleopatra III's partisans and therefore gave her an unwarranted posthumous verdict of history against him lacks real substance. The nineteenth century historian Sharpe (1838, 170) makes a novel comment on the affair, seeing the murder as the outcome of Kleopatra III's failure to appreciate Alexander's manliness in perhaps thinking that "the son whom she had so long ruled as a child would not dare to act as a man", but instead, Alexander being the better plotter, she was put to death.

The death of Kleopatra III seems to have occurred between 14th October, 101 and 16th October, 101. The protocol of P. Adler G.11 dated to 14th October, 101 gives in column 2 Βασιλευόντων Κλεοπάτρας καὶ Βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ υἱοῦ θεῶν Φιλομητόρων ἔτους ιζ, which shows that Kleopatra III began her new regnal year, her seventeenth, still taking precedence over Alexander, whose qualification as "her son" automatically places him in a junior position; both are still the mother-loving gods. Most unusually only one regnal year is shown, the seventeenth year of the queen. In giving only Kleopatra III's regnal year Alexander's status is further downgraded and the hostility to her son implied in this, together with the impression given by this papyrus that the queen was then in a strong position, may add weight to the

theory that she intended finally to dispense with him one way or another, either through exile or death, and that because of this Alexander had her murdered before she could act against him. The papyrus shows no priesthoods, either of the queen or of Alexander, and indeed makes no reference to the deified Ptolemies at all. By 26th October, 101, P.Adler G.12, gives a dating by Alexander alone, the opening of the papyrus reads Βασιλεύοντος Πτολεμαίου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Ἀλεξάνδρου Θεοῦ Φιλομήτορος ἔτους ιδ' ἐφ' ἱερέων καὶ ἱερειῶν καὶ κανηφόρου τῶν ὄντων καὶ οὐσῶν Alexander is now sole ruler, his regnal year of 14 is given and the only reference to the Alexander Cult is in Alexander's continued appearance as the mother-loving god and a blanket reference to the priests and priestesses of the cult. That Alexander continues to hold the title of the God Philometor could well be deliberately done to discount rumours that he had murdered his mother.

The Alexander Cult in the Reign of Ptolemy X.

By November, 101, P. Tebt. I.106 gives the interesting information that Alexander is now ruling with his wife Berenike. The prescript reads Βασιλευόντων Πτολεμαίου τοῦ καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου Θεοῦ Φιλομήτορος καὶ Βασιλίσσης Βερενίκης Θεᾶν Φιλάδελφον ἔτους τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτου ἐφ' ἱερέως Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν γραφομένων ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ. The new royal couple are shown with separate titles, Alexander still as the mother-loving god while Berenike is the brother-loving goddess although she was in fact Alexander's niece and daughter of his brother Soter and perhaps of Soter's first queen and sister of both Soter and Alexander, Kleopatra IV (Adler, 1938,19). Of this marriage Vatin (1970, 75), who considers Berenike's title of Philadelphos to be an emphatic form of "Sister", remarks *Rien ne saurait mieux montrer combien les mariages royaux en Égypte s'étaient écartés des normes habituelles aux peuples grecs*. The information concerning the marriage was hastily added to the earlier papyrus, P.Adler G.12 of 16th October, 101, as the editor notes, the prescripts of such documents were

usually written in advance in the offices of the public notaries and the blank forms kept in the office until required, they would then have to be altered if a change occurred in the government (P.Adler G12, 31, n. to line 1).

In the coinage silver coins with the double date of Kleopatra III and Ptolemy X, Alexander continued to appear from 107/6 to 102; after that year the coins carry the date of Alexander alone (Poole, 1963, 112, nos. 18-28 and 113, nos. 29-48 and pl. 28.1-5).

Immediately after her death all mention of Kleopatra III in the prescripts ceases entirely. In the vague references to the priests and priestesses of the Alexander Cult the memory of that queen and her honours is obliterated along with the individual recognition of any earlier deified Ptolemies, a practice which was to continue as shown in papyri such as P. Grenf. I.36 of 99/8. The impression given by this is that Alexander did not wish specifically to exclude his mother from the cult by retaining the recognition of other members of the dynasty but allowing no mention of Kleopatra III, as she had done with Kleopatra II and Soter. Such specific exclusion would express obvious hostility and no doubt add to the appearance of his having had her murdered. This was an accusation not levelled by the sources against Kleopatra III in the case of her mother and it would seem that Kleopatra III did not have to fear open hostility to the dead increasing her appearance of guilt, as did Alexander. Perhaps because of the rumours of matricide Alexander chose to permanently remove the listing of all the deified Ptolemies and his mother among them.

In B.G.U. 3.998 of 17th December, 101 Alexander appears alone as King Ptolemy called Alexander the God Philometor in his fourteenth year, and the now usual blanket reference to the Alexander Cult ἐφ' ἱερείων καὶ ἱερεῶν καὶ κατηφόρου τῶν ὄντων καὶ οὐσῶν is given. P. Grenf. 2.23 of 100, a deed of cession from the Thebaid, goes further and gives no prescript at all. No doubt by

then the earlier abbreviations of what had become an increasingly burdensome formula had led to the more daring of the scribes choosing to dispense with the whole exercise. Ordinances such as C.Ord. Ptol. 62 and 63, two letters of Alexander and Berenike of 15th October, 99, carry no prescript beyond the names of the king and queen with no Alexander Cult titles or references.

After his mother's death Alexander continued to reign for some twelve years. According to Athenaeus (12.550 citing Posidonius, 47) he was hated by the people, flattered by his courtiers and lived in great luxury, becoming so enormously fat that he needed two men to assist him from the room and yet at a drinking party could leap barefoot from a high couch and outdance the most practised performers.

Justin (39.5.1) says that Alexander's murder of his mother did not go unpunished, as, in anger at the matricide, the Alexandrians drove him from Egypt. As Kleopatra III died in 101 and Alexander was not expelled and Soter recalled until 88 (P. Amh. 51 of 6th September, 88, his latest date, shows Alexander still ruling with Berenike) it was an anger slow to assert itself. Perhaps, however, increasing fury with Alexander's administration was also fuelled by memories of his having been accused of matricide and this added to the outcry against him. The bare narrative of Justin is expanded by Porphyry (F.G.H. 260 F2 [8]) who says that Alexander on his expulsion from Egypt went to Syria and raised a mercenary army there. He paid them on his return to Alexandria by taking the gold sarcophagus containing Alexander's remains and melting it down. As a result of this he was once more thrown out by the Alexandrians and was killed at sea while attempting to reach Cyprus.

In Justin's account Alexander's punishment for his mother's death is contrasted with the virtuous Soter's recall to the throne for having nobly refused to make war on the queen or take his rightful throne by force from his usurping brother.

Alexander's last flight from Egypt and death and Soter's return is dated to just before 14th September, 88 and Soter then ruled Egypt again until about March, 80 (Samuel, 1962, 153). During this period the decline of the Ptolemaic empire accelerated with the death of Apion in Cyrene and his bequeathal of that province to Rome, and with the further contraction of the borders of empire by continuing Roman expansion (Justin, 39.5).

With the reign of Alexander came the virtual end of the dynastic records of the Alexander Cult in the prescripts although limited recognition remained in the inclusion of the titles of the reigning sovereigns only, titles which continued to be taken from the titles held earlier in the cult by their ancestors. The contrast in this is striking when compared to the extensive use of cult recognition through the prescripts for political propaganda by Kleopatra III. Alexander seems deliberately to have refused to follow his mother in using the publication of Alexander Cult inclusion or exclusion as a method of signifying to the world the changes in the political framework at Alexandria. The weapon Kleopatra III had so consistently used was discarded, whether because of its bitter associations, as a diplomatic method of obliterating her recognition or as a bold statement that it was no longer necessary as Alexander now intended to rule without interruption. Whatever the reason for the almost total lack of mention of the Alexander Cult in the prescripts of documents written after her death Kleopatra III's season of triumph was over and her name expunged from those records. Mention of her priesthoods vanished as well and from the heights of her recognition as Alexander priest, as the Goddess Euergetis Philometor Dikaiosyne Nikephoros, as Isis and Aphrodite, the name of Kleopatra III faded from view.

CHAPTER 6 - KLEOPATRA III IN RETROSPECT

In the light of the swift and almost complete obliteration of the memory of Kleopatra III and her personal honours from the official documents after her death how far can her personality and ability as a ruler be assessed from what evidence does remain?

The Acquisition of Honours.

Although the greater part of the evidence for the career of Kleopatra III must be gleaned from the lists of honorifics which she acquired such evidence has real meaning, these titles are not empty honours but confer a great bounty upon their possessor in the respect which they inspire in others. Apart from any material benefits attached to the possession of exalted titles the attitude of reverence which they promote in those around uplifts their holder in an escalation of self-importance induced by the interaction between the eye of the beholder and that of the beheld. The capacity of titles to turn intangible respect into tangible power and influence accounts for the zeal with which they were sought by Kleopatra III fully as much as it does for any other seeker.

The importance of titles at the Ptolemaic court is evident in the elaborate hierarchical structure devised for the courtiers which developed from the second century, at the end of the reign of Ptolemy V and continued to expand in the reign of Ptolemy VIII (Mooren, 1977). This preoccupation with titles is reminiscent of the ancient Egyptian belief in the power of names and the word when "the power of the Egyptian names have in themselves the bringing into act of what is said" (Petrie, 1909, 48, citing the *Definitions of Asklepios to King Ammon, Corp. Herm. xvi.*). The "Egyptianisation" of Ptolemaic rulers, so apparent in their tolerance of the native religion and growing dependence upon and involvement with the

native priesthood, may have brought about in them a similar attitude of reverence for the name; it is, at any rate, an attitude which seems to have affected Kleopatra III in her espousal of an ever-increasing personal titulature, both Greek and Egyptian.

Surviving documents attest to the very early impact of Kleopatra III upon the royal household. About 144, when aged somewhere between eleven and sixteen, she first acquired her own priestess in the dynastic cult at Ptolemais together with the title of *Βασίλισσα*, a title unique for a living princess and always retained by her as queen after her marriage. Objection may be made to the concept that, at so early an age and in so formalised an atmosphere as the royal household of the Ptolemies, these honours were the outcome of the personal initiative of the young princess but when the indomitable nature of Kleopatra III, so clearly evidenced throughout her life and throughout her reigns with both of her sons, is considered I find it hard to doubt that it was at least partly at her own insistence that this unique recognition was bestowed upon her. The perception that Kleopatra III was, from childhood, quite capable of achieving her own ends is strengthened by the fact that, when faced with the murder of the brother whom she could have expected to marry and the marriage to her mother of the uncle to whom she herself was probably betrothed, she indisputably succeeded in marrying the king despite his marriage to her mother. Upon her marriage, when aged between fifteen and twenty, she immediately became part of the *Theoi Euergetai* and seems to have played a definite role in the administration during the triad rule of mother, daughter and husband as her name appears under this title in the prescripts of all official documents. Before 131 there existed a cult to her in association with Aphrodite in Cyprus, where she fled with her husband during the civil war with her mother, a cult which continued into her reign with her son Alexander. During this civil war there came the notable presentation of Kleopatra III as the epiphany of Isis with her priesthood of the Sacred Foal, which promoted

the image of the young queen over that of her mother as Thea Philometor Soteira. When the triad rule resumed she seems actively to have continued to participate in the administration of the kingdom. After her husband's death she came much more fully into her own as a widow and principal heir to the throne and through two joint rulerships succeeded in dominating her sons, making war at the head of her own army against one of them. During her reign with Ptolemy IX she became part of the Theoi Philometores Soteres, often with a special mention by herself apart from Soter, resumed her appearance as Isis through the priesthood of the Sacred Foal, instituted three priestesses in her honour in the Alexander Cult, who displaced the priestesses of the earlier queens, and took the epithets Dikaiosyne and Nikephoros. During her reign with Ptolemy X she retained her existing Alexander Cult honours, resumed her earlier title of Thea Euergetis as well as Philometor, again with occasional mention in the prescripts alone, instituted her priesthood of Aphrodite through which she was worshipped as that goddess, and herself became the Alexander priest. Under Egyptian titles she was venerated as Female Horos, Mistress of the Two Lands, Daughter of Re and Ruler (Troy, 1986, 179).

The steady and persistent acquisition of honours, begun so young, increased even during the unpropitious time of civil war and expanded rapidly during her co-rulerships cannot be patronisingly ascribed to female vanity pursuing the trappings rather than the reality of power. No other queen before her, not Arsinoë II as the Goddess Philadelphos served by a kanephoros, Berenike II as the Goddess Euergetis served by an athlophoros nor Arsinoë III with her own priestess, came anywhere near the eminence of Kleopatra III in the Alexander Cult. Descriptions of her as being *insatiable d'honneurs* (Bouché-Leclercq, 3.56) or that she *war auf solche Auszeichnungen versessen* are facile and do not take account of the serious purpose for which she sought these honours. The use made by her of Alexander Cult forms to spread abroad her chosen image was not

an end in itself but a practical exercise designed to publicise and thereby to uphold and maintain her status. Had she not had a powerful impact upon those around her she would not have appeared in the prescripts at so early an age. Without growing authority she would not have continued to appear in ever increasing splendour throughout her reigns with her mother and Ptolemies VIII, IX and X. Although Ptolemy VIII may have willingly co-operated in promoting her recognition in order to strengthen his own rule it is not conceivable that her hostile sons would, at their own expense, have permitted her precedence over them were she not powerful enough to insist upon it.

The Popular Perception of Kleopatra III.

To comprehend the impact of all this upon the court and the people it must be remembered that Alexander Cult formula would have been disseminated not only in writing in the prescripts of everyday documents but also aurally and visually in the ritual of the cult. Although this ritual is not known in detail the titles of the priestesses, Crownbearer, Firebearer, Basketbearer, Prizebearer, demonstrate a processional function. Given the usual splendour of Ptolemaic processions, such as that of Ptolemy II so graphically described by Kallixeinos of Rhodes, a similar splendour can be assumed for the Alexander Cult, the preserve of the entire dynasty, even though this is one of the many areas of the history of the Ptolemies for which the evidence is sadly and frustratingly lacking. The procession in honour of Arsinoë II, the Arsinoeia, (P.Oxy. 2465) passed through the city led by the kanephoros who was followed by the priests and officials. The citizens made individual sacrifices upon altars of sand in front of their houses and thereby played a personal part in the celebrations. The form of this procession and the citizen participation by sacrifice is very similar to later festivals in honour of the Roman emperors discussed by Price (1984, 101-114). His contention that through this individual sacrifice such festivals directly involved not just an élite but the whole city, and his rejection of a conventional theory of a

"two-tier model" of society (107-109) might be applied in a processional context to Alexandria and the Arsinoeia. If it could be assumed that the Alexander Cult festivals of the time of Kleopatra III, which fall chronologically between the festivals of Arsinoë II and those of the Romans, were of a somewhat similar nature then they would have had a similar capacity for relevance to all the people. In any case the simple enjoyment of spectacle by the citizen body can itself be seen as a way of making the Alexander Cult relevant to all and not just to those literate enough to write or read the prescripts of the documents. The emotional response of watching crowds to magnificent religious and patriotic pageants was no doubt the same in second century Alexandria as at any other time or place, that is, if not invariably favourable then often enough so to serve to uphold the power which provided the moving spectacle. When the possibility of the provision of free food and drink as a benevolence to the crowd is added to the sensory impact, Alexander Cult processions may well have provoked profound sensations of gratitude and respect for those whose divinity they attested, a divinity which, in the case of Kleopatra III, was especially magnificent and multifarious and therefore worshipful. The splendour of a procession which included, each with their retinue, the priest of the Sacred Foal of Isis, Great Mother of the Gods, a phosphoros priestess bearing the fragrant sacred fire, a stephanophoros carrying a crown, a third priestess and Kleopatra III herself as Queen and Alexander priest can probably be assumed to have been striking in its effect; an effect to which Culham's (1986,14) comment that "Religion is probably the single most fruitful field for observing the interactions among elite culture, popular normative culture, and mass culture" is pertinent.

In the scarcity of evidence for Alexander Cult ritual in Alexandria, however, certainty upon the extent and direction of its observance and its impact upon the population at large does not extend beyond the requirement for observance in the prescripts of the deification of the dynasty, which alone would have ensured

widespread awareness of the cult. For the rulers whose divinity it enshrined the impact of the cult would firstly have been upon the court and the élite with the wider effect, spreading awareness and arousing loyalty out among the populace, a fundamental motivation for the major form chosen for its expression, the eponymity of the priesthood and the recognition of the dynasty in documentary protocols.

The Administration.

One episode only survives from Strabo (2.99 to 2.101) to tell of Kleopatra III's awareness of the importance of trade and new trade routes. Ptolemy VIII, during their marriage, had sent the explorer Eudoxos out on a voyage from which he returned with a cargo of valuables which were swiftly impounded by the king. After the death of Ptolemy VIII Kleopatra III sent Eudoxos out again, and this time he was much more extensively outfitted than on the previous voyage, indicating some astuteness on the part of the queen in her willingness to invest heavily in an enterprise which had previously brought good returns. Unfortunately, due to Eudoxos having been driven off course by strong winds, this voyage was extended over such a long time that he failed to return before the death of Kleopatra III. Eudoxos then found himself doubly unfortunate as on his second arrival in Egypt his cargo was taken from him by Alexander. He nevertheless, as a result of various incidents which occurred on the second voyage, furthered his explorations of the trade routes to India (on this see Otto and Bengston, 1938, 194-218 and Tarn, 1939, 324). That such an enterprise is recorded to have taken place at the behest of a woman is remarkable enough in the condition of the times and its preservation by Strabo testifies to its importance. The comment of Macurdy (1932, 169) that it was probably the perfumes and valuables previously seized by Ptolemy VIII which prompted Kleopatra III to finance the expedition rather than the geographical information accruing from it is not necessarily wholly just. The queen's venture was not unproductive and, in any case, illustrates her

ability to promote major enterprises on her own initiative and not through a male associate.

The prudence of Kleopatra III in economic affairs is also clear in Appian's evidence (12.23 and 115) of the great wealth which she deposited in Cos in order to safeguard it, and her grandchildren, during her wars with Soter. The treasure was strangely not reclaimed, it was perhaps left there by the queen should her forthcoming battle for dominance over Alexander once Soter was defeated be unsuccessful and she herself be forced to flee from Egypt. Mithridates later brought up one of the grandchildren, a son of Alexander, in royal fashion. He also appropriated the vast riches, works of art, precious stones and jewellery, and, amongst these treasures, is reputed to have found a cloak which had belonged to Alexander the Great and which he gave to Pompey (Appian, 12.117). None of these treasure ever returned to Egypt but despite such losses as this, Kleopatra II's vast withdrawals from the treasury after the civil war (Justin, 39.1) and the profligacy of Ptolemy X (Athenaeus, 12.550), and however much the empire may have declined since the time of the first Ptolemies, it is apparent that enormous wealth still remained in Egypt at the end of the dynasty. Athenaeus (4.147-8), on Socrates of Rhodes' description of the banquets given by the last of the Kleopatras when meeting Antony in Cilicia, testifies to an extraordinary richness which quite overwhelmed that plain Roman soldier. Such conspicuous wealth, both given and received, was an important requirement for a monarch as the object of ruler-cult (Austin, 1986, 459f) but for the last Kleopatra it seems that the lavish displays which she accomplished were funded by depredations upon the riches held by the temples and upon the estates of wealthy men; there is no certain evidence of an ancestral treasure of the Ptolemies available to her as this had, according to Athenaeus (5.206) been dissipated by her father (cf. Broughton, 1942 and 1985). If this is so then it seems that despite huge losses from time to time the Ptolemies had still continued to

build up and retain considerable wealth until the time of Ptolemy XII Auletes. Kleopatra III seems to have shared her predecessors' ability to amass money if she was able to leave so great a treasure in Cos in her wars with Soter and do nothing to regain possession of it before her death some years later in 101. It seems that the successful management of royal revenues allowed her to secrete such a hoard of treasure without significant impact upon the country's economy.

The papyri are the most important source for evidence of Kleopatra III's ability as an administrator of the territory over which she ruled. Not a great deal of this remains but such documents as C. Ord. Ptol. 47-61 show her participation in the affairs of the kingdom in ordinances promulgated with Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II and with Ptolemy IX. These ordinances deal with matters as varied as the protection of temple revenues, various concessions to priests and officials, the dissolution of associations and the lengthy and important amnesty provisions of 118. During the triad rule of Ptolemy VIII and the two Kleopatras the role played by Kleopatra III may not have been the most important of the three; although her influence on the king cannot be discounted the determination of her mother to retain a considerable role in affairs must be considered. In the rulerships with Ptolemies IX and X, however, the precedence unfailingly taken by the queen implies a much more dominant role. The surviving documents indicate that she was probably acquainted with many aspects of the administration and that over the long years of queenship she acquired considerable governmental expertise in an executive role over the extensive Ptolemaic bureaucracy. After 114 there is, however, a notable dearth of such documents and, necessarily to argue *ex silentio*, it might be conjectured that Ptolemy X was not inclined to permit the survival of administrative orders in which his mother had exercised her ruling powers.

O.G.I.S. 168=C.Ord. Ptol. 57-60, The Aswan Stele, concerns four letters written by Kleopatra III and Ptolemy IX concerning philanthropia extended to the priests of

Chnum at the temple of Chnubo Nebieb at Elephantine. Nock (1930,7) considers this to amount to the incorporation of the queen, king and their ancestors into the temple. The letters confirm the benefits verbally conferred during the visit of the royal pair to upper Egypt and to the temple at Elephantine in 116/5 and clearly indicate the active participation of Kleopatra III in administrative affairs. The sensible and peaceful policy of the Ptolemies which supported the native religion in order to facilitate the acceptance of their rule by their indigenous subjects was maintained by Kleopatra III.

As for the impact upon the economy of the rivalry between Kleopatra III, Soter and Alexander the vast bulk of the papyri of the period consists of peaceable records of loans, contracts, wills, property sales and the like "all the occupations of a quiet society" as even Mahaffy (1899, 215) admits. The silence of so many documents on disturbances in the countryside or civil unrest is evidence of peace and prosperity. As the only constant partner in both co-rulerships was Kleopatra III, and as she dominated both her sons, it is at least as logical to ascribe the settled condition of the country to the beneficial rule of this queen as it would be to ascribe such conditions to the beneficial rule of any king. This peaceful condition is in marked contrast to periods marked by native revolts such as that of the 160's led by Dionysios Petosarapis in the reign of Ptolemy VI or the amixia of the years 123 to 118 in the reign of Ptolemy VIII. The turmoil of the countryside after the civil war and the distress caused by the racial conflicts exacerbated by Ptolemy VIII's treatment of the Greek population eased in the sixteen years of Kleopatra III's ascendancy to allow the restoration of trade and commerce interrupted by earlier dynastic disputes fought out on Egyptian territory.

In the prevailingly peaceful conditions the activity in the building of Egyptian temples such as that at Dendera has been noted. As with the prosperity of the country Mahaffy (1899, 217) attributes these benefices also to the kings, Soter

and Alexander, but does, however, go so far as to remark that the fact that Alexander continued his brother's unfinished temple building projects "points to the permanent and undisturbed influence of Cleopatra III, the queen-mother, during the first twenty years of the disturbed reigns" and that in the temple building of Ptolemies VI, VIII, IX and X it is difficult not to suspect "the influence of the great ladies who lived through the change of kings without stay or intermittence of their royalty" (Mahaffy, 1899, 219). The extensive temple building in which Kleopatra III was involved during the reign of Ptolemy VIII and its continuation in the reigns of Ptolemies IX and X (cf. Bouché-Leclercq, 1978, 2.84 and nn. 3 and 4 and Bevan, 1968, 321/2) demonstrates an ongoing and active interest in the Egyptian religion.

War and Diplomacy.

As an administrator there is, then, some evidence of Kleopatra III's abilities and to such civil talents she added military and diplomatic skills. In her wars with Soter she went herself from Egypt at the head of her army, and although Josephus tells us (*A.J.* 13.284/5 and 348) that she entrusted all things to her Jewish generals and implies that all successes gained were entirely due to them and that the queen did nothing they had not approved, such behaviour, though out of character, would at least credit her with the rare gift of choosing generals wisely. However, when considered objectively, it is unlikely that a woman who had shown sufficient determination to force her son out of Egypt and then to pursue and make war upon him would be prone to act wholly at the behest of any functionary employed by her. Indeed Josephus (*A.J.* 13.351/2) goes on to relate Kleopatra III's own military initiatives after the death of Chelkias in cutting off Soter's attempted return to Egypt in her absence and in besieging and capturing Ptolemaïs.

In assessing the competence of Kleopatra III to rule despite the fierceness of her internal dynastic struggles, some evidence of her capacity for diplomacy in external affairs appears after her capture of Ptolemais when Alexander Jannaeus came to her in homage, bringing gifts and paying her marked attentions. Josephus (*A.J.*13) says that it was on the advice of Ananias that she disregarded suggestions to take the gifts and invade Judaea. Kleopatra III, however, may well have been capable herself of wisely deciding against thus imprudently invading an ally and over-extending her forces. At the least the incident shows that she was able to take sensible advice and, instead of invading, to conclude an alliance with Jannaeus.

Kleopatra III seems, therefore, to have exhibited a definite skill in both war and diplomacy. We are, however, assured by a later historian than Josephus (Sharpe, 1838, 168/9) that "we may be sure this cruel and overbearing woman, who had never yet been guided by any feeling of right or dislike for war, did not yield to the reasons of her general Ananias through any kind feeling towards his countrymen". Nevertheless the same author (1838, 163) also pays tribute to her "stronger mind and greater skill in king-craft" which gained for her the larger share of power in the joint rulerships with her sons, a comment apposite to the circumstance that after his mother made war upon him Soter never attempted an invasion of Egypt either during her reign with Alexander or during Alexander's sole reign after her death, but contented himself with Cyprus until his recall to Egypt in 88.

In addition to the problems of dynastic strife, multi-racial and civil disorder and religious disparity within the kingdom which Kleopatra III inherited there must also have been for her an awareness of the emergence of Rome as the dominant power in the Eastern Mediterranean after the annexation of Macedonia, the first Roman province, in 146. To Polybius (3.1-3) the expulsion

of Antiochos IV from Egypt by Popilius Laenus and the battle of Pydna in 168 marked the establishment of Roman domination of the whole Mediterranean world. As well as attempting to keep Alexandria and the rest of the country quiescent and to control her son, it was necessary, therefore, for Kleopatra III at least to avoid offending this growing power and a very diplomatic attitude can be discerned in the reception of the visiting Roman Senator, Lucius Memmius in 112. P. Tebt. 33 of that year gives elaborate instructions for the Senator's entertainment and care when sailing from Alexandria to the Arsinoite nome; he is to be received with great decorum, suitable guest chambers are to be provided and he is to be presented with gifts, offerings and sacrifices to local gods are to be provided and the utmost pains are zealously to be taken to see that he is satisfied. The Roman threat which was to overwhelm Kleopatra VII did not yet present so great a danger to Egypt as Rome, perceiving the internal divisions of Egypt, may have been content to let that country weaken itself without assistance. Nevertheless it must be allowed that Kleopatra III did not foolishly add dissension with Rome to her internal troubles; in treating representatives of that power with respect and in distancing herself from involvement Egypt was able to remain almost entirely free of Roman interference at this time. Otto and Bengston (1938, 159) have gone so far as to suggest that Kleopatra III deliberately provoked internal discord in order to allay the Roman threat, but this would seem an unlikely and self-defeating course to have espoused. Paradoxically, if dynastic strife did, in fact, keep Rome at bay then it brought along with its woes a definite advantage.

The Androgynous Content.

An androgynous element is plainly present in the titulature and honours acquired by Kleopatra III which accords with the personality she exhibits through the various incidents of her career. Although she pursued the traditional female role of wife and mother she exhibited from her earliest years a competitiveness

and determination to rule more conventionally classified as masculine. She disposed of her children's marriages in a most "unmaternal" but very politic fashion and assumed the principal religious office of the dynasty, which had before been held only by a male priest. In refusing to be dominated by either mother, husband or children she exhibited an independence of mind and fearlessness of action not usually associated with the traditionally passive female role. The adoption of a masculine role and imagery was necessary however, because, as a woman, she was not the political equal of a king however much she may have been his equal or superior in ability. The example and the heredity of the two previous Kleopatras no doubt contributed to her ability to confront and control the situations in which she found herself; the mother and grandmother of Kleopatra III, exhibited as she did the curiously androgynous element which seems to characterise both the women and men of the Ptolemaic dynasty and which reflects the trend in Hellenistic religious and philosophical thought characterised by the hermaphrodite in sculpture and by the concept of the whole and complete being in the bisexuality of gods.

The tendency of the Ptolemaic kings to identify with goddesses is analysed by Tondriau (1948a, 127-146), who examines the number of comparisons and identifications of Ptolemaic kings with known divinities. He notes (145) that together with the comparisons with various gods there is for Ptolemy I a possible identification with Athena, for Ptolemy IV with Aphrodite and for Ptolemy VI as Dikaiosyne. Tondriau (144) comments on *ce curieux thème, basé sans doute sur la conception de la divinité androgyne ou sur l'idée de comparer le souverain à une abstraction*, noting (145 [2]) that this recalls Alexander the Great's appearance as Artemis in Persia, where he frequently appeared in his chariot in the costume and with the bow and arrow of the goddess (Athenaeus 12.537).

Tondriau (1948e, 24-47) returns to this theme in a further study of comparisons and identifications of Hellenistic rulers with deities and again notes (42) the

comparisons for Alexander the Great and Ptolemies I and IV with respectively Artemis, Athena and Aphrodite and (41) of Ptolemy VI as Dikaiosyne together with the female identifications of a number of Roman statesmen, remarking that "the motive of this theme seems to be the desire to annexe feminine qualities and thus increase the stock of the various 'virtues' of the ruler". In commenting upon the identification of the kings with goddesses Cerfaux and Tondriau (1957, 418) see four elements involved (1) the desire to revive the cult of the goddess in association with that of the sovereign (2) the enrichment of the royal cult by the prestige attached to the goddess and by the transmission of divine feminine powers to themselves (3) in the notion of "heritage" with the idea of the king as the son or especially under the protection of the goddess leading to identification with the goddess (4) the divinisation of abstract concepts such as Virtue, Wisdom, Justice. The adoption of such epithets as Nikephoros or Soter or Euergetes makes the holder the incarnation of the particular concept, as for Ptolemy VI with the feminine Dikaiosyne (cf. P. Grenf. 2.15, ll. 1 and 8, P. Adler G.I, ll. 1 and 5).

For the Ptolemaic queens Tondriau (1948b and c) finds direct identifications only with goddesses, of whom the most popular are Aphrodite and Isis; Aphrodite clearly for her identity as goddess of love and beauty, while her assimilation to Isis in Egypt brought queenly favour to that goddess also. There are bearded, representations of Aphrodite, however, which, with the fusion of Hermes and Aphrodite into the Hermaphroditos represented in Hellenistic sculpture give that goddess an androgynous aspect (Burkert, 1990, 155 and n. 31 and 220/1). When Aphrodite's war-like traits in armed representations are also considered (Burkert, 1990, 220) an affinity with that goddess may well have been felt by Kleopatra III and have found expression in her identification with Aphrodite in both Cyprus and Egypt. In Kleopatra III's identification with Isis there is also an androgynous element through Isis' association with Kybele in Kleopatra III's priest of the Sacred Foal of Isis Great Mother of the Gods; Great Mother of the

Gods is Kybele's title. The complex androgynous element in the attributes of Kybele through her association with Attis and Agdistis has been analysed at length by G.S. Gasparro (1985); and the chain of Kleopatra III/Isis/Kybele reaches back to this legend. Although the level of her awareness of the androgynous content in Kybele's mythology cannot be estimated there is, nevertheless, a perceptible, if tenuous, androgyny in the chosen identification of Kleopatra III as Isis qualified by the title belonging to Kybele. The association of Aphrodite with Kybele (Burkert, 1990, 154 and 177/8) links Kleopatra III more strongly with the Phrygian goddess. In the identification of Kybele with Hathor there was a precedent for Kleopatra III in the identification of her grandmother, Kleopatra I, with Hathor in the representation of that queen wearing the ornaments of the goddess; this is an identification which was later to be adopted by Kleopatra VII (Tondriau, 1948c, 25 and 29).

There can be found in the coinage more specific androgynous depictions for the Ptolemaic queens, as in the representation of Arsinoë II with the horn of Ammon, like Alexander the Great, or, more definitively, in Kleopatra III wearing the elephant skin helmet of Alexander the Great (Poole, 1963, 42, nos. 1 and 2 and pl. 8.1 and 96, nos. 94-98 and pl. 23.3). In the coinage Kleopatra III is also featured with her title of ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΗΣ ΚΛΕΟΠΑΤΡΑΣ encircling the head of Zeus Ammon, diademed; this image, a frequent one in Ptolemaic coinage, when encircled by the title and name of the queen associates her closely with the god.

The most significantly androgynous appearance of Kleopatra III comes, however, in her assumption of the priesthood of the dynastic Alexander Cult, not as a priestess but as priest. In the expression of that assumption through the use of the participle *ιερατευούσης* there is a strong androgynous element. This androgyny is seen elsewhere as in the temple of El Kab, 83 kilometres south of Thebes, which Kleopatra III caused to be built at the start of her reign with Soter in 116, where she is depicted as "Womanly Horos, Wife of Both Countries,

Mighty Bull" 1. As a female Horos she is depicted as a combined male/female figure which goes beyond the humanity of either sex into a paranormal state. As "Wife of Both Countries" she adopts a title used by the queens of Ancient Egypt. With Horos, the godly prototype of kingship, she identifies herself as "Mighty Bull" personifying the sacred bull of the Apis Cult so carefully fostered by Alexander and the Ptolemies. In her presentation of herself as a woman in a male role there are strong similarities to the Ancient Egyptian Queen, Hatshepsut. Kleopatra III adopted other titles held by Hatshepsut and other queens of Ancient Egypt; at Dakka, Philae and El Kab she is also "Daughter of Re" and "Ruler" as well as "Mistress of the Two Lands" and "Female Horos" (Troy, 1986, 179). The possibility of Kleopatra III's having been represented wearing the atef crown of Osiris (Milne, 1916, no. 224) is a further instance of the androgynous content to be found in her personal cult.²

The androgynous elements which feature in identifications of the Ptolemaic dynasty have elements of the concept of *The King's Two Bodies* (Kantorowicz, 1957), where the "body politic" contains the "body natural" and reduces the human frailties of the latter, the worthier drawing to itself the less worthy and enhancing it thereby. Although all identification with a deity, even those of the same sex as the person identifying, can be seen to have a theological aspect, the "enhancing" of a particular identification is more striking when the sex of the person involved differs from that of the deity. The "masculine" qualities of the god are a clear addition to the "feminine" qualities of a queen as the "feminine" qualities of a goddess are to the "masculine" qualities of a king. In each case the qualities of the opposite sex refine and enhance those already possessed by the traditional sexual stereotype. In Ancient Egyptian religion the god Atum, the first god who came out of the darkness and brought light, created more gods by mating with himself and so was necessarily of both sexes (Patrick, 1972a, 18). Such bisexuality is a concept which could well have been of great interest to

Kleopatra III in her view of her role as a ruler. For the Macedonian princesses in general the comparison with men has frequently been made; Bevan (1968, 282) opines that in the Macedonian houses "a woman is the equal of a man", Bouché-Leclercq (1978, 2.89) is of the view that the second century was marked by the energy of the impoverished blood of the Hellenistic dynasties "rongées par l'inceste et la débauche" taking refuge and concentrating itself in the type of ambitious queens who had no other morality than the instinctive urges of their affections and hatreds. Macurdy (1932, 2-4) discounts such comments but later remarks that "the striking phenomenon with these women is the fact that so many of them approached more nearly than women in any other period to the character and achievements of the men of their race" (Macurdy, 1932, 233). The impression given by the evidence available on the line of princesses which began with Kleopatra I distinguishes them for their strength of mind, courage, determination and "masculine" aggression. All three of the first Kleopatras were determined to rule and refused to be prevented from doing so in a most "unfeminine" display of resolution; this does not necessarily equate them with men, however, but illustrates the frequently unrecognised capacity of women to accomplish as much as men despite the limitations imposed by society upon them of which men are traditionally free.

The Iconography, Epigraphy and Coinage. (Appendix H.)

In the temple of Horos at Edfou, dedicated by Ptolemy VIII in 142, various reliefs show Ptolemy VIII with Kleopatra III sometimes accompanied by a royal son; at Edfou there is also a relief showing Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II or III being worshipped by Ptolemy IX (Quaegebeur, 1978, 255, n.65 and 257, n.79). The recognition by the Egyptian priests of the political realities expressed in the Alexander Cult protocols is shown in such reliefs. Quaegebeur, (1978, 255) noting the regular association of the queens with the kings in cult scenes comments that *on constate que les décorateurs des temples, comme les scribes*

pour le protocole des documents, devaient suivre l'actualité politique. The queen depicted is not necessarily the wife of the king but perhaps co-regent with her son as in the case of Kleopatra III and Ptolemy IX; that this queen was first in the protocols and Alexander priest are *Autres indices de la prédominance de Cléopâtre III* and *La position de plus en plus importante qu'occupe la reine est bien illustrée par le hémispéos d'Elkab où Cléopâtre III est représentée seule dans une attitude rituelle*, (Quaegebeur, 1978, 255 and nn. 68 and 68 bis and 79, cf. Bouché-Leclercq. 1978, 2.84). Commenting further upon the temple reliefs, a selection of which are given in the order of the succession of the queens and not in the chronological order of the monuments in order to show the diverse situations in which the queens are presented, Quaegebeur (1978, 257) finds that in them one is *tenté d'y reconnaître l'interprétation égyptienne du culte dynastique.*

Although Kleopatra III is quite well represented in temple reliefs less durable depictions of her are rare. Of the numerous examples of Ptolemaic oinochoai and portraits in faience which D.B. Thompson (1973, 93/4) describes only four are possible portraits of this queen, but any of them may equally well belong to her mother, Kleopatra II. One head, possibly from a votive medallion may belong to either of these queens (pl.65. 277), as may a larger faience portrait (pl. 70,c) and two clay sealings from rings or gems (pl. 74, e and i), one of which shows Ptolemy VIII with Kleopatra II or III and the other shows the queen alone. In this last example the profile, with strong, straight nose, finely modelled mouth and well rounded chin, is not unlike the profile on the copper coin shown by Poole (1963, pl. 23.10) wearing an elephant skin helmet in imitation of Alexander the Great and attributed to either Kleopatra II or III. The coin portrait shows a plump, girlish face and may possibly be of the daughter rather than the mother. The portrait of the clay sealing shows a similar, though older, face, with hair dressed in long Isis-style ringlets bound with a fillet. As Kleopatra II is not known to have

identified with Isis but Kleopatra III represented herself as that goddess through her priesthood of the Sacred Foal it is more probable that this portrait is of her than of her mother.

Milne (1916, 88-95) lists two hundred and twenty four Ptolemaic seal impressions, all difficult to attribute to specific rulers, of which he tentatively ascribes only three impressions of a sole female figure (nos. 188-90) to Kleopatra III. They show a female bust with vulture headdress, an Egyptian symbol for all goddesses (Chaeromon, Fr. 25D) often worn by Isis, and with Isis-style crown of disk and horns. Again, given Kleopatra III's strong identification with the Egyptian goddess, it is probable that these belong to her. Two others, (nos. 214 and 5) show male and female busts jugate, with the female wearing in no. 214 the chiton and crown of horns, disk and plumes, and in no. 215 crowned with corn. Milne has attributed these to Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II but again, given the Isis symbolism, they may more probably belong to Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra III. In no. 224, which shows three busts jugate, one male, one female and one male, the female apparently wears the atef crown and the further male head has no royal crown, so may be a prince. Milne tentatively attributes this also to Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II, but, as their only son (Memphites) was killed by Ptolemy VIII, it seems more possible that it represents Ptolemy VIII, Kleopatra III and either Soter or Alexander.

Havelock (1982, 269-276) discussing a portrait in the Vassar College Art Gallery is unable certainly to attribute its regular, idealised features and hair dressed, Isis-like, in long curls to either Kleopatra II or Kleopatra III, the lack of coin portraits and the shared rule of the two making it impossible to do so, but the Isis symbolism again seems to imply that it is more probably a bust of Kleopatra III.

Particularly in the case of the representations collected and analysed by D.B. Thompson (1973) it is notable that for other queens, especially Arsinoë II,

Berenike II and Kleopatra I, clear and well preserved portraits and oinochoai are certainly attributed. The extensive use of these vessels, filled with wine and wreathed with flowers, and used to pour contributions of wine into the phials of priestesses for ruler-cult libations at the altar, is appropriately reflected in the survival of quite numerous examples featuring the iconography of the earlier queens. The lack of similar survivals for Kleopatra II and Kleopatra III again implies the destruction of memorabilia of these queens by their successors, for Kleopatra II from the hostility of her daughter, for Kleopatra III from the hostility of her sons. Given the propensity of Ptolemaic queens for identification with goddesses, particularly with Isis, and for the numerous survivals and representations of other queens (Roscher, *Lexicon*, 1978, 517/8) the dearth of surviving portraits of Kleopatra III, whose goddess identification was so extensive and long-lasting, is remarkable.

In the inscriptions the titles of Kleopatra III are not greatly recognised. I.G.P. lists a number of inscriptions from widely scattered areas which include her as the wife of Ptolemy VIII and usually as Euergetis or Thea Euergetis but sometimes only as γυνή; similarly, in her co-rule with Ptolemy IX she appears only infrequently as Thea Philometor Soteira (nos. 103-4, 106-7, 109, 111, 115 - 118, 123-4, 126, 128, 131, 138, 140 and 141). Inscriptions are, of course, much rarer than papyri and, given Alexander's hostility to his mother and the removal of any mention of her from prescripts written after her death, it is possible that many inscriptions commemorating her were removed or destroyed in an effort to erase her memory. The difficulty of working in stone as compared to papyrus might also account for the sparse recognition of the full and very lengthy titlature of the queen, so much more elaborate than that of other Ptolemies, so much more subject to fluctuation and consequently so much more laborious to produce.

Only a few certain coin attributions can be found for Kleopatra III. Poole (1963, 96, nos. 94-98 and pl. 23.3) lists five copper coins of the reign of Ptolemy

VIII with, on the obverse, the head of Kleopatra III clad in an elephant hide helmet and thus associating herself with Alexander the Great, minted in Egypt and of uncertain date. Five similar copper coins, (98, nos. 127-131 and pl. 23.10) which show a more youthful and attractive profile than those shown in pl. 23.3, may belong to either Kleopatra II or III. It is, therefore, unclear whether Kleopatra II first adopted the elephant hide helmet and was copied in this by her daughter or whether this concept belonged to Kleopatra III alone. During the reign with Ptolemy IX Kleopatra III is certainly recognised in the coinage only in copper coins and through symbolism such as that of the double eagle, one of which has the letter K superimposed, the double cornucopia, two stars or the headdress of Isis; the words ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΗΣ ΚΛΕΟΠΑΤΡΑΣ appear on the obverse of some of these (Poole, 1963, 104 - 108).³ In the reign with Ptolemy X her recognition in the coinage decreases still further, appearing on silver coins but only through the double dates shown for the regnal years of both sovereigns without any other form of acknowledgment (112). Poole (1963, xli, 45 and pl. 8.8-10) notes also the *possible* recognition of Kleopatra III on gold coin struck in the reigns of either Ptolemy VIII or IX. After her death the kind of posthumous recognition awarded in the coinage to Kleopatra I by her sons, Ptolemies VI and VIII, was distinctly not given to Kleopatra III by either of her sons. In his survey *Frauen auf antiken Münzen* Kahrstedt (1910, 274) remarks upon the notable lack of coins extant which give any reference to either Kleopatra II or Kleopatra III. Coinage for Kleopatra II is even scarcer than for her daughter and once again these deficiencies in the sources seem to be part of the *damnatio memoriae* practised upon them both. In discussing Ptolemaic coinage Milne (1938, 204) remarks that after Ptolemy II gold coinage became increasingly rare and that what was minted was usually of exceptional type and size and probably intended for medals rather than coins. The silver coinage minted by the Ptolemies was mainly used by their Greek subjects with copper gaining a growing importance with the native Egyptians (Poole, 1963, lxx). As the only extant coins which certainly

recognise Kleopatra III in the reigns of both Ptolemy VIII and Ptolemy IX are of copper, and the silver coinage in which she appears with Ptolemy X only recognises her through the double dating which equally recognises the king, it might be conjectured that in this powerful propaganda medium the recognition given to the queen was far more heavily oriented towards the native population than to the Greek citizens. The accidents of survival, however, make this a tentative surmise.

Traces of the Queen.

P.L. Bat 22, p.72, discusses a town called "Kleopatra" mentioned in papyri nos. 16,17,18,19, 22 and 23, all from Akôrios Kômè. These papyri are dated between the years 111 to 105, all years of Kleopatra III and very probably refer to a town named in her honour. Had the town commemorated Kleopatra II this would not have been allowed by her daughter to continue and the length of time since the reign of Kleopatra I makes the reference to that queen less likely than to her granddaughter. This topographical survival is similar to the naming of villages in the Arsinoite nome after Arsinoë II (Sijpesteijn, 1973,27-30), and harbour towns on the Red Sea coast after Arsinoë II and III and Berenike II and III (Cohen, 1983,71). This topographical identification is found most often for Arsinoë II, however, after various aspects of whom several streets in Alexandria were named, apparently posthumously as the documents referring to them are dated after her death (P. Lond. inv. 2243 of 252/1).

The Greek and demotic papyri which attest the recognition in Egypt of Kleopatra III as Aphrodite early in her reign with Alexander are echoed by papyri of a much later date. P. Oxy. 14, 1628 of 73 and 1629 of 44 testify to awareness of the cult in Oxyrhynchus well into the first century in giving the residence of all parties to these leases of Catoecic land as the ἀγυῖα Κλεοπάτρας Ἀφροδίτης, a street perhaps named after a temple situated there. P. Oxy. 14, 1644 of 63/2 is a

settlement of claims made by residents of the same street. Even later comes the curious survival of a street name in Alexandria, Ἀφροδίτης τῆς καὶ Κλεοπάτρας, in a papyrus of the time of Severus Alexander (W. Chrest.115), an isolated yet significant echo of the cult of Kleopatra III as Aphrodite in her capital city.

The formal honours adopted by her were not the only epithets applied to Kleopatra III. She may also have been more colloquially known as Kleopatra Kokke, or "the Red", although there is some confusion on whether this name applied to her or to Ptolemy X, Alexander or to both. The source is Strabo, 17.1.8, who calls Alexander ὁ Κόκκης καὶ Παρέισακτος ἐπικληθεὶς Πτολεμαῖος which, as κόκκης can be either masculine nominative or feminine genitive may refer to him or his mother. Chron. Pasch. 347.12 calls Alexander a son of Kokke which may, however, simply be drawing an inference from Strabo. Bouché-Leclerq (1978, 2.05 and 3.83) concludes that both mother and son were known by this name, while Strack (I.G.P. 65 and n.25, and 68/9) inclines to the view that the nickname applies to Kleopatra III alone. As the original passage is ambiguous a firm conclusion cannot be reached without the discovery of further evidence either way, however as Παρέισακτος, which Alexander is also called in Strabo 17.1.8, is in the masculine nominative it seem perhaps more probable that κόκκης can be similarly classified as the two are joined by καὶ and therefore that the term applies to Alexander alone. Peremans and Van 't Dack (no. 14517) call Kleopatra III *peut-être* ἡ Κόκκη and in no. 14555 call Alexander ὁ κόκκης and Παρέισακτος. The reason for the application of the term to either or both can only be conjectured, whether it applies to physical colouring, to murderous proclivities or to some other trait. Its possibly sanguinary implications may account for the willingness of historians to attribute the name to Kleopatra III but this would be unjust as she is not certainly known to have murdered anyone while Alexander is definitely accused of murdering her.

The Alexandrian penchant for applying sobriquets to their rulers can be seen also in Ptolemy VIII's nickname of Φύσκων because of his obesity (Diodorus, 33.22) and Κακαργέτης because of his cruelty (Athenaeus 4.184 and 12.549). Although described by Justin (38.8) as rather resembling a beast than a man Ptolemy VIII was, however, also called Φιλόλογος (Bouché-Leclercq, 1978, 3.81, n.1) for his literary skills. The nicknames of Φύσκων, Λάθουρος and possibly Ποθεινός and Παρείσακτος may also have been applied to Soter (I.G.P., 65 and 69 nn.30-32) although Φύσκων, seems, with its connotations of excess weight, as applicable to Alexander as Soter, while either may have been longed for or brought in secretly by their supporters, as inferred in Ποθεινός and Παρείσακτος. Why Soter should have been called Λάθουρος, or "chick-pea", remains a mystery. The frequently unflattering nature of these sobriquets at least provided an outlet for the less reverent elements of the populace when daily confronted with the "divinity" of their rulers under far more grandiloquent aliases.

The Reputation of Kleopatra III.

The unfairness of the treatment accorded Kleopatra III by historians is quickly and easily seen in Justin, the principal source for her reigns. On her death he comments (39.4) that she well deserved to perish at the hands of her son as she had driven her mother from the bed of her father, had made her two daughters widows by alternate marriages with their brothers, exiled one son and made war upon him and plotted against the life of the other, depriving him of his throne. Of this catalogue of sins it might be pointed out that Kleopatra III's mother had first deprived her daughter of her prospective husband. Of the marriages of her children, where she undoubtedly behaved in a most authoritarian manner, membership of a royal household has historically involved undergoing marriages that are politically motivated rather than chosen by the participants. Kleopatra III's actions in this regard are no harsher than those of generations of kings,

politicians and wealthy fathers of all nations during recorded time. It is interesting that it is in regard to her children's marriages that Vatin (1970, 77) sees Kleopatra III as a true monarch because the marriages of the sons associated with her on the throne were willed and sanctioned by the queen as the Living Law, and that she exercised this absolute power as the heir of Ptolemy VIII (85). As for Soter, he chose to return to Egypt against his mother's will and, therefore, at his own risk when her right of choice of co-ruler was denied her by the Alexandrians. Of the plots against Alexander's life it can only be said that if they existed they were obviously not well planned as they failed of their purpose and that Alexander was by far the more efficient murderer of the two. Had he been willing to accept the secondary place while ruling with his mother, as she could reasonably have expected being herself the principal heir to the kingdom, perhaps no plots would have been hatched against him.

Ptolemy VIII gained his throne by murdering his nephew, Neos Philopator; he then murdered his own son, Memphites, and is accused of killing the Cyrenaeans who came with him to Alexandria for very little cause (Diodorus, 33.13) and of harshly expelling the intellectuals from Alexandria (Athenaeus, 4.184). Soter is accused of killing the friends of his parents (Porphyry, F.H.G. 3.721) of attempting to kill his mother and of committing horrific war crimes while campaigning in Judaea (Josephus, *A.J.* 13, 278 and 345). Alexander gained his sole rule through the murder of his mother and is accused by Pausanias (1.9.3) of treating the Thebans so cruelly in reducing their revolt that they were left without a trace of their former prosperity. No such crimes were committed by Kleopatra III, the only accusation of murder made against her in the sources is that of Justin (39.4) that she had one of her generals executed for allowing Ptolemy IX to escape, and yet she has received an almost totally hostile treatment from later historians. In the nineteenth century Sharpe (1838, 167/168) not only called her "cruel" but also said of her that her two sons were puppets "in the hands of their clever but

wicked mother". Writing in 1904 Bouché-Leclercq took a continually disapproving view of her activities, making various criticisms of her such as calling her replacement of Soter with Alexander *la manoeuvre criminelle* which brought in consequence the *démembrement définitif de la monarchie* (1978, 2.96) and, on her adoption of the title Philometor Soteira, remarking *Pour qui connaît les rancunes opiniâtres de Cléopâtre III?* (1978, 3.56). Grace Macurdy (1932, 170/1) in a work dedicated to the rehabilitation of the Ptolemaic queens nevertheless says of Kleopatra III that "She has the reputation of being a worse woman than the earlier Cleopatras, chiefly because she was a meddling despot." Rostovtzeff writing in 1941 calls her (1972, 871) "as ambitious and cruel as her mother" and says of her (875) that "Her limitless and unrestrained violence involved Egypt in continuous dynastic strife", whereas it might more truly be considered that it was her husband, mother and sons who were largely responsible for this. Volkmann (1958, 37) refers to her exclusion of the memory of her mother from the Alexander Cult protocols as "Propaganda of the diabolical kind that seeks to annihilate the opponent even after death". Mitford (1959, 104) speaks of "the relentless figure of this woman whose thirst for power brought her house and kingdom to impotence". Fraser (1972, I.220) blames her for the "debasement of the currency" in the proliferation of Alexander Cult titles in the second half of the second century and calls her initiatives in the cult "these extravagances of Cleopatra" (I.221) without considering the serious intention behind them.

The evidence of the papyri and inscriptions, formulaic though it is, does not wholly conceal the character of those for whose activities it supplies information; behind the ritual forms of address can be seen something of the real person in illustrating the way in which that person wishes to be seen, what image and character he or she wishes to present to the world. In creating a cult in which what the ruler really is may be less important than what he seems to be it is

difficult to avoid the assumption that the titles chosen by Hellenistic monarchs were relevant to the way they saw themselves. For Kleopatra III her desired image was one which encompassed almost every traditional female virtue embodied in her identifications with various goddesses and in her adoption of the title Philometor; her titles also presented her as an authority figure, however, dispensing justice, bringing victory and conferring benefactions. This androgynous combination of the qualities attributed to male and female gods may reflect something of the real nature of this woman transmuted by divine imagery. The androgyny discernible in the titulature and in her assumption of the Alexander priesthood may also reflect the queen's need to adopt a masculine role because, as a woman, she was not the political equal of a king. For Kleopatra III her administrative and military activities give substance to some of the titles she chose while she simultaneously assumes a gentler aspect in her claim of the more traditionally feminine virtues. Her use of differing tactics against her two sons, military force against Soter whom she wished to remove entirely from Egypt and the subtler domination of Alexander whose physical presence in Alexandria she needed by manoeuvres designed to increase her own religious, and therefore political, status, in themselves reflect the androgynous nature of the titulature and may also reflect the androgynous nature of the woman herself.

The truth, if it can be found, seems to be that the third Kleopatra was a determined, capable, strong and successful woman who ruled in spite of considerable opposition from her family and without the help of a male patron and whose reputation has, therefore, suffered accordingly. Nowhere is she accused of the horrendous crimes attributed to the kings who reigned before and with her and yet she has been more consistently vilified than the worst of them. The recognition she has received has not only been unduly hostile, it has not accorded with her importance nor recognised her contribution to ruler cult.

CONCLUSION - THE PROPER PLACE OF KLEOPATRA III

If the suggestion is accepted that Kleopatra III has been sadly underestimated and her innovative and forceful mode of ruling either dismissed or undeservedly ridiculed, then it is necessary to ask how her historical importance should be estimated in relation to other queens of the dynasty and what effect, if any, her existence had upon succeeding generations.

Greatest Queen of all the Ptolemies?

In estimating the success of Kleopatra III against other Ptolemaic queens it is with the most frequently quoted examples of female power in the dynasty, Arsinoë II and Kleopatra VII, that her achievement must be compared.

An increasingly common perception of Arsinoë II is that found in Macurdy (1932, 230) where she is called "the woman who was probably the greatest of all Hellenistic queens" and (112) "the greatest politically". Macurdy goes on, however, to enunciate the basic difference between Arsinoë II and Kleopatra III, for Arsinoë II, as she puts it, "governed Egypt through her brother". Now how far Arsinoë II actually "governed Egypt" is, of course, open to dispute; the capacity of Ptolemy II to govern and the likelihood or otherwise of his being so completely amenable to the advice of his second wife could be analysed and discussed at great length¹. How far he did so encourage or permit Arsinoë II to act as an *éminence grise* is not, however, the point at issue here; the basic contrast between Arsinoë II and Kleopatra III is that the time of Kleopatra III's greatest influence came after the death of her husband and it was not "through" him that she ruled. In his lifetime she may well have actively participated in government but it is highly unlikely, given her youth and Ptolemy VIII's considerable experience as king before their marriage as well as the continuing presence of

her mother in the reign, that she, as the most junior member of the trilogy, would have exerted a dominant influence. After the deaths of the other two, however, she inherited the kingdom with her own choice of sons as co-ruler, and, although constrained by the Alexandrians in exercising this choice, she consistently took precedence over the son who was forced upon her and not many years later managed to convince the people to expel him from the country, following him herself to wage war upon him so successfully that he never again attempted to return to Egypt in her lifetime. In her co-rulership with her chosen son, Alexander, she again consistently took precedence and attained her greatest heights of power. Alexander was eventually to vanquish her, but only by death; he did not succeed in relegating her to a secondary position in the joint rule during her lifetime.

Kleopatra III did not, then, exercise her rulership "through" a male figure, either as a wife or a regent. Neither did this queen retain her power by the goodwill of foreign statesmen, as Kleopatra VII was later forced to do when faced with a far more immanent threat from Rome than ever confronted Kleopatra III. There are similarities in the reigns of these two queens however, Kleopatra VII was also faced with the prohibition upon Ptolemaic queens ruling alone and circumvented this by making her three year old son, Ptolemy XV Caesar, her co-regent; as Kleopatra III had removed her grandchildren and part of her treasure from Egypt when faced with danger so did Kleopatra VIII send away her son Caesarion and part of her treasure at the approach of Octavian (Volkman, 1958,91 and 193/4). Fraser (1972,I.127) notes Kleopatra VII's awareness of the need to conciliate the Alexandrian population in the last surviving Ptolemaic edict which remits local taxes for Alexandrian small holders, an awareness comparable to that of Kleopatra III in successfully persuading the Alexandrians to exile Soter before she made war upon him. At the end of the reign of Kleopatra VII and Caesarion the papyri show double regnal dates, as they do in the reign of Kleopatra III and

Ptolemy X (P. Ryl. 593 and cf. P. Cair. dem. 31232). The last Ptolemaic queen also suffered from the unfairness of historians and from poets posthumously attributing treachery to her as a woman in ruining the unfortunate Antony. Kleopatra VII, however, unlike Kleopatra III, ruled as a Roman vassal, reporting to Caesar at Alexandria in 48, to Antony at Tarsus in Cilicia in 42 and at Antioch in 37, and supplying ships, men and money in response to Pompey's orders in 42 (Reinhold, 1981/2, 98).

As far as it was possible to do so in the climate of the times Kleopatra III was the only Ptolemaic queen to exercise power in her own right and for a considerable period of time, from the death of her husband in 116/5 until her own death in 101. The anomaly is that it is probably because of this that her achievement has been either overlooked or denigrated in the work of historians concerned with Ptolemaic history as the history of the kings. Arsinoë II achieved some kind of acceptance in this tradition in the palatable female role of good and devoted wife, an acceptance which received considerable help from the concept of a "beauty greatly extolled" of which it has been said that "no lovelier face has come down to us from the Greek world" (Macurdy, 1932, 112, quoting Tarn). Kleopatra VII achieved notoriety rather than fame through Augustus' propaganda campaign against her in his conflict with Antony as an enslaver of noble Roman soldiers and as a drunken and debauched practitioner of magic arts (Reinhold, 1981/2, 97).

Because Kleopatra III succeeded through her own efforts and despite rather than through her relationships with powerful men she was unacceptable in a tradition of historiography which continued until the middle of this century, notwithstanding her having been an apparently devoted wife who gave birth to five children. What evidence remains from her reign indicates that she participated fully in government, successfully exercising administrative, military and diplomatic skills. She maintained a role as queen for some forty to forty five

years, from the time of her marriage until her death at about sixty years. For sixteen of those years she reigned in her own right as heir to the kingdom of Egypt, although forced to accept a co-rulership there is some indication that before her death she was preparing the ground for an attempt to discard this also and to rule alone. Of a dynasty of strong-minded and capable queens Kleopatra III emerges as the most politically successful and individually powerful of all.

Posterity and Kleopatra III.

The obvious hindrance to a claim that Kleopatra III was politically important after her death in having devised a personal form of ruler-cult which served as a model for those who came after comes automatically from the same cause which makes difficult an assessment of her importance in her lifetime, the almost complete eradication of her name from the sources after her death. If it is true that her sons deliberately practised upon her memory the same kind of obliteration which she practised upon that of her mother then the concomitant of this is that, her memory having been erased, the activities of her lifetime could have had no impact upon posterity. For this to be fully accepted, however, is to overlook the extent to which the Romans drew upon the example of ruler-cult offered to them by all the Ptolemies, for all of whom the dynastic Alexander Cult became the foremost device for expressing their personal divinity. If the divinity espoused by the Ptolemies and chiefly expressed through the Alexander Cult made an important contribution to a political system which ruled a large part of the world for several hundred years, and whose influence is still perceptible today, then the conspicuous sanctification of Kleopatra III and her place within that cult is an intrinsic part of that contribution and, therefore, intrinsically important. The outstanding use which Kleopatra III made of political/religious propaganda in her lifetime cannot fail to have affected the perception of Ptolemaic ruler cult by those around her and permeated the view of that cult received by the later Ptolemies and, through them, by their conquerors.

In examining this claim it is again necessary to stress the political importance to the Ptolemies of personal divinity within and without the Alexander Cult. In their identification with such gods as Zeus Ammon, Helios, and Dionysos and in temple sharing which followed Egyptian concepts of the presence of the god in statues and pictures the Ptolemaic kings carried on the personal deification which the pharaohs had practised, and gained through this an image of personal sanctity not claimed by their Greek predecessors. Further than this, however, from Ptolemy I's introduction of the Sarapis Cult at the inception of the dynasty all the Ptolemies displayed a distinct religious inventiveness. The purpose of the introduction and dissemination of Sarapis worship and its success or failure has been the subject of much remark, but whatever the conclusion reached in such discussions it is difficult to deny that this innovation set an example for the descendants of Ptolemy I of the political uses of religion and its value in governing Egypt. The inventiveness demonstrated in that cult in its novel interpretation of Egyptian and Greek religious forms syncretised into a new god was to be shown repeatedly by the descendants of Ptolemy I, upon the practices of all of whom Kleopatra III was able to build.

With the inception of the personal divinity acquired by the kings through the introduction of the most significant propaganda device of the dynasty, the dynastic Alexander Cult, came the extension of this divinity to the queens, which in turn shone a further reflected glory upon their husbands and also supplied them with a practical device for the introduction of economic measures by the use of the name of the deified queen. With the largely posthumous honours awarded to Arsinoë II by her husband the escalation of the importance of the queen really began. The actual deification of Arsinoë II within the Alexander Cult (P. Hibeh 2.199), set a vital precedent for the official deification of the wives of the Ptolemies as goddesses in a cumulative pantheon of ancestor worship glorifying and sanctifying Ptolemaic rule. Whether Arsinoë II was alive or dead at

the time of her deification is a complex and finally insoluble problem, although a conclusion that this honour was posthumous seems on the whole more valid than the view that she was deified before her death.² The single most important factor in this deification, however, is that it happened, whether or not the queen was alive at the time, and by its occurrence the way was opened for the systematic deification within the Alexander Cult of all the succeeding Ptolemaic queens equally with the kings, a pattern which lasted for some 240 years.

For Arsinoë II her divine rights, posthumously granted, are more important than her political power while alive. The deification of the Ptolemaic queens was not an empty form of words, however, but came increasingly to reflect the reality of the power exercised by the queen. The increasing deification of the queens went hand-in-hand with their increasing power until it reached its greatest heights with the deification and power of Kleopatra III, for which the regency of Kleopatra I and the power exercised by Kleopatra II as wife and queen to both of her brothers provided a platform. White (1971,257) has observed that for a whole century the history of Egyptian royalty practically means the history of the three queens, Kleopatras I, II and III "whose ascendancy forms an all but unbroken chain". To suggest that the divine and not the political rights of these queens were emphasised in their recognition within the Alexander Cult is to underestimate its political importance while recognising its theological import.

The syncretism of Egyptian and Greek religion is apparent in the honours assumed by Kleopatra III, as it was earlier apparent in the identification of Arsinoë II as Isis and as Aphrodite Akraia and Aphrodite Zephyritis, identifications substantiated in inscriptions, documents, coinage, temple dedications and reliefs, street names, faience oinochóai and hymns.³ Quaegebeur (1978, 254/5) has noted that the representation of Berenike II as the living consort of her husband with Egyptian gods brought a new element into the iconography of the queens, an element continued in temple reliefs of Arsinoë III with Ptolemy IV and

Kleopatra III with Ptolemy VIII. The institution of a personal priesthood to the queen as a living representation of Isis and of Aphrodite was to await the inventiveness of Kleopatra III, however, who both emulated and extended the honours of the earlier queens in her personal cult, instituting these honours herself and for her own power and glory. A precedent for Kleopatra III as Isis, Mother of the Gods and as Aphrodite is found in the deification of Berenike II and of Arsinoë II in column 2, 6d. of P. Petrie 3.1 which reads Ἰσιδος μητρὸς θεῶν Βερενίκης καὶ Ἀφροδίτης Ἀρσινόης. Kleopatra III expanded her own identification by including a reference to Kybele in the use of her title "Great Mother" and increased the oriental aspects of her personal cult in the function of one of her priestesses as φωσφόρος. She maintained her place in the Alexander cult from her earliest youth, holding the title of Βασίλισσα as princess, wife and co-ruler, and appearing as either the Goddess Evergetis or Philometor Soter. In becoming its priest she eclipsed any other Ptolemaic queen's participation in the Alexander Cult.

Kleopatra III had, then, a tradition of over a century of Ptolemaic religious inventiveness and utilisation upon which to build and to uphold a personal sanctification within the dynastic cult which reached a peak not attained by any of her ancestors, and which was designed to make her person so sacred that her rule was beyond challenge. From this height, however, the use of the Alexander Cult in the prescripts declined swiftly in its apparent rejection by her sons, useful Alexander Cult documentation after the death of the queen is notable for its scarcity. After the year 101, for which Ptolemy X, Alexander I, is shown as Alexander priest no further name can be found until about the year 88 with a further gap until 84/3 when the king, by then Ptolemy IX, Soter II, is again listed in the final entry of this register (P.L. Bat. 24.207). This dearth of material is directly due to the loss of eponymity in the indefinite tenure of the priesthood by the kings and to the cessation of elaborate protocols recognising the earlier

Ptolemies, apparently at the instigation of Ptolemy X after his mother's death. At the same time the power of the queens dwindled, Soter's daughter, Berenike IV, married both Ptolemy X, Alexander I and Ptolemy XI, Alexander II, but neither she nor Kleopatra III's two daughters, both of whom married Ptolemy IX, Soter, were first in the protocols nor took a major share in government. The Alexander Cult did not entirely die out, however, and cultic ritual may well have continued in ceremonies and in forms other than the prescripts. The Ptolemies continued to take cult titles which echoed those of their ancestors; Berenike IV became Berenike Philadelphos, Ptolemy XI was Alexander II, Ptolemy XII was called Philopator and Philadelphos and introduced a new identification as Neos Dionysos along with his nickname of Auletes (Strack, *Archiv.* 131,no. 8, P. Oxy.1644 of 63/2, O.G.I.S. 186)

The revival of the Alexander Cult came through the daughter of Ptolemy XII, Kleopatra VII, who became Thea Philopator and called her youngest child by Antony Ptolemy Philadelphos. C. Ord. Ptol. 75-6 of 12th April, 41, is a letter from Kleopatra VII and Ptolemy XV, Caesarion; in true Alexander Cult style it opens Βασίλισσα Κλεοπάτρα Θεὰ Φιλοπάτωρ καὶ Βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Ἰσὶ καὶ Καῖσαρ Θεὸς Φιλοπάτωρ καὶ Φιλομήτωρ. O.G.I.S. 194 of March, 39 is an inscription from Thebes in honour of the Governor, Kallimachos and gives the same titulature for Kleopatra VII and her son.

Echoing her great-grandmother in her title of Βασίλισσα Kleopatra VII also renewed and syncretised Greek and Egyptian religious imagery in her personal sanctification. She used this title on the coinage which she struck, in some of which she appeared as Aphrodite with Ptolemy XV as Eros in her arms and which also employed the symbolism of the eagle and the cornucopia (Poole,1963, 122/3, nos.1-11 and pl. 30.5 to 8). At Patras, before Actium, coins were struck showing Kleopatra VII as Isis (Roscher, 1978,518 and Volkmann,1958,177). This queen was portrayed at Dendera wearing the

traditional crown of the queens and at Erment wearing the crown of Arsinoë II, which she wears also in the stele of Turin; an exceptional Egyptian stele with a Greek inscription shows her wearing, like the pharaohs, the double crown of Egypt and offering her son before Isis; these representations are of the living queen (Quaegebeur, 1978, 255/6 and n. 74 and 259). The crown worn is also like that of Isis, daughter of Geb, and at Erment Kleopatra VII is called by the demotic title "daughter of Geb" which was held by Arsinoë II and other queens and translates as "hereditary queen", "co-regent". The title of Ruler of Upper and Lower Egypt, which designated the queens as pharaohs and was conferred upon Arsinoë II probably after death was also used for Kleopatra III and VII (Quaegebeur, 1978, 258 and Troy, 1986, 179). Kleopatra VII adopted at least seven more than the four Egyptian titles of Kleopatra III and among them were included such purely ceremonial epithets as "Mistress of the Beauty of the Courtyard" as well as "Ruler" and "Female Horos", titles identical to those of Kleopatra III. Several of Kleopatra VII's titles are variations on the theme of "Ruler of the Two Lands" the most complete of which is "Upper Egyptian queen of the land of the white crown, Lower Egyptian queen of the land of the red crown" (Troy, 1986, 179-197). Kleopatra VII, in constructing a similar image of divinity to that devised by Kleopatra III, identified very closely with Isis, dressing in the robes of that goddess and becoming known as *θεὰ νεωτέρα* or *νέα Ἴσις* (Plutarch, *Antony*, 54.6); the "new" Isis is probably intended to denote an actual reincarnation of the goddess although it may also imply mortality, as may Ptolemy XII's assumption of Neos Dionysos. Antony's assumption of the title Neos Dionysos imitated its use by Ptolemies IV and XII and directly links the ruler cults of the Ptolemies and the Romans (Tondriau, 1948d, 169). In 41 Kleopatra VII came to Tarsus as Aphrodite to meet Antony as Dionysos "for the good of Asia" (Volkman, 1958, 97) This last, brief flowering of divine queenship, revived so much in the pattern of Arsinoë II's posthumous honours and of Kleopatra III's

living ones, is appropriate for the last of the Ptolemies and Queen of the last of the Hellenistic kingdoms.

The problems of the beginning of the Alexander Cult and its survival into Roman times have been extensively discussed by Plaumann (1920) and more recently by Taylor (1975). Welles (1940, 281) has taken the view that the Alexander Cult was rather a perquisite than an instrument of royalty and that Kleopatra III assumed her titles principally because she liked them, discounting their propaganda value. He also remarked, with a somewhat ponderous jocularity, that "To have checked this provincial effusiveness and accumulating bad taste in the East for two or three centuries may well.....be credited to Rome as one of her major accomplishments". It may rather be the case that such a system of personal aggrandizement was deliberately imitated by the Caesars in a similar pursuit of power. A rather more perspicacious assessment than that of Welles is offered by Nock (1942,219) who sees the "new hierarchy of annual priesthoods created by Kleopatra III as comparable with the provincial priesthoods and the municipal sevirate of the Roman Empire, as a device to use the desire for distinction as a reinforcement of loyalty". Julius Caesar's occupation of the office of *pontifex maximus* combined with his claim to divine descent as a qualification for divine rulership, and recalls the assumption by the Ptolemaic kings and by Kleopatra III of the Alexander priesthood. In early 44, among other extraordinary honours, Julius Caesar was decreed a god by the Senate and Antony was appointed to a special priesthood in his honour; to have his own priest gave Caesar a special place in the state religion and showed him as a god (Taylor,1975, 67). The statue of Caesar was erected in the temple of Quirinus with the inscription *Deo Invicto* (Cicero, *Ad Atticus* 12.45). Augustus, sacrificing as *pontifex maximus* to his Genius, his attendant spirit, was in virtually the same position as high priest of his own cult as the Ptolemies had been as high priests of their own divinity and of their ancestors (Taylor, 1975,59 and 204); Tacitus

(1.10.5) says that Augustus wanted to have his own cult, temples and priests. How far the Alexander Cult and the other religious honours of the Ptolemies formed the basis for the cult of the Caesars is part of the larger question of how far Hellenistic ruler cult in general was significant for the divinity of the Roman emperor, but the Roman rule of Egypt, with the new god-kings as absentee landlords and the grain surplus shipped to Rome, seems too close an association for the more grandiose aspects of Ptolemaic ruler-cult to have escaped the notice of the Romans and too attractive in its elevation of the individual to have been rejected by them.

Weinstock's view (1971,3) that Julius Caesar's pursuit of the religious honours paid to him was not part of an "irresponsible game" but a constitutional necessity for a single and permanent ruler is the basis of his claim that Julius Caesar conceived the Roman version of ruler cult. The long and close association of Julius Caesar, Antony and Kleopatra VII and the use made by that queen of the kind of religious propaganda practised by her ancestors clearly links the espousal of similar religious forms by Roman statesmen to the system devised by the Ptolemies, even though the immediate precedent for Julius Caesar may have been the honours granted to Pompey. Weinstock (1971, 411) sees Caesar as "an imaginative and daring religious reformer, who created and planned new cults, accepted extraordinary honours, and died when he was about to become a divine ruler - a reformer, moreover, who did not want to appear as an innovator, nor to spread a new philosophy of life, but to be guided by tradition", a sentence which could equally well have been written about Kleopatra III with the important qualification that she lived for many years as a divine ruler. No such tribute has been paid her, however, instead her greater innovation and success in the same kind of enterprise has been dismissed with such remarks as that of Welles quoted above.

The definite royal purpose shown in Kleopatra III's political propaganda in the accumulation of epithets, in the revival of the earlier titles of the Ptolemies and in the inclusion and exclusion of family members from recognition in the dynastic cult together demonstrate a deliberate royal policy, upon the propaganda value of which Nock (1942, 218/9) concludes that whether or not its finer points were perceived by the general public "Nevertheless, the general tenor of the policy must have been realised". An important target of the propaganda distributed by ruler cults such as the Alexander Cult, directed downwards from the court rather than upwards from the people, is the people themselves. Politicians and courtiers are often too close to the ruler to be fully convinced by it and are also more able to gain personal advancement by a change of allegiance. Ptolemy II seems to have adroitly developed a system of propaganda based rather upon the deification of his dead wife than upon himself, perhaps perceiving that divinity is more likely to be accepted in the dead than in the living. His successor tended rather to reserve for himself the moral status of benefactor in his assumption of the title of Euergetes but from Arsinoë III onwards the role of the queens as protectors and beautiful goddesses became steadily more important in Ptolemaic mythology. That propaganda campaigns can be effective and their message continue to be received and accepted over a long period of time is well demonstrated in the campaign of vilification against Kleopatra VII undertaken by Augustus, who converted his internal conflict with Antony into a foreign war with Kleopatra as Queen of Egypt and declared war against her, not Antony (Reinhold, 1981/2, 97). Her "betrayal" of Antony at Actium on 2nd September, 31, was part of the portrait presented of her as an abandoned and depraved woman and an Egyptian queen and has resulted in an enduring image which is still part of popular mythology. The headline to a review (Hogan, 1990) of a recent book about Kleopatra VII read, however, "Queen of the Nile transformed

from evil temptress to history's victim" indicating the continuing late revision of this image.

The remarkable cohesiveness of the forms of dynastic propaganda, practised through notions of divine birth, personal cults, types and legends of coinage, festivals, processions, statues and iconry by the Hellenistic kingdoms, especially Egypt, and by Rome is a further link between their individual versions of ruler-cult, the variations of which are less striking than their similarities. All of these devices were used by Kleopatra III in employing the weapons she had to hand in her place and time to project the desired vision of herself which Nock (1942, 219) has found effective though "not inconsistent with megalomania". A certain degree of megalomania is no doubt consistent with any form of ruler cult and may well contribute to the efficacy of its execution. How far Kleopatra III believed her own propaganda can only be surmised but it is not impossible that she fell into that common error and acquired a faith in herself which may have gone far to help her conduct her forceful campaign. In the mixture of politics, religion, flattery and opportunism which makes up ruler cult the one constant is the ruler's wish to present himself as a god for whatever reason, a wish aided by the ancient world's attitude to the intermingling of the human and the divine. The different choice of god by different rulers must reflect that ruler's personal preference for one aspect or another which the chosen god projects; for the Ptolemies the favoured choices among the Greek gods were Dionysos and Aphrodite, which presumably says something about the qualities which appealed to the dynasty as a whole. Nevertheless, although common features and choices can be discerned, each deification resulted from different causes which were met with differing solutions. For Kleopatra III the solution was supremely her own and unique; the legend which she wove about herself was intrinsic to the position which she built up throughout three reigns, and its destruction after her death emphasises its importance as does the manner of her death. Kleopatra III wished to exercise

power directly and not through a male relative and consequently came to as bad an end as any woman in the ancient world who followed such a course. The lesson of moral excellence was not to be found in so aggressive a woman and Justin's satisfaction at the fittingness of her death is as apparent as that of much later historians.

The Hellenistic queens were apart from other women of their time, part of a world whose way of life was not applicable to the wider community of women and which did not survive. After Actium the power of the divine queens was over and their "strange adventure" (Vatin, 1970, 274) finished. Their ways of attaining and displaying the power which they held were not finished, however, consciously or unconsciously later queens have followed a method so efficacious and so suitable for female use in a male oriented society. Elizabeth Tudor, whose image was similarly constructed against a political background in which a female sovereign sought to wield power equivalent to that of a king, could have learned from Kleopatra III in the real and purposeful use of honours acquired through the total supremacy of an unconstitutional monarchy, honours which were not empty but which were carefully designed for particular ends.

If, in their response to the political and religious necessities of their times each of the practitioners of royal cult merits a monograph, then none is more deserving than Kleopatra III. The *maïsson féconde* guaranteed by Tondriau (1948b, 15) for fresh research into the ruler-cult of Ptolemaic kings could equally be found in the ruler-cult of this extraordinary Ptolemaic queen.