Notes to Chapter I.

1. The Throne Names given to the Ptolemies by the Egyptian priests have their own intrinsic interest, Mahaffy (1899, 255/6) gives a list of these and Tondraiau (1948a, 143) gives full references to commentaries upon them. The multifarious Greek names and titles applied to the Ptolemies, which include official and popular epithets and Alexander and personal cult titles are listed in I.G.P., 64-66. The elaborate Egyptian titles given to Ptolemy IV are to be found in P. Bayer 45, twelve lines of which are devoted to this king's titles (cf. Bell, 1966,57 and n.32 and 140). Bouche-Leclercq (1978, 3.82/3) discusses the many titles of the Ptolemies.

2. The religious zeal of Ptolemy IV may have stemmed from a wish to increase the honour of the dynasty after his victory at Raphia in 217, although Fraser (1972,1.220) has suggested instead that Ptolemy IV wished to increase the status of Soter over that of Ptolemy II and of Berenike II, his mother, over Arsinoë II, his step-grandmother. The puzzling inclusion and omission of the Theoi Soteres from the presepts in the years 215/4 to 170/69 is analysed in detail by Oates (1971) and is also discussed by Lanciers (1986). No wholly satisfying explanation for this has yet emerged however.

3. The evidence for this is found in O.G.I.S. 16, which concerns a shrine erected by Arsinoë I at Halicarnassus for Ptolemy the Saviour and God, dated around 308-6, and S.I.G. 390 concerning the worship of Ptolemy as a god by the Confederation of Cycladic Islanders ca 308.
Notes to Chapter 2

1. On the alternating embassies of the brothers to Rome and the events of these years there has been a great deal of modern comment. See, for example, Bevan (1968, 291-301), Samuel (1962, 142), Will (1966, 302-306), Fraser (1972, 1.120/1) and Bagnall (1976, 27). The sources are to be found in Zonaras (9.25 in Dio 20), Diodorus (31.33), Eusebius (1.163 and 2.131) and Polybius (31.10).

2. Mooren (1988, 439-443) goes so far as to argue for a long-term intimate relationship between uncle and niece from at least 143 resulting in the illegitimate birth of Ptolemy IX, Soter II in February, 142, some three years before the marriage (between September, 140 and February, 139) which would have legitimated him. He bases this theory on hieroglyphic inscriptions which give Soter the title “distinguished in his birth together with that of the living Apis” (438, n.26) which “seem to imply” (438) that Soter's birth coincided with the that of an Apis bull born on 18th February, 142. Mooren goes on to argue against the theory of Cauville and Devauchelle (1984) that the boy's mother must have been Kleopatra II while maintaining his own conclusions upon Soter's illegitimate birth to Kleopatra III in 142. Mooren, nevertheless, recognises (441) that whether such titulature as that which he quotes is necessarily a reflection of historical reality or whether it is simply an example of the kind of phraseology used in the Egyptian titulature is open to question.

The somewhat tenuous nature of the evidence for Soter's birth in 142 conflicts with the total lack of mention of any such scandalous incident by the three ancient literary sources for the period, Justin, Pausanias and Porphyrius, who would no doubt have been quite willing to relate such an event had they had any knowledge of it. The existence of an illegitimate child for some three years before a royal marriage is probably rather difficult to hide. That such a child was then publicly admitted to and accepted upon the marriage and fully recognised as an heir to the throne and included in the royal family after the marriage, and not permanently hidden away, would make it more difficult to believe that no whisper of his premature existence would have reached the literary sources. Mooren's theory, while upholding the concept of a mutually desired relationship between Kleopatra III and Ptolemy VIII before their marriage, does not deal with the practical problems posed by such an inconvenient birth. Illegitimate children as the product of kings and concubines are common. An illegitimate child as the product of a king and a princess who was both his niece and stepdaughter would attract far greater attention.

Another possible date for Soter's birth is 28th March, 140/39, still preceding the marriage of his parents between September, 140 and February, 139. Ptolemaic chronology is notoriously difficult to establish but evidence for Soter's birth at this date could be found in the inscription S.E.G. 9.5 (cf. Samuel, 1962, 130) if this inscription is dated to 140/39 and the reference to the "son" which it contains is taken to be to Soter, and not to Memphites. The dating of this inscription is extensively discussed by me in Chapter 3, 98-101, where the conclusion of 140/39 rather than 109/8 is reached in agreement with Préaux and against Otto and Fraser. That this inscription does, in fact, refer to Soter rather than to Memphites is, however, questionable.
Notes to Chapter 3

1. The lengthy ordinances of this decree endeavoured to restore peace to the countryside in their provisions for the remission of punishment for all crimes to Ptolemy VIII's accession, with stringent penalties for those who persecuted or tried the offenders. Attempts were made to provide against future wrongdoing by officials and orders were given for those who had fled to return home to work. A letter which forms part of the decree (C.Ord. Ptol. 42 and 43) extended various privileges to the troops in Cyprus (cf. Mitford, 1938, 291-9). Whether such decrees were promulgated from humanitarianism or pragmatism they nevertheless attempted to deal directly with the problems of insurgency and dissatisfaction in the countryside.

2. Heinen (1978, 190-192) argues that the dress to which Justin (38.8) refers represents the king's attempt to appear as splendid as possible to his Roman visitors and to demonstrate his identification with Dionysos.

3. Apparently eager to preserve the superiority of the Alexandrian library over that of Eumenes at Pergamum, Ptolemy VIII issued an edict preventing the export of papyrus (Sharpe, 1838, 161). He wrote a lost commentary on Homer and he also wrote his memoirs (F.H.G. 3.186-9)). Memoirs are written for posterity, whether to tell the truth or to give that version of it which seems to the writer to be true or which he wishes, for some reason, to disseminate. The twenty four books of the king's work were apparently a mixture of biography, natural history, geography, ethno graphy and anecdotes about Ptolemy II's mistresses and Antiochus Epiphanes' eccentricities in Rome. The memoirs gave descriptions of his life in exile in Cyrene and of the palace area of Alexandria and its livestock, included such literary assertions as 'the flowers in Calypso's garden were water-parsnips, not violets' (Boardman et al, 1986, 341) and had also some mention by the king of a meeting with Massinissa of Numidia at Cirta, probably around 160-155 (Kotula, 1983). Although only fragments remain it could safely be assumed that the work would have been concerned to portray the king and his reigns in a favourable light.
Notes to Chapter 4

1. Several papyri of the first and second centuries attest to the legal equality of Egyptian women. From the numerous available examples from the late second century come other wills, such as P. Grenf. I.21 of 126, in which a soldier leaves land and slaves to his wife and daughters. In the years 114/3 P. Grenf. I.25 concerns the sale of land by a priestess and her husband, P. Amherst 2.46 concerns a woman money-lender and P. Lond. 1204 concerns the sale of a share in a house from one woman to another. From 109 comes P. Grenf. I.27, a contract in which a woman gives land to her daughter. In the Egypt of the time “there was real equality between man and wife” (Theodorides, 1971, 292), a social climate to which the Ptolemies appear to have been sensitive, and which Kleopatra III might well have felt as relevant to a queen as to a commoner.

Alexandrian women, though not deme members, were ἀντάρχες, “citizens”, when wives or daughters of demosmen, (Pomeroy, 1984, 47). In chapter three of this work Pomeroy gives a detailed account of the more restricted legal position of Greek women, at least in the smaller Greek cities outside Alexandria, when compared to that of Egyptian women.

2. Sharpe (1838, 163) has said of Soter’s marriage to Kleopatra Selene “Perhaps history can hardly show another marriage so wicked and unnatural” a comment which seems, perhaps, a little excessive when the whole history of marriage is considered. Selene’s subsequent forced separation by Kleopatra III from Soter after having borne him two sons and dispatch to Antiochos VIII, Grypos (Justin, 39.4) possibly outdoes in maternal unkindness the earlier marriage to Soter. Selene seems, however, to have been a born survivor of marital disruption and subsequently married Antiochos IX, Kyzikenos, the half brother of Grypos and then possibly Antiochos X, the son of Kyzikenos (see stemma, Appendix A.)

3. Having been torn from Soter Kleopatra IV went to Syria and married Antiochos Kyzikenos. The middle sister, Kleopatra Tryphaena, was married to the brother of Kyzikenos, Antiochos Grypos, and both were sons of Kleopatra Thea, the sister of Kleopatra III. Antiochos Grypos was at war with his brother and, according to Justin (39.3), Kleopatra IV induced the army of Grypos to desert to Kyzikenos. Grypos was victorious, however, and after the defeat of Kyzikenos Kleopatra Tryphaena charged Kleopatra IV with having waged war against Grypos and herself from envy and with having married outside of Egypt when she was divorced from Soter against the will of her mother. Despite Grypos’ pleas for her life Kleopatra Tryphaena then had Kleopatra IV killed in revenge and from fear that Grypos’ pleas had arisen from a more than brotherly interest in her sister’s welfare. When, after another battle Kyzikenos was in turn victorious, he then had Kleopatra Tryphaena put to death. Grypos subsequently married the third sister, Kleopatra Selene (see note 2 above).

2.4, 5 and 6 cover the years 110 to 108 and P. Cair dem. 31079 and 31254 the years 106/5. This list is not intended to be to be exhaustive, but merely to illustrate the frequency with which evidence of the exclusion of Kleopatra II from the Alexander Cult can be found.

5. Demotic papyri such as P. Cair. dem. 30602 and 3 and P. Ashm. dem. 3 of 116/5 show the return of Neos Philopator to the prescripts very soon after the death of Ptolemy VIII. From then on his presence is consistently found, as in P. Grenf. I.25 and 2.20 of 114, P. Lond. 880 and 1204 and B. G. U. 3.994 of 113, in the series P. Rein Gr. (= P. L. Bat. 22.13 to 22) for each year from 113 and again in 105, P. Grenf. I.27 of 109, P. Adler G.5 of 108, P. Pestman Recueil 2.4, 5 and 6 for 110 to 108, P. Brussels E7155 of 107/6 and several other contemporary papyri. The listings for the inclusion of Neos Philopator and the exclusion of Kleopatra II have many papyri in common, but the definite appearance of the murdered prince in the prescripts can be certainly dated a little before the definite disappearance of his mother from them.

6. Eupator’s early appearance in the prescripts can be seen in P. Grenf. I.12 of 148, P. Gen. inv. 5 of 145/4, P. Tebt. I. 6 of 140/39 and P. Grenf. 2.15 of 139, this continued appearance in the prescripts of the triad rule has been dealt with in Chapter 3. From 116/5 his appearance is at least as frequent as that of Neos Philopator and is found in the same prescripts. A further interesting aspect of Eupator’s appearance in the prescripts is that Ptolemy VI was frequently demoted to a position following his elder son, who has precedence over his father in several Greek prescripts (Wehrli, 1974, 9), and this placing is not uncommon (P. Ashm. p.60 lists several others). A possible explanation for the seeming consistency with which this occurs might lie in Ijsewijn’s (1961, 9, no. 129 and 108, no. 128) conclusion that in 158/7 Eupator was the Alexander priest. If this is so then he must have been extremely young at the time as his mother, Kleopatra II, was herself only born in 180 (Peremans and Van’t Dack, no. 14516). On the basis of three demotic papyri P. L. Bat. 24 no. 133 gives only Ptolemaios, son of the King and Queen as Alexander priest, a son who could well be Eupator, but whether, indeed, such an office would have given him precedence in the prescripts of much later years is open to question. Nevertheless, while it may be that in at least some of these cases the positioning could be due to scribal error the frequency with which the sequence occurs seems to require some further explanation. It may be that the association of Eupator on the throne with Ptolemy VI from 153 to 150 (Samuel, 1962, 143) combined with an earlier Alexander priesthood could account for the increased status which the prescripts imply. In P. Tebt. I.6 of 140/39, line 19 of which reads καὶ Θεοῦ Εὐπάτορος καὶ Θεῶν Φιλομητόρων καὶ Θεῶν Εὐεργετῶν Eupator is not only placed before both of his parents but in this papyrus, the earliest known after the marriage of Ptolemy VIII to Kleopatra III, he precedes both the Θεῶν Φιλομητόρων and the Θεῶν Εὐεργετῶν, who are placed in that order.
Notes to Chapter 5

1. In his article "Helenos, Governor of Cyprus" (J.H.S. 79, 1959,) T.B. Mitford pays considerable attention to the restoration of the name of Helenos' father. On pp. 95/6 he discusses earlier attempts at restoration, for which the only Greek names found applicable were either Apollodorus or Apollonios. In note 9a he discusses P.M. Fraser's suggested alternative of Apollodotos. No firm decision is reached on any of these with the conclusion that none of the suggestions can be rejected with confidence. The article concerns itself in the main with a detailed reconstruction of Helenos' career and the examination of the relevant papyri and inscriptions. The difficulty of establishing a satisfactory reading of the name of Helenos' father is also discussed by Glanville and Skeat, J.E.A. 40, 1954, 57 (57). On Helenos see also L. Mooren (1977, 184), where he describes Helenos as the τροφευς or "bringer up" of Alexander.

2. The earliest source for the eponymous priests of the Alexander Cult can be found in Charon of Naucratis (P. Hibeh 199). The most up to date and detailed lists of the eponymous priests and priestesses of both Alexandria and Ptolemais may be found in P.L. Bat 24, The Eponymous Priests of Ptolemaic Egypt, Leiden, 1983, by W. Clarysse and G. Van Der Veken.

3. The basic function of the clergy in Ancient and Ptolemaic Egypt was to maintain the order of the universe through the cult of the statue, which assured the presence of the god on earth; a sacerdotal function exercised only by delegation of powers from the sovereign as sole priest (Dunand, 1973,162). In Ancient Egypt the king was the High Priest, par excellence, and performed ritual tasks in daily cult and great festivals. When replaced by a priest that priest was, in principle identical with him. (Engnell, 1945, 5 and nn. 5 and 6, and 6).

Indigenous priests in Egypt are said to have lived lives of great frugality, labour and piety with numerous duties such as offering sacrifice, burnt offerings and libations, robing the statue of the god, tending the sacred animals, preserving the knowledge of the sacred literature, writing in the sacred books, interpreting dreams, foretelling the future and testing priestly candidates. Much time was also spent in arithmetical and geometrical speculation by scholarly priests (Chaeromon, Frs. 10 and 11 and p.x, cf. n.1 to 56 and 56 ff.). None of these more routine tasks seem to have been the lot of the Alexander priest, an office filled from its inception by men of high rank.

O.G.I.S. 244 of 189 records the appointment of a High Priest at Daphne by Antiochos, who is to receive honour and glory as a man of worth and ability. Diodorus (1.73) affirms the great veneration in which priests were held in Ancient Egypt and that they played the role of councillors to the king.

4. The term hiereia is used in the Ptolemaic era principally to refer to priestesses of the Alexander Cult. It can also, though rarely, be employed, as in hierissa to refer to Egyptian women serving the indigenous cults, even though it essentially designates the function of a Greek religious. In Egyptian religion it is not known precisely what function corresponds to the hiereia. In the Canopus Decree (O.G.I.S. 56) the servitors of the cult of Princess Berenike are called variously
In the Egyptian text they are called in demotic "musicians" or "priestesses", the first term indicating their particular function and the second the category to which they belong in the hierarchy. Although a correspondence is established between the Greek and Egyptian terms there is a continuing ambiguity and neither Greek nor Egyptian realities are clearly expressed. (Dunand, 1978, 354).

While there are isolated mentions of female stolists who robed and adorned the statue of Isis there is no known instance of a woman as chief priest in a temple of Isis. (Heyob, 1975, 91-97).

In the Alexander Cult the priestesses had some eponymity. As daughters they reflect their father's glory and were, therefore, presumably unmarried.

5. Liddell and Scott, 1968, 820, translate ἱερατεύω, ἱερητεύω as "to be a priest or priestess". Lampe, 1968, translates this verb as "to be a priest, to exercise the priesthood". Peremans and Van 't Dack (Studia Hellenistica 25, 1981, No. 5180a) call Kleopatra III Βασιλεύσις Κλεοπάτρα, la déesse Évergète qui est aussi Philométor - prêtresse (ἱερατευόμη) d'Alexandre et des Lagides - Alexandrie - 105/4. The qualification of "prêtresse" by (ἱερατευόμη) indicates a need to explicate the meaning of this term beyond that of simply a "priestess".
Notes to Chapter 6


2. The Atef Crown of Osiris, composed of the white crown of Upper Egypt and the two red feathers of Busiris, to which were sometimes added the solar disk and a pair of horns was part of the insignia of royalty and divinity worn by that god. It was very occasionally worn by goddesses such as the snake-headed Heptet, who assisted Isis in bringing about the resurrection of Osiris (Budge, 1969, 2.131). It was also worn by Ra-Harakhte, or Horos of the Two Horizons, the form which Horos took as a god of light identified with Ra; by Seker, the necropolis deity of Memphis; by Maahes, the son of Bast by Ra; and by Harsaphes, the ram-headed god of the Fayum who, as a fertility-god, was sometimes identified with Osiris. (Ions, 1975, 29, 50, 58, 70, 103, 116 and 135).

The rarity of its wearing by female deities adds interest to this possible depiction of Kleopatra III wearing the crown as an example of the androgynous element of her personal cult.

3. The imagery of the double cornucopia used in the coinage of Kleopatra III and Ptolemy IX appears in the imagery of Arsinoë II as her special attribute. It has been assumed from Athenaeus (11.497 b-c) that Ptolemy II invented this as a tribute to her but this is disputed by Rice (1983, 202) as it is not certain whether the passage refers to the dikeras or to the keras, the horn shaped drinking cup, and Athenaeus refers not to its invention but to its over-filling with natural produce. There is no proof of its use for Arsinoë II during her lifetime. The double cornucopia symbolises joint deities and joint royalty and has also strong chthonic associations of birth, reproduction and death; it is used as a funerary emblem in the Eastern Mediterranean. (Rice, 1983, 202-208).
Notes to Conclusion

1. Probably the most famous instance of Arsinoë II's influence over Ptolemy II is seen in the Decree of Chremonides of 265/4 where it is said that Ptolemy II "speaks in accordance with the policy of his ancestors and his sister in his zeal on behalf of the common freedom of the Greeks" (Dittenberger, *Syll. I*. 434, line 16). The view that Arsinoë was the leading force in the government, largely based upon this decree which was promulgated four years after her death, has been disputed by Stanley M. Burstein (1982) whose contention is that Ptolemy II was using the memory of his dead sister to reap political gain for himself. The capacity of Ptolemy II as a ruler was earlier upheld by W.W. Tarn (1928).

The increasing interest in Arsinoë II in the 1980's has brought penetrating analyses of her true role such as that of Stanley M. Burstein (1982). Hans Hauben (1983, 127 and n.22) finds her a veritable inspiration and true administrator of Ptolemaic maritime policy but not necessarily the *de facto* ruler of Egypt. Sarah Pomeroy (1984, 17) finding little evidence for the view of Arsinoë II as the driving force in the government of Egypt sees this as an inference which has been drawn from mainly posthumous evidence.

2. The largely posthumous nature of the honours awarded to Arsinoë II and their usefulness to Ptolemy II has also been widely commented upon in books and articles such as those listed above. Quaegebeur (1978, 249) remarks that in the abundance of documentation for Arsinoë II only the statues of Senou are testimony for the living queen, all other contemporary documents are to the deified Arsinoë. Her most significant honours include the cult of Arsinoë Aphrodite at Zephyrion in a shrine built in her honour by the admiral Kallikrates (Strabo, 17), the culmination of her importance as a political/religious figure in 262 in the redistribution of the apomoira from the temples to the royal revenues in the name of the deceased and deified Arsinoë identified with Isis (C.Ord. Ptol. 17-18), and her posthumous elevation in the naming of the reclaimed land at Lake Meoris as the Arsinoite Nome.

3. The identifications of Arsinoë II as Isis and Aphrodite and of other Ptolemaic queens as goddesses have been extensively documented, on this see for example Tondriau, 1948b, c and d, D.B. Thompson, 1973, Roberts, 1966 and Quaegebeur, 1978. For the temple sharing of Arsinoë II instituted by Ptolemy II after the death of the queen see Nock, 1930, 4 - 6. After examining the multifarious identifications of the Ptolemaic queens with both Greek and Egyptian goddesses Tondriau (1948b, 15) comments upon the danger of underestimating the importance and rejecting the theological content of these identifications.
APPENDIX A
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APPENDIX B

CHRONOLOGY OF MAJOR EVENTS

160-155
Birth of Kleopatra III - Peremans and Van 't Dack no. 14517

145
Return of Ptolemy VIII to Egypt from Cyrene after the death of Ptolemy VI - Samuel, 1962, 45
Marriage of Kleopatra II and Ptolemy VIII - Peremans and Van 't Dack no. 14616

140-139

By ca. 135
Birth of five children to Kleopatra III and Ptolemy VIII - Peremans and Van 't Dack nos. 14519-21, 14554/5

132/1

130
Return of Ptolemy VIII to Egypt - Samuel, 1962, 147.

127/6
Probable return of Kleopatra III and children to Egypt - Mitford, 1959, 103

124

118

28th June, 116
Death of Ptolemy VIII - Samuel, 1962, 7. Beginning of co-rulership of Kleopatra III and Ptolemy IX, Soter II after his recall from Cyprus at the insistence of the Alexandrians - Justin 39.3

116/5

6th April, 115
Earliest firm date for the rule of Kleopatra III and Soter II without the participation of Kleopatra II - P. Cair. dem. 30.602 and 30.603. Probable date of divorce of Soter II from first wife, Kleopatra IV - Justin 39.3.
114/3
Ptolemy X, Alexander II proclaims himself king in Cyprus - O.G.I.S. 181

107

103/2
Flight of Alexander II from Egypt - Koenen, 1970, 65 and n.7

101

88
Alexander's final flight from Egypt and death. Recall of Soter to Egypt as king - Samuel, 1962, 153.
APPENDIX C

PRIESTHOODS OF KLEOPATRA III


Phosphoros, Stephanophoros, Hierieia - 116/5 to at least 107/6, 105/4 - P. Cair. dem. 30.602/3, P. Brussels E 7155/6. P. Köln. 2.81.

Priest of Queen Kleopatra, the Goddess Aphrodite - 107/6 to 105/4 - P. Brussels E 7155/6.

Priest of Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis who is also Philometor Dikaiosyne Nikephoros - 105/4 - P. Köln. 2.81

Queen Kleopatra the Goddess Euergetis who is also Philometor Dikaiosyne Nikephoros and Priest of Alexander and the Deified Ptolemies - 105/4 - P. Köln. 2.81

GREEK TITLES OF KLEOPATRA III

Basilissa - ca. 145/4 to 101 - P. Amh. 2.45, P. Adler G.11.


Dikaiosyne, Nikephoros - 116/5 to at least 105/4 - P. Cair. dem. 30.602/3, P. Köln. 2.81.

EGYPTIAN TITLES OF KLEOPATRA III

Female Horos, Mistress of the Two Lands, Daughter of Re, Ruler - Troy, 1986,179, 209 and 212 (on the Egyptian titles see also footnote 1 to Chapter 6, found on page 240 and Koenen, 1970, 74 and n.17)

Mighty Bull - Koenen, 1970, 74 and n.17
APPENDIX D

SUPPLEMENTUM EPIGRAPHICUM GRAECUM 18

727. Decretum Cyrenensium, a. 139/2 vel 124(121)/16. — Cyrene.
Fragmentum stelae marm. alibi in lateribus duobus inscriptae ed.
P. M. Fraser, Berytus XII 1958, 101/4 n. 7, c. im. ph. pl. XII, 2.

(a) In fronte.

----------------------------- -ος e. 23

----------------------------- τάν τιρ. e. 15

[------------------------------ καὶ I παρόντα το[ άς

[------------------------------ καὶ δύναν κατ' ἐνιαυτόν

[------------------------------ καὶ ἐνέχας τα—

5 [έσαι [υπὲρ τὸς ὁγιασμὸς καὶ σωτηρίας τῷ βασι-

[καὶ τῶν τίκων (οὐτῶν) ἐν τοῖς τεταγμένοις ἄμφ]παις καὶ τοῦθεοι

οποιῶν

[------------------------------ δυνάτων δὲ ἀυτὸς στά-

λας περι

[τοῦτο, ἡλίων εἰ καὶ (e.g.) τέντε δύορας ἐπὶ τῶν ἅρων κατ'

ἐνιαυτόν, σεινες

[ἐπιμελήσονται οὐτῶν (?) . . . . κατὰ τὰς ἁμορφά(τας) ὧς κα

γαριζομέθα τοίς

10 [------------------------------ καὶ] τοῦθεοι ἄτομως καὶ

[------------------------------ καὶ]

(b) In latera dextra.

----------------------------- 

----------------------------- 

----------------------------- 

----------------------------- 

----------------------------- 

----------------------------- 

----------------------------- 

----------------------------- 

5 ane

[------------------------------ 

τατ

[------------------------------ 

σαν

[------------------------------ 

τα


10 — -vex | [θάνατος καὶ καλλιτέχνης καὶ εὐθές καὶ | [παραθέναι ποιεῖται οὕτω τὰς ψυγάς καὶ | [συνεργεῖ τὰς βασιλείας καὶ τὰς βασιλέσσας | [καὶ τῷ νῦν αὐτῶν] Πτολεμαῖος, εὐθαφίο[[τέιν-]]

15 τας περὶ τῶν ἀπαντημένων παρά[[ταυτῶν]] τάδε αὐτῶν ἰδίω περί φιλαν-]]

θρόσκων' ἀνοιγόν[[ταν δὴ]] οἱ λάβει καὶ αὐτὸν ταύτης ταύτης | [καὶ σφηνανδρώσαν καὶ υφόπτων. Δὲ δὲ ἄρματι | — — ἡμέραν τῷ αὐτῶν ἐκάσθῳ]] σφηνανδρώσι. | Οἱ δὲ ἀρμαγεῖ καὶ λαρδάθων | 20 τὸ πρωταμενὸν | καὶ τὰς σταθὶς κοιμηθέντων καὶ | [θυατέρων ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις βασιλέων | [Πτολεμαῖοι καὶ βασιλέσσαι Κλεο-]]

25 πάται | τὰς ἀδέλφας, θεοὶ Σωτῆρες, καὶ τῷ νῦν | [αὐτῶν]

Ptolemaioi καὶ τοῖς γονέοις | [καὶ τοῖς προγόνοις αὐτῶν καὶ | τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς | [θεοὶ] καὶ σεκαίρων, ἐκάστῳ τῷ νόμιμων. | [Τὰ δὲ | ὅμοια παραστάσαντα αὐτὸν ἄρχοι καὶ | — [—] τασοῦδομενοι | κατὰ μήνα ἐπὶ τάς | [— — ποιηθέντων ὑπὲ κυβερνῶ τῶν]

30 προεκλίθοις ... Τᾶμα δὲ πάντα | [— — εἰπαράστατοι | — —]

Col. II 35 — — o ... άη[[5]] ... — — τῶν σφηνανδρήσεων | [— — ὡς τινῶν φημῆσθαι. ἔδο | [— — τινῶν] γεγονότων φαινόμενον. ἔδο | [τινὲς] τῶν καθημερινῶν φαίνεται ἐν τις[[δ̣ων]] ἐλήμεσιν

40 ἐνικήμενον, αὐτοὶ μὲν || [πιστεύοντον ὑπὸ τὰ διὰ τοῦ βασι-]]

45 λικῶν | προσταμένοι καὶ τῶν νόμων διοικησίας ἐπιτῆμα, τὰ δὲ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτῶν | ἀπές εἰς τοὺς καθήκοντας κατὰ | 50 τῶν νόμων κηρανομένως. | [Θεοῦ οἰκοδομῆ ἐκδότη:] | 55 Βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος καὶ βασιλέας | Κλεοπάρα, ἡ ἀδελφή | Ἐφιλοῖος καὶ | [Τὸν ἐπετάκλαμεν τοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν πόλεων]

50 τεταμένους ἐπιτατὼν καὶ οὐ κεκακακῶν || [ἐξείλθει προστά-]]

ταμοῖς ὑποτεθάναμεν || [ὁμιλῶν τὰς τάξεις, ὅπως παρακολου-]]

θήτη.| Ἐπεὶ ὁδὸν σφηναδίκον μεθύτη τῶν ὑπὸ | [τὴν βασιλείαν]

τασσομένων παρὰ λόγων | σκύλλαντος, ἐναγάμης ἡ τοῦ προσ-]]

55 τάγματος γυνῆ νανὸ καὶ ἓρι τὸ παρ' ὑμῖν κείμενον δικαίωτον ὅτι | διάκρισα, ὅπως καὶ ἓρι τὸ λοιπὰ | καταπολεμήθησαν ἦν | τὰς αἰτήσεις | ποιηθόμενοι μὴν εἰρήνη προάγοντο. | Ἐφοδοσέθη: | 60 ['Ενος θ'], Τομπιείου κτ' | Φαμενθό κτ'. | [Βασιλεὺς καὶ βασιλίσσας προστάτου || ἧν ἑνική | ἐκθέτων ταταμενῶν | ἡ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ὑπὸ τὴν βασιλείαν]

65 τασσομένων ἀδύνατα αἰτήσονται || [ὁ κατη<ταμα>ν, μὴ παρα-]]

σφηναδίκος σφηναδίκος || [ὁ νὰ ἑκάστου | τῶν κατακολου-]]

θήτη. | Ἐπεὶ δὴν σφηναδίκος μεθύτη τῶν ἑπὶ | [τὴν βασιλείαν]

τασσομένων παρὰ λόγῳ | σκύλλαντος, ἐναγάμης ἡ τοῦ προσ-]]

70 τάγματος || [καὶ ἑρις τοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν πόλεων ταταμεи'ε[ν] | [προςεγγαραφών οἱ θεοὶ] Σωτῆρες | [ — —]
APPENDIX F

LES PAPYRUS DE LA FONDATION ÉGYPTOLOGIQUE REINE ÉLISABETH

III

FRAGMENTS DE CONTRATS PTOLEMAÏQUES.

Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire E. 7155; E. 7156 A et B.

Ptolémaïs Euergetés, 107.06 avant Jésus-Christ.

[...] les papyrus de la Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth.

FRAGMENTS DE CONTRATS PTOLEMAÏQUES.

Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire E. 7155; E. 7156 A et B.

Ptolémaïs Euergetés, 107.06 avant Jésus-Christ.

[Fragments de contrats ptolémaïques.]

Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire E. 7155; E. 7156 A et B.

Ptolémaïs Euergetés, 107.06 avant Jésus-Christ.

[Fragments de contrats ptolémaïques.]

Les papyrus de la Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth.

III

FRAGMENTS DE CONTRATS PTOLEMAÏQUES.

Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire E. 7155; E. 7156 A et B.

Ptolémaïs Euergetés, 107.06 avant Jésus-Christ.

[Fragments de contrats ptolémaïques.]

Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire E. 7155; E. 7156 A et B.

Ptolémaïs Euergetés, 107.06 avant Jésus-Christ.

[Fragments de contrats ptolémaïques.]

Les papyrus de la Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth.

III

FRAGMENTS DE CONTRATS PTOLEMAÏQUES.

Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire E. 7155; E. 7156 A et B.

Ptolémaïs Euergetés, 107.06 avant Jésus-Christ.

[Fragments de contrats ptolémaïques.]

Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire E. 7155; E. 7156 A et B.

Ptolémaïs Euergetés, 107.06 avant Jésus-Christ.

[Fragments de contrats ptolémaïques.]

Les papyrus de la Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth.

III

FRAGMENTS DE CONTRATS PTOLEMAÏQUES.

Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire E. 7155; E. 7156 A et B.

Ptolémaïs Euergetés, 107.06 avant Jésus-Christ.
Appendix F (Cont.)

LES PAPYRUS DE LA FONDATION ÉGYTOLOGIQUE

Ligne 1, lire Φιλοσοφήσαν — 1. 4, nous supposons que le papyrus présentait un blanc après Σευτάτης, comme c'est le cas l. 10 après γνωσι; sinon la restitution serait trop courte d'environ 8 lettres — l. 5, lire βασιλείαν — l. 14 et l. 15, lire πέμπτον — 1. 17, la lettre qui suit μετά pourrait être un μ.

E. 7156 B.

5 [...], περὶ τοῦτον ἦν [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. x εἰς ἔπειρα [...]. [...]. [...]. κυρίου τελεση [...].

10 [...]. στρατηγὸς [...]. ἐν τῇ ἡράκλεος [...]. Αὐτῷ πρὸς Περσάκλειδα [...]. ἐν τῇ συνοχῇ [...].

E. 7156 A.

5 [...]. θεῶν Φιλοσοφήσαν καὶ θεῶν [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...].

10 [...]. Αὐτῷ πρὸς Φιλοσόφησιν [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...]. [...].
APPENDIX G

P. ASHMOLEAN GR. 49

P. Ash. Gr. 49 (+P. Brussels E 7155, 7156 A, B) 1076 B.C.

A

[ἀντίγραφον συγγραφῆς ὁμολογ[ιας ]]

[Βαγ[λευντῶν] Κλειστάρας Θεᾶς Ἐδεργετῶν] καὶ Πτωλεμαίου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Αλεξάνδρου Θεῶν Φιλομητρῶν ἲτων(ε) ἐδίδακτον τοῦ καὶ φηδόν

ὦ [Περίδως βασιλέως Πτωλεμαίου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Αλεξάνδρου Αλεξ[άνδρου] καὶ Θεῶν Σωτήρων καὶ Θεῶν Ἀδελφῶν καὶ Θεῶν Εὐεργετῶν καὶ Θεῶν Φιλοσ[άρτων καὶ] Θεῶν [Ἐπισκόπων καὶ Θεῶν Ἐπιστάτων καὶ Θεῶν Φιλομητρῶν καὶ Θεοῦ Νόου Φιλοπάτωρος καὶ Θεοῦ Εὐεργετοῦ καὶ Θεός] Φιλομητρῶρρ]

5 [καὶ] ὃς [Φιλομητρῶρρ καὶ [εἰρεῖνς βαρηνότητος Κλειστάρας Θεᾶς Ἀφροδίτης (τ)ῆς καὶ Φιλομητρῶρρ Ἐλευθερωτοῦ τοῦ τῆς ψυχοστοργίας τῶν πατρῶν τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ στρατηγοῦ καὶ διδασκαλίας τῆς νήσου καὶ ναυάρχου κρατες τῶν ναυτικῶν τοῖς κατά τὴν βασιλείαν, ἑρεία[σ]

βασιλείας Κλειστάρας Θεᾶς Ἐδεργετῶν τῆς καὶ Φιλομητρῶρρος Χαμβαρύρου τῆς Ἀπολλ(ωνίου), ἑρεία τῶν Ἑσθανθὸς καὶ μεγάλης Αρχηγὸν] τοῦ Τιμιόδορον, ἱεραίας Ἀρωμήσεως Φιλαδῆτος τῆς Εὐεργετῶν τῆς Ἐλευθερίας, ἑταιρευσεῖς βασιλείας Κλειστάρας Θεᾶς Ἐδεργετῶν [Διο"


[δὲ καὶ Πᾶσι καὶ Φ]ραγμὸς οὐ καὶ Πάσι οἱ δύο] Λέωντος τοῦ καὶ Σενσοφότος μένει κυρίας ὡς τοι[ῃ]τιμαῖ πρὸς αὐτούς συγγραφᾶς Α[γυπτίας]

[πρὶν τῶν ....] καταλη[φθασ]εις ὑπὸ τοῦ προγκραμμένου αὐτῶν πατρῶν [Ἀδω]νώτους ὑπαρχόντων καὶ γερανῶν καθῆκτας ....[η]

[.... καὶ χ[είρ] τέθευσα] ....[....] .... τῷ ὁμοσπάρῳ αὐτῶν ἄδελφοι Ἀπολλ(ωνίῳ) τῶν καὶ Ἀρωμήσις οὐδέποτε [δὲ] τῶν εὐδύτης ....[η]


μέρους γερανῶν τριάν ἐπι[. ....] .... καὶ τέμπου δικαίως τῷ ἡμίσους τῶν χρυσομένων αὐτῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ Πτωλεμαίδου Ἐδεργετίδος

[τ]έμπου γερανῶν Ζω[ύ]χου θεοῦ [....] .... τῷ τέμπου δικαίως μέρους τῆς ἀποδομής αὐτοῦ ὡς ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἱερῶν ὁργῆς, 

δύον τε ἡν, ἕνον [νομοθετή τῶν ἄδελφ]ον Ἀπολλόφιγγον τοῦ καὶ Ἀρωμήτης· Μεταλλάτεις δὲ ξεκενήσαν, ἐξερευνεῖ τὰ προωρισμασμένα ....[/η]

[ ... ...] .... εἰς τοὺς αὐτούς Παρλαμ(α) καὶ Φανήν

20 [ ......] .... τὰ δύο μέρη ....] δὲ τοῦ Φιλαρ[αγ]

[ ......] .... αδείσσατι τοι[ουτῶν ....]

[ ......] .... μὲνδ[ ......] ....[ ......] ....[ ......] ....[ ......]

[ π]ρὸς τὸν ἔτεου μηδ[ ......] τοὺς ....[

[ ....] .... αὐτοῖς τρόπον ἤς ἐν αἰρέουται
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B

[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]

κληρον τελευτ[ 
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]

άντίγραφον χαραγμάτων. Χμμώνιοι [...]

Άπολλώνιοι καὶ Θεόδωρος, κατάκειται [...]

άντίγραφον ὑπογραφῆς. Παῦλος δὲ καὶ Πάσις καὶ Φανίας δὲ καὶ Πάις οἱ δύο Λέοντος τοῦ καὶ

Σεσοφυίνιτος [...]

ὁμολογῶν καθότι προαγάραπται καὶ τεβέλειθα τὴν συγγραφήν κυρίαν παρὰ Πτολεμαίου. ἕι[ραφεν ὑπὲρ

15 αὐτῶν — τοῦ — ἀξιωθῆ]  

diā τὸ φάσκειν αὐτοὺς μή ἐπιστησθῇς γράμματα.

C (a)  

D  

E  

\(\psi\)πογεγ\(ρ\)αμμεν  

\(\tau\)εα\(\) [...]

\(\varphi\)γραφφ

Χαίδα \(\delta\) [...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...] C (b)  

[...]

[...] E  

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...] FPM...

A1. l. σοφ.  2. l. Φολομηρίων.  3. Θε(α)ε: see Comm.  4. απολ(ν)ου: see Comm.  5. ιβατλαίον.  6. l. βασιλείαν.


and 16) perhaps rather than πέμμα, as edd. prr.; 1. πέπτου,  17 χειρῶν might be read as λεῖρων,  18 Ατ εἴποι, μέρη?

19 εἰς δὲ? See Comm.  20. ξειοσαν edd. prr.  21 νομος edd. prr.

B. ιουσθητετ. [...]: φροντισθητετ. οὐδε edd. prr.; θαι seems clear. See Comm.

C (a) and (b) are on the same line of vertical fibres, but it is uncertain which is to be placed above the other.

E. It is not certain that this fragment belongs to the foregoing text.
APPENDIX H (The portrait discussed by Havelock (1982, 269-276) cannot be reproduced here)

Temple Relief

Although the caption shows Ptolemy IX this is more probably Ptolemy VIII with the two Kleopatras (Quaegebeur, 1978, 256).

Portraits in Faience

Kleopatra II or III (Thompson, 1973, 93)
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Clay Sealings

Physkon, Kleopatra II or III / Kleopatra II or III
(7; mid 2nd c. B.C.)

(Thompson, 1973, Plate 74 and p.94)

PTOLEMAIC SEAL-IMPRESSIONS.

(Milne, 1916, Plate 5)

The Coinage

(Cleopatra III)

(Poole, 1963, Plate 23)

Right - Ptolemy VIII in Egyptian Dress
(Thompson, 1973, Plate 68, pp. 76 and 205)

Below - Kleopatra I
(Thompson, 1973, Plate 65, pp. 92 and 201)
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ADDENDA TO BIBLIOGRAPHY.


Mooren (1989, 573) has remarked that in the availability of contemporary documents as a resource to amplify the classical authors "Egypt occupies a privileged position". The papyri provide a firm basis for this and l'exploitation des monuments hiéroglyphiques et de la documentation démotique (Quaegebeur, 1989, 595) sheds additional light on the information given by the literary sources.

From the temple of Edfou come dedicatory texts and tableaux of dynastic cult depicting a long series of deified royal couples, often with the indigenous clergy. These have been examined for the information they can furnish to supplement existing sources in articles such as those of Quaegebeur (1971, 1978, 1983) already referred to in the body of this thesis. However, Cauville and Devauchelle (1984) in discussing the stages of construction of the temple of Edfou put forward some nouvelles données based upon their interpretation of reliefs and inscriptions in that temple and upon some demotic papyri, suggestions not made by earlier interpreters of the Edfou material such as E. Chassinat (Quaegebeur, 1989, 596, n. 4). Given the revolutionary nature of some of these hypotheses they have received surprisingly little attention in the ensuing years. There are responses from Thompson (1989) and Mooren (1988) while Quaegebeur (1989, 596/7 and nn.3-5) refers to Cauville and Devauchelle (1984) without comment.
Cauville and Devauchelle's theories include a novel suggestion upon the parentage of Ptolemy IX, Soter II. They propose that, although his paternity by Ptolemy VIII is unquestioned, his mother was not, as the literary sources state, Kleopatra III, the second wife of Ptolemy VIII, but Kleopatra II, the first wife of Ptolemy VIII. They opine (31) that la grande latitude laissée aux rédacteurs allowed them to display true facts through their mastery of hieroglyphs and that scant attention has been earlier paid by historians to inscriptions found at the bottom of the exterior wall of the naos of the temple because of the difficulty of access. Among the new theories emanating from their interpretation of Edfou inscriptions qui jettent une lumière tout à fait nouvelle (47) they give as evidence of this particular suggestion (40/41) an interpretation of Edfou VII, 9, 3-4 which reads in part that in the year 54 of the king on the eleventh day of the month of Payni (28th June, 116) the god looked towards heaven and his elder son appeared on the throne, the heir of the god Euergetes and the goddess Philometor Sotera.

Several papyri attest that Kleopatra III took the title of Philometor Soteira on ascending the throne with her son Ptolemy IX, Soter II, at the death of her husband, that she continued to reign with Soter as the Gods Philometores from 116/5 to 107/6 and that she retained this title at least until 105/4 during her reign with her son Alexander (see Appendix C, 245). However, in 132/1 Kleopatra II also took this title, during the civil war with her husband and daughter (above, 103) and this is the basis of Cauville and Devauchelle's claim that it was Kleopatra II who was the mother of Soter II, that she, and not Kleopatra III, ruled with him from 116/5 to 107/6 and that during this time Kleopatra III was exiled from Egypt until her return in 107/6 and subsequent reign with her son Ptolemy X, Alexander I until her death in 101.

The literary sources who attest to Kleopatra III's being the mother of Soter and reigning firstly with him and then, after Soter's exile, with Alexander, are
Pausanias I, 9. 1-3, Justin 39, 3.1-2 and 4.1-5.1 and Porphyry in Eusebius Chron., I, 164-6 (ed. Schone). Pausanias calls Soter "Ptolemy Philometor", saying of him that no other Ptolemy was known to be so hated by his mother (above 146 for discussion of this title for Soter II). None of these sources give any mention of an exile of Kleopatra III and subsequent return, although the alternating exiles of Soter and Alexander and the events subsequent to the death of Ptolemy VIII are dealt with in some detail in Justin's account. Cauville and Devauchelle's (48 and n.36) objection to the literary sources is that all three date from the second and third centuries A.D. and that the reliability of their sources cannot be established. These statements are difficult to deny, and, indeed, could be made of the work of other classical authors. As objections, however, Mooren (1988, 440) sees them as "gratuitous", pointing out that "If one cannot prove the trustworthiness of the sources, one still has to demonstrate their unreliability before discarding the information they provide. That all three authors are in agreement on the matter under consideration should make us very cautious in our verdict." To jettison sources purely on such grounds would create alarming gaps in the information available on the ancient world and both Mooren and Thompson (1989) have examined whether the information given by the classical authors in this instance can be upheld from other sources such as the documentation of the period.

In countering Cauville and Devauchelle's hypothesis that Kleopatra II was the true mother of Soter II, Mooren (1988, 439) emphasises that "The ancient authors who write about Soter's lineage explicitly cite Kleopatra III as his mother." His principal concern in this article is to establish the date of Soter II's birth rather than that Kleopatra III was his mother, of which he has no doubt (on Soter's birth date see above note 2 to Chapter 2, 234). However, in refutation of Cauville and Devauchelle's theory he points out (442) that had Soter indeed been the son of Kleopatra II, as they suggest, he would undoubtedly have been murdered by
Ptolemy VIII, as were Neos Philopator, Kleopatra II’s son by Ptolemy VI and Memphites, her son by Ptolemy VIII, both of whom represented a threat to Ptolemy VIII (Neos Philopator before the marriage of Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II and Memphites during the civil war).

Mooren also deals with the evidence of *cinq papyrus de Pathyris* (Cauville and Devauchelle, 49) for which they provide no reference. In search of these texts he found five in which the mother of Soter is called “the daughter of the Gods Epiphanes” (Mooren, 1988, 440 and n.34) a title which would, indeed, refer to Kleopatra II rather than to Kleopatra III. However, Mooren (440) has established that all five were written by the same scribe “thus forming but a single piece of evidence” commenting that “demotic scribes too could make mistakes”. Alternatively there is the contention that these papyri may contain a dating formula which goes back to the months during which Soter II reigned with both Kleopatra II and Kleopatra III for a short time after the death of Ptolemy VIII (Mooren, 1988, n. 34 and above 130/131).

As for the hatred of Kleopatra III for Soter II, attributed by Cauville and Devauchelle (48) to his really being the son of Kleopatra II, Mooren (1988, 443) suggests that this could be attributed to the trauma of his illegitimate birth in 142, some three years before the marriage of Kleopatra III and Ptolemy VIII. This premise could be doubted, however, as a child who was the outcome of an intimate relationship between the two well before their marriage would more probably have been welcomed by his mother as providing a bond with the king which would put pressure upon him to marry her. That Kleopatra III hated Soter II as an adult is not a unique situation for rival heirs to a throne. On the usual Ptolemaic system of primogeniture Soter II should have been the undisputed heir. That the throne was instead willed to his mother and her choice of son (above 120-123) brought about a situation highly conducive to mutual detestation. On Mooren’s (1988, 438 and n.26) theory of the date of 142 for the
birth of Soter II based upon hieroglyphic inscriptions linking it with the birth of an Apis bull on 18th February, 142 he expresses surprise that these inscriptions are not cited by Cauville and Devauchelle in support of their own theories, even though he is then at pains to discount those theories.

Mooren (1986, 443/4, n. 58) further discusses Cauville and Devauchelle's reconstruction of the period after Ptolemy VIII's death stating that "In my opinion this reconstruction cannot be maintained." This discussion concerns the question of the priesthood of the Sacred Foal of Isis, Great Mother of the Gods (on this see also above 103-106 and Appendix C, 245) which Cauville and Devauchelle (49) state to have been attested only from 131 to 106, linking this to Kleopatra II instead of Kleopatra III "which seems impossible to accept." Not only does the cult clearly belong to Kleopatra III in 131/130 (P. Leid. 373a) but instead of being *brusquement abandonné* in 106 as Cauville and Devauchelle (49) maintain, it still existed in 105/4 when Kleopatra III reigned with Alexander, the considerable evidence for which is given by Mooren. That the priesthood belonged, therefore, to Kleopatra III is clear and is further evidence that she is the Thea Philometor Soteira who reigned with Soter II from 116 to 107, during which period this priesthood was maintained.

Thompson's (1989) objections to the theories of Cauville and Devauchelle are based upon a detailed investigation of the contemporary papyri. Her study post dates Mooren's, which was delivered in 1986 although not published until 1988, and is referred to by Mooren (1988, 440, n.35) as being currently undertaken. Since Thompson's study was published I am unaware of any defence to its conclusions having been offered.

In Thompson's examination of a vast body of texts from the period she has concentrated upon three. The first of these, P. Cairo dem. 30.602 dated to 6th April, 115 (on this see also above 131) shows Ptolemy VI alone, a plural gods
Euergetes, which could include both Kleopatra II and III, and a reigning queen who is Thea Philometor Soteira Dikaiosyne Nikephoros. The question of whether this queen is Kleopatra II, as Cauville and Devauchelle would assert, or, on the orthodox view, Kleopatra III, is clarified by OGIS 739 of October-November, 112 which calls the reigning queen Thea Euergetis, who is also Philometor Soteira. This titulature discounts Cauville and Devauchelle's (48/9) assertion of a clear distinction of these titles with Thea Euergetis belonging at this period only to Kleopatra III and Thea Philometor Soteira only to Kleopatra II (Thompson, 700). In this papyrus both kings, Ptolemies VI and VIII appear alone, which leaves the only place for the reigning queen as part of the Theoi Philometores Soteres of the opening lines. Thompson (700 and n. 22) adds, however, that in papyri from Thebes a singular Ptolemy VI as Theos Philometor is regularly accompanied by a plural Theoi Euergetai, calling for very circumspect interpretation of this data.

Thompson's third protocol (Pestman, Recueil 5) again illustrates that Soter II's reigning queen might equally well be known as Thea Philometor or Thea Euergetis (on this see also Appendix C, above 245). Thompson's (701) conclusion upon all of this is of "a much greater flexibility in the nomenclature of the queen than Cauville and Devauchelle would allow to exist from the evidence of the Edfu hieroglyphs.....Orthodoxy may I think still stand. It was probably Kleopatra III who reigned with Soter II down to 107 B.C."

Both Mooren and Thompson raise compelling arguments to refute Cauville and Devauchelle's hypotheses. However, neither of them deal at any length with the issue of the double dating of the documents from late October 107, recorded in Eusebius (Chron., I, 164-6, ed. Schone) and attested by the contemporary texts. This system, in which the opening year of the reign of Kleopatra III and Ptolemy X, Alexander I, is given as year eleven of the queen and year eight of the king, dating Kleopatra III's reign from 116 and Alexander's from the beginning of his
rule in Cyprus from 114/3 (see above 159/160), is found in numerous papyri throughout the joint reign (cf. Samuel, 1962, 130, 151). Apart from the papyri, however, the coinage also gives evidence of this system. Coins of the joint reign of Kleopatra III and Alexander I consistently show the dates of both sovereigns in precisely the same fashion as do the documents of the period (Poole, 1963, 112, nos. 18-28, pl. 28. 1-2 and above 159/160), clearly affirming Kleopatra III's long reign since the death of her husband in 116. The dating of the coinage is an issue not taken up by Cauville and Devauchelle although they make a brief mention of the system (49, e) and attribute it to the time of co-regency of Kleopatras II and III and Soter II after the death of Ptolemy VIII.

The hypotheses of Cauville and Devauchelle on the parentage of Soter II and his co-ruler from 116 to 107 are refuted not only by the literary sources but by documentary and numismatic evidence too copious to be passed over. It might also be pointed out that the Edfou inscriptions which they use to sustain the theory that Soter II was the son of Kleopatra II were installed in the temple during the reign of Soter himself and presumably at his direction. Although at that time calling himself the heir of the Goddess Philometor Soteira, in accordance with the terminology he shared with Kleopatra III, there is no mention of any queen ruling with him and this alone is a negation of all other sources and affects the historical accuracy of the inscriptions. Similarly inscriptions Edfou VII, 9, 5-8 (Cauville and Devauchelle 52, 4) which describe Soter II as heir of the god Euergetes and the goddess Philometor Soteira and Alexander I as the heir of the god Euergetes and the goddess Euergetes make no mention of their co-ruler, Queen Kleopatra. Later references in 88 (Cauville and Devauchelle, 53) to Soter II simply as heir of the gods Euergetes are explained by the authors as attributable to Soter II's wish to efface the memory of dynastic quarrels. Such altruism being unusual in a Ptolemaic king the titles given him might more properly be attributed to a correct recording of his parents as Ptolemy VIII and
Kleopatra III as the Gods Euergetes, the title they held jointly during their marriage.

The parentage of Soter II and the identity of his co-ruler during the years 116-107, although of interest in the context of this thesis are, nevertheless, not crucial to its central argument which is that the reputation allowed Kleopatra III by generations of historians has unfairly denigrated both her character and achievements. Nevertheless, given that these nouvelles données have been put forward it is also interesting to note that they have been consistently refuted and, therefore, that the re-writing of the history of the period is not called for.
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