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ABSTRACT

The concept of woman-power existing in the highest circles of society in the Mediterranean world is proven, through a detailed study of the career of Cleopatra I. Cleopatra I, daughter of the Seleucid king, Antiochus III, wife of the Ptolemaic king, Ptolemy V, and mother of the Ptolemaic king, Ptolemy VI, became the first female regent in the Hellenistic period. Her regency was a crucial precedent for her female descendants, who all became joint co-rulers with their husbands and enjoyed much greater powers than any other queens before them. The difficulty of this study was in the lack of sources. Virtually nothing is known about Cleopatra I’s career and queenship, which, as a result, required a thorough discussion of not only her predecessors and their precedents, but also her own policies and precedents.

The thesis is divided into five chapters and fifteen appendices, the last six appendices serving as a sourcebook. Chapter One describes in detail the immense influence of the Ptolemaic ministers and their oligarchic faction at the court, especially during the reigns of the weaker Ptolemaic kings before Cleopatra I’s time, and. However, as influential as these powerful Ptolemaic ministers were, a strong monarch, such as Cleopatra I, was able to suppress their large influence on the monarchy. Having suppressed the influential ministers at the court, Cleopatra I utilised another group of courtiers. These courtiers, eunuchs, came from her own retinue and are the focus of Chapter Two. This chapter documents the introduction and institutionalisation of eunuchs into the Ptolemaic court by Cleopatra I. Much as Cleopatra I’s descendants had to rely on her precedents to gain influence and power at the Ptolemaic court, Chapter Three looks at Cleopatra I’s three most influential and important predecessors, Arsinoe II,
Arsinoe III, and Hatshepsut. These three queens were vital to Cleopatra I's future success, since each contributed greatly to Cleopatra I's acceptance and appointment as the first female Ptolemaic regent. The last two chapters of the thesis focus on Cleopatra I. Chapter Four discusses extensively the greater rights and privileges Cleopatra I enjoyed when viewed as the Pharaoh's Wife. However, even with these increased rights, Cleopatra I failed to be recognised and acknowledged any differently than her predecessors had. It is in the last chapter, Chapter Five, that Cleopatra I's power and influence at the court become manifest. This chapter discusses in what areas of the queenship Cleopatra I, during her regency, established new precedents and how her precedents and policies affected royal women not only in her own Ptolemaic kingdom, but also all over the Mediterranean.
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The Ptolemaic Kingdom in Egypt was one legacy of Alexander the Great’s vast
conquests\(^1\), although Alexander had never intended that it be divided up like booty
between his successors. Ptolemy I, one of Alexander’s \(\deltaιάδοχοι\), established one of the
most successful and wealthy absolute monarchies of the Hellenistic period, and founded a
dynasty lasting close to three hundred years. One factor contributing greatly to the
kingdom’s longevity was Ptolemy I’s successes in establishing a \textit{modus vivendi} between
the monarchy and its varied subjects\(^2\). On the one hand, he had easily won the loyalty of
his Greco-Macedonian subjects through his connection to Alexander the Great and his
Macedonian lineage. On the other hand, he had gained the support of the indigenous
people through his patronage of their native religion and institutions\(^3\), which led to his
acceptance by the Egyptian priesthood and his recognition as Pharaoh\(^4\). The necessity of
maintaining this balanced relationship between monarch and subjects, Greco-Macedonian
and Egyptian, remained a serious concern for each Ptolemaic ruler and determined their
success or failure as a ruler. The inability of a Ptolemaic ruler to control, assimilate, and
appease his subjects resulted in civil unrest and revolt within the kingdom. Rebellion

\(^1\) At the time of Alexander the Great’s death in 323 B.C. his empire stretched eastward from Macedonia
encompassing the entire Achaemenid Empire to the Indus and southward into Egypt (cf. Appendix D, Map
B “Alexander the Great’s Empire” and Map C “Map of the Successor States”).

\(^2\) In the Hellenistic period, the subjects of the Ptolemaics consisted of an indigenous Egyptian population,
emigrant Greeks, Jews, and other minorities: “ὁ γοῦν Πολύβιος γεγονὼς ἐν τῇ πόλει βεβλύττεται τὴν
tότε κατάστασιν, καὶ φησὶ τρία γένη τὴν πόλιν οἰκεῖν, τὸ τε Ἀἰγύπτιον καὶ ἐπιχώριον φύλον, ὄξυ
καὶ ἀπολιτικόν, καὶ τὸ μισθοφορικόν, βαρύ καὶ πολύ καὶ ἀνάγωγον ἐξ ἔδους γαρ παλαιὸν ξένους
ἐφρούν τοὺς τὰ ὀπλα ἐχόντας, ἀρχεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ ἄρχεσθαι δεδεσθέμενος διὰ τὴν τῶν βασιλέων
ουδένειαν πρῶτον δ’ ἦν γένος τὸ τῶν Ἀλεξανδρείων, οὐδ’ αὐτὸ εὐκρινῶς πολιτικὸν διὰ τὰς αὐτὰς
αἰτίας, κραίττον δ’ ἐκεῖνον ὄμως, καὶ γὰρ εἰ μιγάδες, Ἑλλήνες ὄμως ἀνέκαθεν ἦσαν καὶ
ἐμέμνηντο τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐθνῶς” (Strabo, Geog., 17.1.12). Cf. Bevan, \textit{Egypt}, Fraser
\textit{passim}, and Appendix D, Map D “Map of Alexandria”.

\(^3\) Bevan, \textit{Egypt}, 188. Essentially, the native Egyptians were bound to work for the Ptolemaic king whether
as royal peasants or as ‘tax-payers’. The priesthood formed the only privileged class of the natives
enjoying freedom from compulsory labour, allowance of retaining certain privileges of self-government,
and independence in their professional businesses (cf. Rostovtzeff, \textit{SEHHW}, 317ff.).

\(^4\) Cf. also Rostovtzeff, \textit{SEHHW}, 267ff.
largely originated in the Thebaid\(^5\) where native Egyptians tried to reclaim the Egyptian throne from the "foreign" Ptolemies and return the monarchy back to the "rightful kings": the last line of Egyptian kings who resided in the Thebaid region\(^6\). An even greater cause of concern for the Ptolemaic monarchy was the constant civil unrest within its new capital, Alexandria, where the Alexandrian populace acted much like the Praetorian Guard of Imperial Rome, making and breaking rulers\(^7\). One such serious incident resulted in the Bacchante-like slaughter of Ptolemy V's ministers, Sosibius and Agathocles in 202 B.C., by the Alexandrian mob\(^8\). Satisfying the interests of the Egyptian, Greco-Macedonian subjects, and the mixed Alexandrian populace was a difficult problem, but was eventually achieved not by a Ptolemaic king, but by a Ptolemaic queen, Cleopatra I. I believe that her unprecedented regency was a combination of not only her own forethought\(^9\) but also the existence of "ideal conditions".

"A woman's power has heretofore in the history of these houses\(^10\) always come from overpowering strength of character, combined with weakness in her husband's personality\(^11\) or from the position of regent for a minor son. The queenship of Cleopatra I from her prestige as a Seleucid princess, with a claim of some sort on Coele-Syria, her wealth and the vigour of her nature, together

---

\(^5\) Cf. Appendix D, Map A "Map of Egypt".


\(^7\) The Praetorian Guard of the Roman Empire from A.D. 41 onwards, in Claudius' reign, were crucial to the political intrigues of the emperor and only supported Claudius after he bribed them with a large donative. After murdering the Empire's successor, Pertinax, in A.D. 193, the Praetorian Guard became so powerful that it determined which leader would become their next emperor (cf. CAH VII, OCD\(^3\)).

\(^8\) This upheaval was the first instance of open hostility towards a palace group, in this case, the ministers: "Its importance lies in the fact that now for the first time, so far as we know, the lower element of the population, in this case no doubt largely Egyptian, was able to express its own strength" (Fraser, 118).

\(^9\) Cleopatra I realised a compromise was needed to be made between her Greek and Egyptian subjects. This compromise saw the continuation of some Greco-Macedonian customs, but also the institutionalisation of Egyptian traditions as well.

\(^10\) Macurdy is referring to the Hellenistic royal houses of the Macedonians, Syrians, and Ptolemies.

\(^11\) Macurdy has placed Ptolemy II and Ptolemy IV into this category.
with the fact that she was regent, does mark an epoch in the history of women’s power in Ptolemaic Egypt.”

Cleopatra I\textsuperscript{13} was the daughter of Antiochus (III) the Great, a Seleucid king\textsuperscript{14}, and Laodice\textsuperscript{15}, daughter of Mithridates II of Cappadocia. She became the first “foreign” Ptolemaic queen when she was given to Ptolemy V in marriage (193 B.C.)\textsuperscript{16}. As a foreign queen in the Ptolemaic kingdom she had many social and political obstacles to overcome. For instance, her Syrian background may have posed the greatest danger to her and also to the legitimacy of her offspring, since relations between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies were never truly amicable\textsuperscript{17}. Furthermore, she also had to deal with various elements of the Ptolemaic court: the ministers, who came from the most prominent aristocratic families, the royal bodyguard, the \textit{σωτροφοι} of the king, and her varied subjects (Greco-Macedonians, Egyptians, and Jews). Each of these groups posed a potential threat to her position. Despite this opposition, her exploitation of the strengths and weaknesses of the Ptolemaic monarchical structure, I believe, was one of the main reasons for her later success, her prototypical and unprecedented regency. However, for Cleopatra I, the first Ptolemaic queen to become the regent of Egypt, simply gaining the support of the largest faction, the native Egyptians, does not justify and explain her

\begin{footnotes}
\item[12] Macurdy, 47.
\item[13] \textit{PP VI.14515; RE 11} (1922), coll. 738-740, no. 14; and Macurdy, 141-147.
\item[14] \textit{Cf. Appendix B, “Seleucid King List”}.
\item[15] A powerful Seleucid queen in her own right. One indication of her political power is found in an inscription (\textit{SEG} 26.1226), which shows her communicating to her cities by letter, much like the governors of satrapies would. There is also mention in this inscription of her funding subsidies during times of crisis either from her own resources or from the crown resources (\textit{cf. OCD}\textsuperscript{3}, “Laodice [3]”).
\item[16] Cleopatra I was not connected in any way to the Ptolemaic house. \textit{Cf. Appendix A, “Genealogical Tree”}.
\item[17] The hostility of Ptolemaic Egypt towards the Seleucid Empire was part of the traditional Ptolemaic foreign policy and the policy of virtually all of the Ptolemaic ministers (like Polycrates, one of Ptolemy V Epiphanes’ last ministers, before the influx of pro-Seleucid sympathies accompanying Cleopatra I’s regency. (\textit{Cf. Will}, I.133-186.)
\end{footnotes}
success, her new institutions, and the power she possessed and passed onto her progeny. Thus, every element of the court and of the kingdom must be considered.

The aim of this study is, therefore, twofold. The first three chapters will examine the different institutions and individuals that influenced and made possible Cleopatra I becoming the first independent queen to rule Ptolemaic Egypt. The second aim of this study is to show what lasting impact Cleopatra I’s regency had on the different aspects of the Hellenistic world, but mainly on future Ptolemaic institutions and policies. In particular, the most evident and lasting impact of Cleopatra I’s prototypical reign is reflected in the changed political position, power, and potential of the Ptolemaic queens after her reign. Although her most famous successor was Cleopatra VII, the effects of Cleopatra I’s reign were already apparent in the case of her immediate successor, Cleopatra II\(^\text{18}\), and in respect to Cleopatra III\(^\text{19}\), whose recognised independent power lasted longer than any other Ptolemaic queen before her. Although the influence of Cleopatra I’s regency radically changed the Ptolemaic power structure, the effect of her reign on other Hellenistic dynasties was also very noteworthy, including that on her own native Seleucid kingdom. During the second century B.C., Cleopatra Thea, daughter of

\(^{18}\) Cleopatra II ruled together with a Ptolemaic king, Ptolemy VI, from 180-145 B.C. (cf. Appendix B, “Ptolemaic King List”). She was the first of the Hellenistic queens to achieve a recognised political equality with the king (cf. Appendix H; OCD\(^3\), 346-347; Macurdy, 150ff.; and Strack, 32ff. and 75).

\(^{19}\) Cleopatra III ruled jointly in Alexandria from 116-101 B.C. (cf. Appendix B, “Ptolemaic King List”). Although her reign was shorter than Cleopatra II’s, she had a greater impact on Ptolemaic matters. Macurdy (161) calls her “the most dominating of the Macedonian-Hellenistic Queens”. Some of the most significant lasting impressions of her reign was that, like Cleopatra I, her name preceded Ptolemy IX’s in the dating formula (OGIS 167, 738, 739) and in 105/4 B.C. she, instead of the king, served as priest in the royal cult (OCD\(^3\), 347). Her dominance and control of matters is perhaps best summarised by Justin (xxxix.4.6): “She richly deserved her infamous death – she had driven her own mother from her marriage bed, made two daughters husbandless by marrying them to their brothers in turn, made war on one son after driving him into exile and treacherously plotted the death of the other after robbing him of his throne” (Yardley, J.C. Justin: Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus. [1994] Atlanta, 251. Cf. Justin, xxxiv.4).
Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II, sat on the Seleucid throne uncontested as regent (126 B.C.)\textsuperscript{20}. Cleopatra I’s impact on the Hellenistic world is undeniable.

The greatest difficulty of this study lies in the lack of sources. With the loss of virtually the whole of Hellenistic historiography, one must rely on brief references in late epitomes and occasional allusions in often fragmentary and ‘insecurely dated literary and epigraphical texts’\textsuperscript{21}. Despite her association with so many famous rulers such as Antiochus III, Ptolemy V Epiphanes, and Ptolemy VI Philometor, Cleopatra I remains a curiously anonymous figure in ancient history, an anonymity extending into modern scholarship.

Ancient evidence dealing with the Ptolemaic dynasty is fourfold: literary, papyrological, inscriptional, and numismatic. Unfortunately, for one reason or other, none of these sources yield much in the way of confirming Cleopatra I’s achievements. Furthermore, virtually nothing is known about Cleopatra I’s involvement in Seleucid and Ptolemaic affairs, foreign and domestic, at anytime during her life. There is no contemporary Ptolemaic literary evidence and no direct reference to Cleopatra I’s position in the literary works of other ancient writers\textsuperscript{22}. Thus, Cleopatra I’s entire existence, as little documented as it is in the extant literary evidence, is very obscure. This documentary problem, however, is not restricted to Cleopatra I but represents a

\textsuperscript{20} Cleopatra Thea possessed a great deal of power and influence not only as regent in 126 B.C., but also during her joint rule with her son, Antiochus VIII Grypus (125-121 B.C.) (cf. Appendix B, “Seleucid King List”). Her power and influence, even during her joint rule, are clearly seen in her ability to coin her own image on the Seleucid currency. Most noteworthy, one issue portrays the jugate heads of Cleopatra Thea and Antiochus VIII, but with the unprecedented place of honour in the foreground occupied by the queen and not, as customarily, by the king (Morkholm, \textit{Coinage}, 28 and plate xliii.635 [tetradrachm from Sidon]).

\textsuperscript{21} Burstein, 197.

\textsuperscript{22} The only direct reference to Cleopatra I’s political position is from a passage from Livy. \textit{Cf.} Appendices H and CC.
major problem with respect to Hellenistic queenship, and history. Unfortunately, Cleopatra I’s case represents the extreme of this problem. There are no studies devoted to Cleopatra I alone. Only slowly, but still inadequately, have papyri collections from the reigns of Ptolemy V and Ptolemy VI begun to reveal that this rarely mentioned queen was of immense importance to the position and power of all Ptolemaic queens succeeding her.

The papyrological evidence constitutes the main source of information for the Ptolemaic dynasty; unfortunately, the vast majority of papyri comes from the Chora and thus does not refer directly to Alexandria and its affairs. The greatest proof and undeniable evidence of Cleopatra I’s political position and power is seen in her titulature – found in royal inscriptions and papyri – during the period of her regency.

The importance of Cleopatra I’s reign and her influence on subsequent Ptolemaic queens is also ignored and overlooked by modern scholarship. This is perhaps a direct reflection of the limitations of ancient scholarship, which saw no use for commenting on the political activities of women, although antiquity was rampant in gossip. Modern scholarship has also avoided the entire question of how much political authority Cleopatra I actually wielded. Her virtual absence from these sources is especially appalling considering the pioneering and only work to date on the inner politics and intrigues of the Hellenistic Queens was by Macurdy. Her work, while considerably out-of-date, still remains the single most important authority for its treatment of the

---

23 “Few important periods of history...are so unsatisfactorily documented as the Hellenistic Age. The evidence is jejune, fragmentary, and often ambiguous...” (Bell, H. I. and Skeat, T.C. Book Review on Walter Otto. Zur Geschichte der Zeit des 6. Ptolemaers. Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 21 [1935], 262).
25 This is none more clearly seen than in the Polybian tradition. Cf. Polybian excerpts in the Appendices.
importance and powers of Hellenistic queens – specifically the royal women of the Macedonian, Syrian, and Ptolemaic houses. It remains an invaluable study for its completeness.

The only individual studies on queens in Ancient Egypt are by Robins, Troy, and Tyldesley, but they only examine the queenship in Pharaonic times\textsuperscript{27}. Nevertheless, all three scholars are helpful in determining native Egyptian attitudes towards Cleopatra I’s position as queen and regent, since their discussions deal with native attitudes towards female pharaohs\textsuperscript{28}. The works of Robins and Troy are also useful for their insight on the status of queens at the Ptolemaic court when viewed as the Pharaoh’s wife\textsuperscript{29}.

Carney\textsuperscript{30} also discusses the advantages gained by Ptolemaic queens with their association and status as Pharaoh’s wife. This is particularly important in light of the Ptolemies’ gradual assimilation of a larger indigenous population. Although Carney does not specifically comment on Cleopatra I’s regency, her work is important in supporting my argument that Cleopatra I’s regency was instrumental in changing the entire future of the political position and power of later Ptolemaic queens. She does this in three ways, by discussing: i) the precedents set by earlier Ptolemaic queens, such as Arsinoe II, ii) the higher status Ptolemaic queens possessed as a result of being associated with Pharaonic queens, since Egyptian women enjoyed high status in general, and iii) the advantages the revival of Pharaonic sibling marriage brought to the queenship\textsuperscript{31}.

\textsuperscript{28} Cf. chapter three, section 3.3.
\textsuperscript{29} Cf. chapters three and four.
\textsuperscript{31} Carney, 436 and n. 38.
Next in importance are the works on the Ptolemaic royal house by Mahaffy, Bevan, and Bouché-Leclercq, inasmuch as they survey the entire dynasty\textsuperscript{32}. However, even with their focus on each Ptolemaic ruler from Ptolemy I Soter to Cleopatra VII, not more than a few pages are devoted to Cleopatra I. They give no credit to Cleopatra I for maintaining friendly relations with Rome and Syria, instead, they explain her reign as a time when there was peace and tranquillity only because the Romans, and likewise the Seleucids, chose to leave Egypt alone\textsuperscript{33}. This explanation appears very unlikely, in particular, considering the decades of dissension between Egypt and Syria. Their works also reflected the way in which Cleopatra I would continue to be viewed throughout time - as an insignificant Ptolemaic queen. However, this premature dismissal of Cleopatra I’s reign raises many questions. For instance, although each scholar acknowledges the fact that Cleopatra I became regent, the significance of this is passed over despite the fact that this was the first such occurrence in Ptolemaic, and indeed in Hellenistic, history. This hesitation to discuss Cleopatra I further is obviously quite deliberate.

Next, the work of Otto\textsuperscript{34} focused on those critical years and events during Ptolemy VI Philometor’s lifetime and Antiochus IV Epiphanes’ expeditions that “gave a decisive turn to the destinies of the Mediterranean world”\textsuperscript{35}. Otto makes some important conclusions when dating the birth of Cleopatra I’s and Epiphanes’ three children, but like debates surrounding Cleopatra I’s dowry, such discussions do not focus on the details of Cleopatra I’s regency and her creation of new institutions\textsuperscript{36}. Nevertheless, Otto’s work


\textsuperscript{33} Cf. chapter five.


\textsuperscript{35} Bell and Skeat, 262.

\textsuperscript{36} Cf. chapters four and five.
remains an important source for its documentation and interpretation of events in the second century B.C.

In very recent years greater attention and some credit has been given to Cleopatra I’s unprecedented political position and influence. For instance, she is now praised for the maintenance of good relations with the Romans and Syrians. Alberro is a representative of this new attitude: “while Cleopatra I lived, Egypt was quiet...but after the death of Cleopatra [I]...matters changed drastically.” The importance also of the Alexandrian populace to the Ptolemaic rulers has also been discussed in detail. Fraser provided an excellent examination of this group, and through this discussion it became clear that their approval and support were crucial to the Ptolemies. Their adoration also of their queens - becoming manifest during the queenships of Arsinoe II and Arsinoe III - was an important advantage to Cleopatra I.

Despite the lack of recognition of Cleopatra I’s brief regency, it was not as quiet and uneventful as the modern scholarly tradition leads us to believe. Nor did Rome dominate Ptolemaic affairs until the reign of Cleopatra I’s children despite Livy’s description of Ptolemaic matters. Cleopatra I’s foreign policy reflects a strong and stable Ptolemaic government, which was clearly pro-Seleucid and anti-Roman and, clearly from the titulature during Cleopatra I’s regency, there is proof of her political

38 Alberro, 58.
40 Cf. chapter three.
41 Cf. Appendix H and Justin, xxx 2.8.
42 Cf. chapters four and five on Cleopatra I’s foreign policy, which was pro-Seleucid. This is briefly acknowledged by scholars such as Davis and Kraay: “in silly opposition to the policy of the late queen [Cleopatra I]...[Eulaeus and Lenaeus] began a war against Antiochus [IV] Epiphanes of Syria” (167).
power and control. But before looking at Cleopatra I's regency, let us first turn to a discussion of the powerful and influential aristocratic families of the late third and early second centuries; the first important step in understanding how Cleopatra I became the first female regent.
A monarchy rules through an oligarchy...for the reconstruction of history it is equally important to know the oligarchs or aristocrats as the monarch himself, whatever this title may be.¹

Cleopatra I's need to utilise courtiers and ministers to achieve her ambitious goals is indicative of the increasing power of such individuals in the Ptolemaic court. This historical trend reveals the necessity of either co-operating with or suppressing this powerful group. It is not a coincidence that such a group is found in the heart of virtually every court cabal and coup in antiquity². Their internal, and sometimes external, connections with other prominent and important families were extremely complex and very often extremely secretive. Two of the most intricate internal networks can be found in the Achaemenid family of the Persian Empire³ and the Alcmaeonidae family of Athens⁴. In both cultures, members of these most prominent families were always present in their governments' framework whether publicly or covertly. Ptolemaic history and politics was no exception.

Thus, a discussion of the most prominent families in Ptolemaic history during the reigns of Ptolemies IV to VI is important to understanding Cleopatra I's influence and actions during her regency. Two observations will become apparent⁵. First, with the accession of a weak monarch, the aristocrats at the court formed a powerful oligarchic faction and dominated

---

⁵ Cf. Appendix E for a list of important ministers and court-figures at the Ptolemaic court during this period.
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Ptolemaic affairs through their many contacts and connections. Second, Cleopatra I was able to control these aristocrats during her regency, and thus directly decide upon Ptolemaic matters. Cleopatra I's control is proof that the influence of prominent families and ministers on the monarchy was confined to individual reigns, and that an able ruler could suppress these aristocratic courtiers.

The role of aristocratic families in court politics during the reigns of the first three Ptolemies has been little documented. Even when important members of the court ministry have been singled out, the importance and close relationship of the Ptolemaic king's 'friends' to the king did not lead one to suspect any forthcoming conspiracies or court cabals, since these "friends" were intensely loyal to their king. Ministers began to gain power independent of the king in the reign of Ptolemy III and already by Ptolemy IV's reign their interests contrasted those of the king's. Extant evidence from Ptolemy IV's court onwards is a little exaggerated, but problematic and greatly debated because much of it derives from Polybius.

1.1 Family Connections

Our best and earliest evidence of ministerial control is from Ptolemy IV Philopator's reign. Ministerial control, according to Polybius, began with the family of Sosibius. There is a discussion amongst modern scholars concerning whether Philopator was weak and powerless or whether he was a stronger individual than Polybius suggests, one who took great pains to install his foreign policies. The former has been argued by a number of scholars who believe that

---

6 PP VI.14545; RE 23 (1959) coll. 1678-91, no. 22; Samuel, 106-14; and Abel, K., Hermes 95 (1967), 72-90. Cf. Appendix AA.

7 This is the opinion of such scholars as Green, 290, 291; Bevan, Egypt, 222; Errington, JHS 99 (1979), 196-97 based on Polybius: “πανηγυρικότερον διήχει τά κατά τὴν ἀρχήν...” (v.34). Cf. Polybius, 62.7-8 and Walbank, 1564, who believes, from Polybius onwards, the literary tradition is hostile towards Philopator. Cf. Appendix AA
Ptolemy IV was completely dominated by the women and advisors around him, while the latter idea is supported by Huß who tries to credit Philopator with initiating ambitious overseas policies. Polybius, a contemporary of Ptolemy V and Cleopatra I, oftentimes is openly biased and hostile towards Ptolemaic rulers mainly because of his good relationship with Rome and specifically because of the Ptolemies' dealings with the Achaean League. Although biased against Rome's opponents, Polybius is nonetheless a contemporary to important events in Ptolemaic history and thus must be regarded as an important source. For instance, in Polybius' accounts of Sosibius' tactics and political decisions, one must be cautious but also open, since some truth may lie behind Polybius' accounts. It is necessary now to observe more closely the individual aristocratic ministers (and their families) from the reign of Ptolemy IV onwards, when these Ptolemaic ministers attained much influence over the monarchy and monarchic decisions. Through the discussion of these most influential ministers and their families, one will understand how completely these courtiers and their associates controlled Ptolemaic affairs and thus gain a greater appreciation for Cleopatra I, who was able to suppress this court oligarchy from the very beginning of her regency.

for other references to Ptolemy IV by other ancient writers.
8 Huß, W. Untersuchungen zu Außenpolitik Ptolemaios' IV. (1976) Munich, passim.
9 Sent to Rome as a political exile (in 169 B.C.), Polybius became a close friend and mentor to Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus.
10 I believe that it is no coincidence that those Ptolemies who had good dealings with the Achaean League were portrayed favourably by Polybius (i.e. Ptolemy VI). Likewise, those who had bad dealings with the Achaean League were condemned (i.e. Ptolemy IV and V). Polybius from a very young age was groomed and educated for a future position in the Achaean League, as his father (Lycortas) before him, who had been general of the league several times (for more on Lycortas, cf. Syll. 686; Polybius, xxii.3.6; Pausanias, 8.9.1, 30.8, 37.2, 48.8; and Walbank, II.483).
1.1.1 Sosibius

Sosibius' career had begun under Ptolemy (III) Euergetes, under whom he had reached a high position at the Ptolemaic court. Sosibius’ career represents the first evidence of the dominating influence courtiers could have on a weak ruler (i.e. Ptolemy IV). However, one must not forget that Sosibius had to attain a prestigious position at the court first whereby he could be promoted further when the opportunity came. Relatively little is known about Sosibius’ early career under Ptolemy III. The extant evidence only mentions his very important appointment to the eponymous priesthood of Alexander at Alexandria. Already, this appointment anticipated the control he would soon have over the Ptolemaic court.

The extant details of Sosibius’ career have been compiled in the table below. It reveals a successful and important political, religious, and military career.

11 PP I.48; II.2179; III.5272; IV.10100; VI.17239; RE 3 A (1929), col. 1151, no. 3; Bevan, Egypt, 220; Mooren, Titulature, 63-66, no. 18; Holleaux, III.47-54; Huß, 242-251; Green, 304; and Préaux, 155. Cf. Appendix EE.
12 PP VI.14543, 16297, 16943; RE 23 (1959), coll. 1667-78, no. 21; Samuel, 106-108; and Will, I.133-186, 216-364, passim.
13 Cf. below, 18.
### Table # 1: Family of Sosibius, son of Dioscurides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prominent Families (First Important Member)</th>
<th>Related Family Member in a High Position (relation in brackets)</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **SOSIBIUS, son of Dioscurides**           | (under Ptolemy III):                                          | - reached a high position at the royal court  
22 July 235 to 10 July 234 B.C.:  
- eponymous priest at Alexandria  
(under Ptolemy IV):  
- became Philopator's 'prime minister'  
soon had to share control of the government with Agathocles (under Ptolemy V):  
- through a false decree became the guardian of young Ptolemy V | - As the eponymous priest his name appears in the dating formulae of that year. |
| **PTOLEMY** (son)                          | (under Ptolemy V):                                          | - dispatched by Agathocles to King Philip V of Macedon as an ambassador | - Ptolemy immediately returned to Egypt after Agathocles' death. |
| **SOSIBIUS** (son)                         | (some time before the death of Agathocles):  
(under Ptolemy V):  
- a member of the σαματοφυλάκες “Gentleman of the Bodyguard” (under the new regent, Tlepolemus):  
202-201 B.C.:  
- entrusted with the royal seal | - Lost the royal seal in 201 B.C. after an unsuccessful attempt with his brother to depose Tlepolemus. |
| **ARSINOE** (daughter)                     | 14 Sept. 215 to 3 Sept. 214 B.C.:  
- καταφρονή in Alexandria | | |

---

14 Information on the family histories of the ministers at the Ptolemaic court is gathered from Bevan, *Egypt* unless otherwise specified. For information on his family, cf. Appendix EE.

15 *P. Petrie III.55a; IV.22*. An excellent chronological compilation of Ptolemaic Egypt's "Eponymous Priests and Priestesses" is found in Clarysse, W. & Van Der Veken, *passim*.

16 There is really no such position in the Ptolemaic dynasty. In the Ptolemaic dynasty the monarch is at the head of the state followed by his ministers, some of whom, if the king desires, may be designated with greater importance and rank. This "prime minister" position appears to be more an aspect of the Seleucid dynasty where the highest office at the court — next to the monarch — was that of "minister of affairs", which Hitti (chp. xix) connects to the continuation of the Persian office of vizier.

17 PP VI.14779 and RE 23 (1959), col. 1763, no. 47.

18 PP I.12; II.2947; III.5273; and RE 3 A (1927), col. 1152, no. 4.

19 For the condemning of Agathocles and his family cf. Polybius, xv.32.6-8.

20 PP III.5027.

21 *P. dem. Louvre* ined. 2328 (cf. Pestman, *Chronologie*, 39 and 128 n. 21); *P. dem. Louvre* E 9416; *P. dem. BM* 10377; and *B.G.U.* VI.1264 II.5-6, 1275 II. 5-6, 1276 II. 2-3, and 1277 II. 3-4.
Ptolemy IV Philopator was the weakest Ptolemaic king to ascend the throne since its establishment by Ptolemy I Soter and Sosibius took full advantage of him. Sosibius had gained such prestige and such respect at the court by the time of Ptolemy IV's accession that he was unquestionably appointed Philopator's "prime minister"\(^\text{22}\). There is no doubt from the literary sources that during the early part of Philopator's reign Sosibius controlled and governed the political affairs in Egypt: "Σωσιβίου δὲ τοῦ πλείστου ἐν τοῖς φίλοις δυναμένου (φήσαντος)"\(^\text{23}\) and "οὗτος γὰρ μάλιστα τότε προεστάτει τῶν πραγμάτων"\(^\text{24}\). It was from this position that he, according to Polybius, governed with "quasi-dictatorial powers" (ὁ νευδεπίτροπος) with Ptolemy filling the part of roi faînéant\(^\text{25}\). Furthermore, Philopator did not mind this subsidiary role as he was "indifferent to the character of the people whom he allowed to direct the affairs of the kingdom...as long as they provided him the means for a life of literary and aesthetic sensuality and saved him the trouble of governing"\(^\text{26}\). It was Sosibius' versatile roles and positions which served all of Philopator's interests. In Sosibius, Philopator had found an advisor, military officer, and priest. Using his immense political power and influence, Sosibius also quickly rid the court of his enemies, most of whom were members of the Ptolemaic royal family\(^\text{27}\). The death of each of these individuals clearly revealed his control over Ptolemy IV since, after making these suggestions,
Philopator still had to authorise their death sentences. Hölbl summarises Sosibius’ absolute authority and influence at the Ptolemaic court:

> Der König stand seit seinem Regierungsantritt unter dem Einfluß des mächtigsten Mannes am Hofe, des Alexandriner Sosibios. Dieser gehörte zu den intelligentesten und skrupellosesten Persönlichkeiten der hellenistischen Geschichte; über Jahrzehnte hinweg zeigte er sich allen hofischen Intrigen gewachsen.²⁸

From this point onwards, Sosibius would use his cunning to remain influential at the court throughout Ptolemy IV’s reign and even into the early reign of Ptolemy V: “σκέπος ἀγχίνων καὶ πολυχρόνων.”²⁹

Sosibius also had a very successful priestly career as well. From 22 July 235 to 10 July 234 B.C. he occupied the very prestigious post of the “priesthood of Alexander, of the Brother- and-Sister Gods, and of the Benefactor Gods” at Alexandria.³⁰ He was the first identifiable prominent courtier to gain this position without past family members having attained it first. It is as a result of this post during that same year that his name appeared in the dating of documents all over the realm. The importance and prestige of the eponymous priesthood is revealed by the fact that the name of the eponymous priest even preceded that of the name of the deified kings and their consorts.³¹ It is also significant that the eponymous priesthood from the mid-third century B.C., beginning with Alexander, father of Pelops, would be attained by courtiers out of whose families a member would play the chief role as the head of the aristocratic families at the Ptolemaic court at different times throughout Ptolemaic history. Thus, the eponymous priesthood was an indicator of power within a certain aristocratic family since individuals who held this distinguishing honour

---
²⁸ Hölbl, 111.
²⁹ Polybius, xv.25.1 and Walbank, II.481.
³⁰ Cf. Bevan, Egypt, 220ff.
³¹ Tarn, 51.
either had sons in influential positions or themselves became influential at the court later in their career. The list of prominent family members appointed eponymous priests at Alexandria (below) confirms this observation, since some of the most prominent ministers at the Ptolemaic court, or at least their fathers, had been eponymous priests:

264/263 B.C. Alexander\(^3^3\) (father of Pelops, who became prominent under Ptolemy II)
235/234 B.C. Sosibius ('Prime Minister' to Ptolemy IV in 222 B.C.)
223/222 B.C. Dosithoe\(^3^4\) (his son, Cines, becomes chief advisor to Ptolemy VI)
218/217 B.C. Mnasiadas\(^3^5\) (his son, Polycrates, a supporter of Agathocles)
216/215 B.C. Agathocles\(^3^6\) (becomes young Ptolemy V's guardian in 203 B.C.)
204/203 B.C. Aristomenes\(^3^7\) (becomes regent of Egypt in 201 B.C.)
187/186 B.C. Aristonicus\(^3^8\) (a eunuch is appointed an eponymous priest!)

The list of individuals who became eponymous priests also reveals some of the most powerful courtiers at the court who did not have to rely on ancestors to gain access into and have influence in the inner circle of ministers (i.e. Sosibius, Agathocles\(^3^9\), Aristomenes, and Aristonicus).

Last of all, there is a brief reference to Sosibius' military career as well, "τὸ δὲ τῶν Ἀιγυπτίων πλῆθος ἤν μὲν εἰς δισμυρίους φαλαγγίας, ὑπετάττετο δὲ Σωσιβίῳ."\(^4^0\) There are no specific dates for this military command, however, Egyptian troops were not used by the Ptolemies.

---

\(^{33}\) The seven ministers listed here (or their sons) were the only courtiers able to use the eponymous priesthood to gain immense influence at the court because the monarchy was at its weakest during this period from the mid-third century B.C. to the mid-second century B.C. Although there were numerous other annual magistrates at the Ptolemaic court before and after this period, the strong monarchy was able to control its courtiers regardless of their offices and posts.

\(^{34}\) If the son of Dosithoe, then PP VI.15854.

\(^{35}\) Cf. section 1.2.3 below.

\(^{36}\) Cf. section 1.1.2 below.

\(^{37}\) Cf. section 1.2.2 below.

\(^{38}\) Cf. chapter two, section 2.1.

\(^{39}\) Cf. Walbank, II.492 specifically refers to "Agathocles and his circle".

\(^{40}\) Polybius, v.65.9.
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until the Battle at Raphia (217 B.C.).

The number of individuals from one family appointed to important offices and positions directly reflected the amount of influence and power that family had within the court. Because of the number of generations a family could remain within the court, the future of that family was guaranteed to a certain degree by its progeny. Sosibius’ family exemplified such a strong family with each of his children having being appointed into very prestigious posts (above, table #1). Political influence and power originated from these powerful families, such as Sosibius'. Soon, political influence was found among the supporters of this central family, who eventually formed a powerful and interconnected oligarchic faction at the court.

Aristocratic court families, however, had much to lose with the accession of a new king. Usually, certain family members were immediately exiled or murdered by an opposing court family. For instance, the exile of an individual was proof that (s)he posed a threat to that minister. This was the fate of Sosibius’ son, Ptolemy. Nothing is known about Ptolemy except that in 204 B.C. he was ‘dispatched’ to Macedon as an ambassador immediately after the death of his father, which also coincided with the accession of Ptolemy V. Although nothing is known about Ptolemy’s career and importance at the court, the possible threat he posed to Agathocles is clearly revealed by his exile. Sosibius, Sosibius’ son, however, reveals the power and longevity of his family even though it required him to publicly condemn his father. Even more significant is his ready acceptance by the Alexandrians. Sosibius, son of Sosibius, then continued to serve as a very able minister and was widely trusted and admired by the Alexandrians so much so that he was

---

41 Polybius, xvi.22.3ff and Walbank, II.527 believe he was sent to Philip of Macedon in 204 or 203 B.C.
42 This episode is mentioned by Polybius, xv.32.4-6. Cf. Walbank, II.492, 526-527.
even given the prestigious role as the holder of the royal seal in 202 B.C.:

εδόξει γάρ οὗτος τὸν ἀριστεῖον προστάταν τοῦ βασιλέως ὁ φρονιμότερον ἢ κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν, τὴν τε πρὸς τοὺς ἐκτὸς ἀπάντησαν ἵναις ποιεῖσθαι τῆς ἐγκεχειρίσμενης αὐτῷ πίστεως· αὐτὴ δ' ἦν ἡ σφραγίς καὶ τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως σώμα.\textsuperscript{43}

The last mention of either brothers was their collaboration in opposing Tlepolemus, the regent (202-201 B.C.), immediately after the death of Agathocles\textsuperscript{44}. Whatever Agathocles had feared about Ptolemy, Sosibius’ son, revealed itself through this struggle of power within the court.

Later in the reign of Philopator, Sosibius was assisted in the running of the Ptolemaic dynastic affairs by Agathocles and his family: "λοιπὸν δὲ συνεδρέυσαντες οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἀγαθοκλέα καὶ Σωσίβιον, οἵ τῶν προεστῶτες τῆς βασιλείας"\textsuperscript{45}. It is not known precisely when Agathocles and Sosibius began to control Ptolemaic affairs together. Although Sosibius had acquired a partner in Agathocles, it is clear that by the time of his death he had still not firmly established an oligarchic network at the Ptolemaic court. Agathocles, on the other hand, did accomplish this task.

1.1.2 Agathocles\textsuperscript{46}

One of the most debilitating "accessions" in the Ptolemies’ history, which further weakened the dynasty’s core, was that of the young Ptolemy V Epiphanes in 204 B.C.; only six years old at the time\textsuperscript{47}. Ptolemy V’s accession revealed to all the existence of another authority behind the king’s power. For the first time in Ptolemaic history, all affairs of the Ptolemaic kingdom were unabashedly run by its courtiers. Although this type of control was already familiar to the

\textsuperscript{43} Polybius, xvi.22.1ff. (cf. Appendix EE) and Polybius, xv.12ff. (cf. Appendix FF).

\textsuperscript{44} Cf. footnotes 65-66.

\textsuperscript{45} Polybius, v.63.1.

\textsuperscript{46} PP I.14; III.4986; IV.10061, 10078; V.14047; VI.14576; RE I (1893), coll. 757-758, no. 19; Abel, K. Hermes 95 (1967), 86-90; Green, 304; Ijssewijn, 84-85; Mooren, Titulature, 67ff., no. 20; Mooren, Families, 289; and Préaux, 155. Mahaffy (128) had originally given him the more general classification as a Greek. Cf. Appendix FF.

\textsuperscript{47} The Rosetta Stone, dated to March 27, 196 B.C., was decreed in Ptolemy V’s ninth year to mark his accession (Mahaffy, 151). Cf. Will, I.93 and Walbank, II.283 on the guardianship of Hellenistic kings who were minors.
Ptolemaic subjects with Arsinoe II’s influence over her husband and brother, Ptolemy II, and Sosibius’ control over Philopator, Agathocles and his family completely controlled every aspect of the government: politically, economically, and religiously. Agathocles’ career is outlined in the table below:

Table #2: Family of Agathocles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prominent Families (First Important Member)</th>
<th>Related Family Member in a High Position (relation in brackets)</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AGATHOCLES                                 | (under Ptolemy IV):                                          | - shared control of the government with Sosibius 27 Aug. 216 to 13 Sept. 215 B.C.:  
                                         | * eponymous priest at Alexandria 48 (under Ptolemy V) 221-203 B.C.:  
                                         | * through a false decree became the guardian of the young Ptolemy V, but he had the leading role | - He reached a very high position at the Ptolemaic court soon after his arrival into Egypt (his family had migrated to Egypt shortly before Ptolemy IV’s accession).  
                                         | - Possibly because of Sosibius’ decease, soon after Ptolemy V’s accession, Agathocles played the leading role in the government. |
| OENANTHE 49 (mother)                       | (under Ptolemy IV):                                          | - nursed Philopator while he was still an infant 203 B.C.:  
                                         | * sent to her death | |
| AGATHOCLEIA 50 (sister)                    | (under Ptolemy IV):                                          | - mistress of Philopator 203 B.C.:  
                                         | * sent to her death | - Agathocleia and her mother, Oenanthe, dominated court life during Ptolemy IV’s reign and the earlier part of Ptolemy V’s reign. |

Agathocles’ first appearance and quick promotion to important political and religious positions within the Ptolemaic dynasty are as mysterious as that of Sosibius. However, Agathocles’ career and Sosibius’ choosing him essentially to act as his successor would be more justified if Hölbl’s suggestion that Agathocles was “ein Jugendfreund des Philopator” was correct 51. As already observed in the case of Sosibius, Agathocles held the position of eponymous priest to Alexander during Ptolemy IV’s reign – no doubt under Sosibius’ instruction. At the

48 B.G.U. VI.1262 II. 2-3, 1283 II. 2-4; P. dem. Louvre 3263; and SB III.6303 II.2-3.
49 PP VI, 14714; RE I (1894), coll.747-48, no. 2; JEA 31 (1945), 74; and Ijsewijn, 84-85 sub. no. 71.
50 PP VI, 14731; RE 17 (1937), col. 2189, no. 6; JEA 31 (1945), 74; and Ijsewijn, 84-85 sub. no. 71.
51 Hölbl, 112.
accession of the young Epiphanes in 204 B.C., Agathocles did not appear to have as much political influence and authority as Sosibius had when he was appointed Philopator’s “prime minister”, although Agathocles had certainly by this time attained a very high position at the court:

Unlike Sosibius’ appointment to his important post as “prime minister” to Ptolemy IV, Agathocles used more unconventional means to gain power and control under Epiphanes. According to Polybius, Agathocles forged a false decree, which made himself and Sosibius the rightful regents and guardians of Epiphanes:

Agathocles also resorted to bribery to retain the loyalty of his subjects and the Ptolemaic army:

There is another important difference between Sosibius’ control of the Ptolemaic kingdom and that of Agathocles. Unlike Sosibius, who dominated the king and his affairs, the trio of Agathocles, his sister, Agathocleia, and his mother, Oenanthe, were jointly involved in the control of the government, that is, of the royal family.

Agathocleia and Oenanthe, with one serving as the king’s wet-nurse and the other as his mistress, played the largest roles during Philopator’s reign:

---

52 Polybius, xv.34. Walbank, II.494 comments on ministerial control: “βασιλείς ἐκ βασιλέων μεταχειριζόμενοι.”
53 Polybius, xv.25.3ff and Walbank II.482.
54 Polybius, xv.25.11.
The extent to which these two women influenced Philopator varies in the sources. Plutarch, for example, believed that these two women controlled the dynasty. Plutarch’s source was Cleomenes, King of Sparta, who was in Egypt at this time and therefore a reliable source. Other sources also acknowledge the influence of Agathocleia and Oenanthe:

That Agathocleia and Oenanthe had dominating roles at the Ptolemaic court is argued by Bouché-Leclercq: “Non contents de dominer le roi, ils possédaient maintenant le royaume; ils se montraient en public, on les saluait, ils avaient leur cortège. Agathocle, toujours à côté du roi, gouvernait l’État; les femmes distribuaient les places de tribuns, de préfets, de généraux, et nul n’avait moins d’autorité dans le royaume que le roi lui-même”.

In turn, these two women dominated the young Epiphanes. Understandably, the rage of the Alexandrian mob was also directed at them, since they shared equally with Agathocles in the corruption of the kingdom.

In summary, an examination of Sosibius’ and Agathocles’ careers at the Ptolemaic court reveals that their attaining power for themselves and for their family members were not accidental occurrences. Indeed, several factors had to be present. First, the monarchy had to be weak, thus allowing the courtiers to take control. Second, once in control it was very hard to suppress their

---

56 Athenaeus, xiii.577.a.
power not only because of the strength of the central family, but also the many connections this central family had with other aristocratic families. Agathocles’ household is the best example of such a family because together with Agathocleia and Oenanthe, these three dominated and influenced all Ptolemaic affairs. Furthermore, Agathocles established an oligarchic faction at the court with his connections to various other prominent aristocratic families. With these factors present, eventual control by such individuals at the accession of each new monarch would be more easily accepted and more natural. However, it was these very networks of courtiers that Cleopatra I successfully controlled and used to promote her own power\textsuperscript{59}. It is to those other prominent courtiers that I now turn.

1.2 Other Prominent Families

It is not enough to acknowledge Sosibius’ and Agathocles’ possession of a certain amount of influence within the Ptolemaic government without recognising their deeper internal court connections - the oligarchic faction - that were essential to help “influence” and control the monarch. The cover up of Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III’s deaths is the best attestation of Sosibius and Agathocles’ strong political connections\textsuperscript{60}, suggesting that they received formidable support from other prominent Greek families. In turn, Agathocles’ connections with several other prominent families is revealed by the promotions these families received because of their association with him:

\textsuperscript{59} Although this oligarchic faction was gaining influence on the weak monarchy beginning in Ptolemy IV’s reign, Cleopatra I’s regency not only diminished their influence over the monarchy, but also curbed their power.

\textsuperscript{60} Cf Polybius, xv.25 and Appendix F.
Likewise, families considered a threat were quickly eradicated, exiled, or murdered. Agathocles rid the Ptolemaic court of his rivals by sending some away to serve as ambassadors to the other Hellenistic kings. Most prominent of these “exiled” individuals was Ptolemy, a son of Sosibius, although numerous other sons from other prominent families were also sent out of Egypt.

Agathocles then replaced those vacant positions with his own adherents:

Despite Agathocles’ scheming and bribing aimed at winning support for himself among the aristocracy, the Alexandrian populace did not accept his regency and guardianship very willingly. In fact, the literary evidence reveals that Epiphanes’ subjects were simply waiting for another powerful individual to depose Agathocles and to give back rightful power to the monarch and his family. This new leader of the people was Tlepolemus.

---


62 Cf. above, 15, 19 and Polybian passage (xv.12ff.) below.

63 Cf. Mooren, Families, 290. In replacement of these other courtly figures, Agathocles “καὶ τὰς μὲν τῶν φίλων χώρας ἀνεπλήρωσε, παρεισαγαγὼν ἐκ τῆς διακονίας καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ὑπηρεσίας τοὺς εἰκασιότατος καὶ βρασυτάτος” (Polybius, xv.25.20-21). It is hard to believe that others ministers at the court would have gone so far as to accept these servants and attendants into their circle.

64 Polybius, xv.12ff.

65 “τῷ δὲ μηδὲν ἔχειν πρόσωπον ἄξιοντος τοῦ προστάτους, καὶ δι’ ἓν τὴν ὀρθὴν εἰς τὸν Ἀγαθοκλέα καὶ τὴν Ἀγαθοκλέας ἀπερείστονται, τὴν ἠτυχίαν ἦν, ἐπὶ μιᾶν ἐλπίδα καραδοκοῦντες τὴν κατὰ τὸν Τληπόλεμον καὶ ταῦτης προσανέχοντες” (Polybius, xv.25.25.) Cf. Polybius, xv.25.35-36 and Walbank, II.487 for the growing conflict between Agathocles and Tlepolemus.
1.2.1 Tlepolemus

Tlepolemus had been initially promoted through the ministerial ranks by Agathocles. Tlepolemus’ early career is obscure, although from the literary evidence it is known he had acquired the very prestigious post of στρατηγὸς at Pelusium as a result of his support for Agathocles. Unfortunately, aside from a brief mention of Tlepolemus as the στρατηγὸς, nothing else is known about him (below, table #3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table #3: Tlepolemus, son of Artapates III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prominent Families (First Important Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLEPOLEMUS, son of Artapates III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the growing discontent against Agathocles and his family, Tlepolemus soon realised his immense support both from the army and from the populace. It was not long before he schemed to rid Agathocles and his family and to acquire the regency for himself:

66 PP I.50, 337; II.2180; III.5288; VI.14634, 14787; VIII, 50; and RE 6 A (1937), col. 1618-1619, no. 6. Cf. Walbank, II.487, who comments on the possibility of Tlepolemus being of Persian descent.

67 Cf. Bevan, Egypt, 255-257.

68 Polybius, xvi.21.1, 22.6-11; and Walbank, II.525-526.

69 Polybius, xv.25.25ff, 26.5ff, 27.1ff, 29.6. Cf. Walbank, II.487, who believes that Tlepolemus was appointed to this post by Sosibius.
Tlepolemus appears to have been a popular soldier and commander, but he was not successful as a regent. The Alexandrian populace soon tired of him and sought another individual to replace him. They soon turned to Sosibius, son of Sosibius:

With the death of Agathocles, the struggle at the court became one between Agathocles’ supporters and his returning rivals. Importantly, these courtiers became regents or close advisors to the monarchy through the support of the Alexandrian populace. After the death of Agathocles and his family, the Alexandrian populace became a large factor in determining the king’s advisors and regents. This is also the case with Aristomenes, regent after Tlepolemus.

1.2.2 Aristomenes

The next important figure at the Ptolemaic court was Aristomenes, a forgotten figure amidst the turmoil surrounding the dominating figures of Sosibius and Agathocles. An Acarnanian, he came to Egypt some time after 216 B.C. and quickly and quietly rose through the ranks, no doubt as a result of his good relations with and support of Agathocles early in his career. When next we hear of Aristomenes he had already been appointed one of Ptolemy V’s

---

70 Polybius, xv.25.26ff. For more on his supporters cf. Polybius, xv.25.26ff., 29.3-4 and footnote 65.
71 Cf. Mooren, Families, 255ff.
72 Cf. above, footnotes 18, 42, 43.
73 Polybius, xvi.22.1ff. Cf. Wallbank, II.526.
74 PP I.19, III.5020; VI.14592; RE 2 (1895), col. 948, no. 2; Ijsewijn, 86-87, no. 83; Diodorus Siculus, xxviii.14; and Polybius, xv.31.6-12. Cf. Wallbank, II.492.
75 Cf. Polybius, xv.31.4ff.: "οἱ δὲ περὶ τῶν Ἀγαθοκλέα, βλέποντες ἡδη τὰ καθ’ αὑτοὺς, ἐδέντο τῶν σωματοφυλάκων προσβηθῆι περὶ αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς Μακεδόνας, δηλοῦντας ὅτι τῇ ἐπιτροπείᾳ ἐκχωροῦσιν"
bodyguards, followed by an eponymous priesthood, and before long he was appointed as the guardian and regent of Ptolemy V. The career of Aristomenes is outlined below:

Table # 4: Aristomenes, son of Menneas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prominent Families (First Important Member)</th>
<th>Related Family Member in a High Position (relation in brackets)</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARISTOMENES, son of Menneas</td>
<td>after 216 B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• an Acarnanian who came to Egypt (under Ptolemy V)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• appointed by Agathocles alone as a Bodyguard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• perhaps commanded the Macedonian troops at Alexandria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• eponymous priest at Alexandria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• regent of Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• fell into disgrace and was replaced as regent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aristomenes is highly praised in the literary tradition as “an admirable and virtuous administrator” serving the king’s needs no less than he had catered to the needs of Agathocles:

ο δὲ άνήρ οὐδὸς τὸ μὲν γένος ἦν Ἀκαρνάν, καθ’ ὅσον δὲ προβαίνων κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν, γενόμενος κύριος τῶν ὀλίων πραγμάτων, κάλλιστα καὶ σεμιτάτα δοκεῖ προστίθηναι τῷ τε βασιλείᾳ καὶ τῇ βασιλείᾳ, κατὰ τοσοῦτον κεκολακευκέναι τὴν Ἁγαθόκλειος εὐκαρίαν. πρῶτος μὲν γὰρ ὡς ἐαντὸν ἐπὶ δείπνων καλέσας τὸν Ἀγαθόκλην χρυσοῦν στέραν ἀνέδωκε μόνη τῶν παρόντων, δ’ τοῖς βασιλεῖσιν αὐτοῖς ἑδος ἐστὶ μόνῳ συγχωρεῖσθαι, πρῶτος δὲ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ προερημένου φέρειν εὐλόμησεν ἐν τῷ δακτυλῷ γενόμενης δὲ θυγατρός αὐτῷ ταύτῃ Ἁγαθόκλειον προσηγόρευσεν.

καὶ τῆς ἀλλής ἐξουσίας καὶ τῶν τιμῶν, ἐτὶ δὲ τῶν χορηγῶν ἄν ἔχουσι πάντων, αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ πνευμάτων δέονται συγχωρηθῆναι σφιχὶ μετὰ τῆς ἀναγκαίας τροφῆς. ἰνα χαρήσαστες εἰς τὴν εξ ἀρχῆς διάθεσιν μηδὲ βουληθέντες ἐτὶ δύνανται λυπεῖν μηδένα. τῶν μὲν οὖν ἄλλων σωματοφυλάκων οὐδεὶς ὑπήκουσεν, Ἀριστομένης δὲ μόνος ὑπέστη τὴν χρείαν ταύτῃ ὁ μετὰ τινα χρόνον ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων γενόμενος.”

76 Polybius, xv.31.7ff.
77 Cf. Polybius, xv.31.6-12.
78 The most famous episode of Aristomenes and his amiable relationship to Agathocles is mentioned by Polybius, xv.31.4ff. when only Aristomenes offered to help Agathocles when his favour with the people had ended: “οἱ δὲ περὶ τῶν Ἀγαθόκλεα, βλέποντες ἦν τα καθ’ αὐτοῖς ἐδόντα τῶν σωματοφυλάκων προσβλέπεια περὶ αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς Μακεδόνας, δηλοῦσας ὅτι τῆς ἐπιτροπείας ἐκχωροῦσι καὶ τῆς ἀλλής ἐξουσίας καὶ τῶν τιμῶν, ἐτὶ δὲ τῶν χορηγῶν ἄν ἔχουσι πάντων, αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ πνευμάτων δέονται συγχωρηθῆναι σφιχὶ μετὰ τῆς ἀναγκαίας τροφῆς, ἰνα χαρήσαστες εἰς τὴν εξ ἀρχῆς διάθεσιν μηδὲ βουληθέντες ἐτὶ δύνανται λυπεῖν μηδένα. τῶν μὲν οὖν ἄλλων σωματοφυλάκων οὐδεὶς ὑπήκουσεν, Ἀριστομένης δὲ μόνος ὑπέστη τὴν χρείαν ταύτῃ ὁ μετὰ τινα χρόνον ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων γενόμενος.” Cf. Cary, 217.
79 Polybius, xv.31.7ff. Cf. Bevan, Egypt, 257.
Although Aristomenes was regarded highly, it was his unique anti-Roman and pro-Seleucid views which contributed to the great dislike of him at the Alexandrian court, probably mirroring Ptolemy V's growing displeasure towards him. Aristomenes' political views were, perhaps, enough reason for his rivals to hate or fear him. The fear felt among the courtiers may be reflected in Epiphanes' changed attitude towards him. Epiphanes had revered Aristomenes like a father, but now suddenly sentenced him to death. Aristomenes' falling out of favour with Epiphanes was thus a combination of his foreign policies and the scheming of his enemies at the court:

"Οτι ο Πτολεμαίος ο της Αιγύπτου βασιλεύς μέχρι μέν τινος ἐπηνεῖτο. Ἀριστομένη δὲ τὸν ἐπίτροπον αὐτοῦ γεγενημένον καὶ πάντα καλὸς διώκηκότα τὴν μὲν ἀρχὴν ἡγάσα καθαπερεὶ πατέρα καὶ πάντα ἔπραττεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἑκείνου γνώμης. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ὑπὸ τῶν κολαχευόντων διαφθαρεῖς τὴν ψυχὴν τὸν ε ᾽ Ἀριστομένην παρρησιαζόμενον ἐμίσησε καὶ τέλος συνισνάγκασεν αὐτὸν πάντα κάνειν τελευτῆσαι."

Aristomenes had similar views to Cleopatra I concerning Ptolemaic foreign policy. Cleopatra I's policies are reflected in the years of peace between the Ptolemaic and Seleucid kingdoms when she became regent (180-176 B.C.). This may suggest that Aristomenes was also loyal to Cleopatra I, and possibly another reason for his enemies to plot against him. Unfortunately, there is no extant evidence to prove this theory. Thus, unsatisfied with Aristomenes, the Alexandrian populace soon turned to another courtier who had more familiar views in terms of foreign policy. We turn next to Polycrates.

1.2.3 Polycrates

After Aristomenes' demise, Polycrates and members of his family reached prominent posts.
within the Ptolemaic kingdom. We hear of him for the first time with his appointment to numerous distinguished military posts in the early part of the third century B.C. Polycrates owed his promotions mainly to Sosibius and Agathocles\(^{82}\) and became a very influential and important minister to both Ptolemy IV and Ptolemy V\(^{83}\). Typical of the prominent aristocratic court families, Polycrates' family had also been powerful at the height of his ministerial influence. Polycrates' early career had relied on the support of Sosibius and Agathocles, however, Mnasiadas, his father, had been the distinguished eponymous priest the year (218/217 B.C.)\(^{84}\) before Agathocles thus forecasting the future importance of his family members. Although, Polycrates required Agathocles for his early appointments, Polycrates' career continued to thrive after Agathocles had died therefore revealing the extent of influence this powerful aristocratic family enjoyed at the Ptolemaic court.

Polycrates' career began with several important military posts\(^{85}\) and in 203 B.C. he became \(\sigma\rho\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\omicron\omicron\) of Cyprus. He acquired this post after Agathocles' death, receiving this appointment independent of the powerful ministers, Sosibius and Agathocles, but with the support of the Alexandrian populace\(^{86}\). Cyprus, along with Cyrenaica, Syria, and Phoenicia, formed the four vital areas of Egypt's frontiers that protected the Ptolemaic dynasty from both land and naval attack\(^{87}\). The \(\sigma\rho\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\omicron\omega\) of each of these areas, especially Cyprus, were the most trusted and influential ministers of the Ptolemies and "were always among the highest-ranking administrators in the

---

\(^{82}\) \(PP\) II.2172. \(Cf\). Polybius, v.64.4-7, 65.5, 82.3, 84.8. \(Cf\). Walbank, I.589; II.490.

\(^{83}\) \(PP\) VII.14546, 17232; \(RE\) 23 (1959), coll. 1691-1702, no. 33; Samuel, 108-114, \(Gnomon\) 38 (1966), 714-715; Abel, K. \(Hermes\) 95 (1967), 72-90; Moorcn, \(Hi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\epsilon\chi\iota\chi\iota\epsilon\iota\epsilon\varsigma\) 42; and Polybius, xviii.55.5.

\(^{84}\) \(Cf\). above, 18 and below, footnote 91.

\(^{85}\) Polybius, v.64.4-7, 65.5, 82.3, 84.8. \(Cf\). Bevan, \(E\gamma\nu\gamma\iota\) 227 and Bouché-Leclercq, \(Lagides\), 1.291.

\(^{86}\) Bouché-Leclercq, \(Lagides\), 1.291 and Bagnall, 219.

\(^{87}\) Bagnall, 240.
service of the Ptolemies, and in the second century B.C. they were the most exalted Ptolemaic officials outside Egypt. Although clearly an advocate of Agathocles and Sosibius, through whom he had been promoted to his various military posts, Polycrates’ career did not suffer as he was not incriminated along with Agathocles’ and his supporters by the Alexandrian mob as a traitor against the monarchy.

Polycrates’ died in 185 B.C. while trying to suppress the Egyptian revolts. He had become one of Ptolemy V’s most influential ministers. Indicative of the longevity of prominent aristocratic families in Egypt, Polycrates’ family continued to thrive and to obtain positions of importance at the Ptolemaic court.

Polycrates’ family history thus reveals the depth of an aristocratic family. With the death of an influential minister, there was always another to take his place. Polycrates replaced Aristomenes as regent in 192 B.C. amidst much Egyptian support. It is perhaps not coincidental that his past association with the Egyptian people – when he was given the task of training the new native recruits in 217 B.C. – was one of the factors that gained him popular support and led to his promotion to regent in 192 B.C. The successful careers of each of Polycrates and his distinguished family members have been compiled in the table below:

---

88 Pomeroy, 42. Cf. Bagnall, 219. Walbank (II.627) comments on Polycrates’ rough period at this important post “owing to the threat from Antiochus and perhaps Philip”.
89 Cf. Mooren, Families, 292.
90 The introduction of this new policy to the army resulted in a greater influence of the native element on Egyptian life (Walbank, I.592).
### Table # 5: Family of Mnasiadas, son of Polycrates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prominent Families (First Important Member)</th>
<th>Related Family Member in a High Position (relation in brackets)</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MNASIADAS</strong> of Argos, son of Polycrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTOLEMY (son)</td>
<td>218/217 B.C.:</td>
<td>• eponymous priest in Alexandria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7):</td>
<td>• bore the title ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ</td>
<td>- Mooren ranks the titular honours in the following order by their importance: 1. ὁ συγγενής 2. τῶν πρῶτων φίλων 3. ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ τῶν ἀρχισωματοφύλακτων 4. τῶν φίλων 5. τῶν διαδόχων 6. τῶν σωματοφύλακτων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLYCRATES (son)</td>
<td>soon after 220 B.C.:</td>
<td>• entrusted with a high military command (by Sosibius and Agathocles)</td>
<td>- Despite the gap in our sources between 217 to 203 B.C., Bagnall believes that Polycrates continued to rise in his position based on the high position of his female relatives around the period of Philopator’s and Arsinoe III’s deaths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(pre-Battle of Raphia):</td>
<td>• enrolled and trained the 100’s of native Egyptians in the native phalanx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>217 B.C. (Battle at Raphia):</td>
<td>• commanded cavalry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>203(?)-197 B.C.:</td>
<td>• στρατηγός of Cyprus, succeeding Pelops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(around Agathocles’ death):</td>
<td>(7): bore the title τῶν πρῶτων φίλων</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>197 B.C.:</td>
<td>• at Ptolemy V’s Anakeleteria, he played the most prominent role in the ceremony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>192(?)-197 B.C.:</td>
<td>• replaced Aristomenes as regent/prime minister</td>
<td>- His foreign policy was for Egypt to alienate the Seleucid Dynasty and to support the Romans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>185/4 B.C.:</td>
<td>• fought against rebellious Egyptians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLYCRATES (II, son of Polycrates)</td>
<td>(7):</td>
<td>• bore the title πρῶτος φίλος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERMIONE (daughter of Polycrates II)</td>
<td>170/59 B.C.:</td>
<td>• ἀθλησσαρή in Alexandria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLYCRATES (son of Polycrates II)</td>
<td>(7):</td>
<td>• bore the title ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

91 *Cf.* Polybius, xviii.55.5.
92 *PP VI.* 15233, 15770.
93 *Cf.* Polybius, v.64.4-6, 65.5, 82.3, 84.8.
94 *OGIS* I.90 n. 20; *SEG* xx.194; *SB* VIII.10108; and Polybius, xviii.55.6.
95 *Cf.* Polybius, xiii.54.1, 55.4.
97 *Cf.* Polybius, xxii.17.3, 17.7.
98 Mooren, *Hiérarchie,* 36.
99 *Cf.* Bagnall, 253. Bagnall bases his argument on Polybius’ account (xv.29.10) of how Polycrates’ relatives tried to console Oenanthe, but being rebuffed cursed her heartily.
100 *PP VI.* 15233.
101 *PP III.* 5119; *VI.* 17209; and *P. Lond. dem ined.* 10513.
102 *PP VI.* 15770 and *SB* VIII.10112.1.2. *Cf.* Walbank, ii.483, 488.
Last of all, I turn briefly to a discussion of Philammon, representing those other ministers whose careers changed drastically with a change in the monarch.

1.2.4 Philammon

Unlike Polycrates, Philammon was the prime example of the fate of weaker aristocrats, who not only lacked family solidarity and security (as seen with Polycrates’ family), but also lost their influence, and their lives, when a change occurred in the Ptolemaic court structure. Philammon did not have a strong family and thus his career heavily relied on the career of those who had promoted him, in his case, Agathocles. A brief outline of Philammon’s career is displayed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prominent Families (First Important Member)</th>
<th>Related Family Member in a High Position (relation in brackets)</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHILAMMON</td>
<td>(?):</td>
<td>• blamed as the person who murdered Arsinoe III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(?):</td>
<td>• λιβύκαρχος in Cyrene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Philammon’s career and demise is typical of the fate of aristocratic families with a change of monarch. A new monarch might have his own retinue, which consisted of an entirely different group of attendants and courtiers than that utilised by the last monarch. However, as already seen with the reigns of Ptolemy IV and Ptolemy V, the most influential and powerful

---

103 PP VI.15082; RE 19 (1938), coll. 21-23, no. 2; and Polybius, xv.25.12, 26a.1.
104 Mooren, Families, 290.
105 Polybius, xv.25.12. Cf. Walbank, II.483-484, who does not believe that this financial post was even an official title.
106 This is none more clearly seen than with Cleopatra I’s usage of her personal attendants (cf. chapters two and five).
aristocratic families could also control several successive monarchs\(^ {107}\). With Cleopatra I's succession as regent, though, there was a cessation of ministerial manipulation and influence on the monarchy.

1.3 Cleopatra I's Relationship with These Significant Families

As much as there is evidence for careers of the courtiers so too is evidence for Cleopatra I's involvement and association with these families lacking. Although any suggestion of her association with the ministers serving her husband is unprovable, several things can be conjectured. First of all, whether or not Aristomenes had any contact with Cleopatra I throughout his service at the Ptolemaic court, he was one of the only ministers who favoured a pro-Seleucid policy. Aristomenes favoured a policy of peace with the Seleucids and hostility towards the Romans. This fact alone suggests, at the very least, a possibility that there was some connection between Cleopatra I and him. His murder at the insistence of his court enemies may further show that a connection between himself and Cleopatra I existed since they shared the same "dangerous" views. Secondly, if anything, history has revealed the necessity for "internal" support when any significant change to a ruling structure was planned\(^ {108}\). With the accession of a monarch, supportive courtiers, who must already be in important posts and offices, are immediately promoted to the most prominent positions. Thirdly, this chapter has revealed that the ministers not only grew in power but also in corruptibility. However, after the death of Agathocles, the Alexandrian populace became a large factor in determining the king's chief advisors.

It is unknown which ministers supported Cleopatra I. However, she must have received

\(^{107}\) Such as the families and connections to Sosibius and Agathocles.

\(^{108}\) Cf. chapter two, footnote 51.
some aid, since lack of sufficient support would have seen her suffer the same fate as her predecessor Arsinoe III. One can only surmise that with the successes of Cleopatra I both before and during her regency, even if grudgingly, she would have received the support of several of these prominent families. That descendants of these prominent families continued to hold important court posts after Cleopatra I’s time proves this possibility. Full-scale support, then, came from her own adherents and attendants, whom she immediately appointed to important posts and offices at the Ptolemaic court.

1.4 Summary

The dominance of influential aristocratic families in Ptolemaic politics is very apparent not only in the case of Sosibius’ and Agathocles’ own families, but also of the aristocratic families associated and connected to them. These courtiers were the first group to benefit and grow more influential at the court as a direct result of the erosion of the king’s power beginning with Ptolemy IV. The weakening of the king’s power gave an opportunity for this institution, and others, to gain more influence and control of dynastic affairs and politics. These prominent aristocratic families quickly formed a formidable oligarchic faction to control and influence the monarch whereby, even with a change in the monarchy, one member from these aristocratic families was already in a close position to the successor. Cleopatra I’s regency would, however, put an end to this dominance. Cleopatra I represents the next institution, the Ptolemaic queenship, that gained greater influence at the court as a direct result of the erosion of the king’s power. Just as Agathocles’ supporters were promoted to high court positions through Alexandrian popular support, so too did Cleopatra I rely on the same support for her own promotion. Thus, through a
study of the Ptolemaic courtiers, we have taken the first step to understanding how Cleopatra I became regent. First and foremost, Cleopatra I took advantage of the same opportunity which enabled the courtiers to become so powerful at the court; through the successive accession of weak kings beginning with Ptolemy IV. Second of all, Cleopatra I proved how only a strong monarch, even if it was a queen, and one with widespread popular support, could suppress the influence of these courtiers and their circle of supporters. A queen was, after all, at the pinnacle of power in a monarchical government.
CHAPTER TWO

History knows of some persons of this unfortunate class, whose spirit triumphed over their physical disabilities.¹

Eunuchs played very prominent roles at the ancient courts where they were employed and tolerated. Eunuchs were prominent in the Achaemenid Empire, serving not only as guardians of the king's harem², but also as loyal protectors and supporters of the throne³. The earliest known eunuchs were found at Cambyses' court⁴ and continued to hold different posts and offices in the service of successive Persian kings after Cambyses⁵: "bereits im Achaimenidenreich gab es nicht nur am Hof des Grofikonigs, sondern auch in den Häusern der Hocharistokratie Eunuchen"⁶. When the Persian kingdom was conquered by Alexander the Great in the late fourth century B.C., Alexander adopted Persian methods and customs to the dismay of his generals and Greek subjects. As a result of this, it is not surprising to hear of eunuchs in those Hellenistic kingdoms formed from the Persian Empire. The earliest mention of eunuchs is in the Seleucid court⁷.

After eunuchs became institutionalized in the Seleucid and Ptolemaic kingdoms⁸, they appeared in the other Hellenistic kingdoms of Pontus, Bosporus, Cappadocia, Judaea, Cilicia, Parthia, and Armenia and then in the Roman Empire⁹.

¹ Bevan, Egypt, 185.
² This function remaining true to their Greek name, εὐνομοῦχος, which means "keeping the bed" (Liddell and Scott, 329).
³ Herodotus, 3.92.
⁴ Cambyses (530-522 B.C.) was the second Persian king after Cyrus the Great (560-530 B.C.). Aspadas (cf. Ktesias, FGrHist 688, F. 13) and Izabatas (ibid.) were extremely influential and important court-eunuchs to Cambyses. Cf. Guyot, "Prosopographie der Hofeunuchen".
⁵ Guyot, "Prosopographie der Hofeunuchen" passim.
⁶ Guyot, 52.
⁷ For more on this, cf. Hitti, chp. xixff.
⁸ Eunuchs were introduced permanently into the Ptolemaic kingdom by Cleopatra I as ministers and attendants (cf. section 2.2ff. and chapter five).
⁹ Guyot, passim.
Throughout antiquity eunuchs have been scornfully referred to as a treacherous, unintelligent, and licentious group, epitomizing the ancients’ characterization of a ‘barbarian’¹⁰. Eunuchs were deeply despised by Classical authors mainly because of their “oriental” classification: “the disgust expressed by Classical scholars at the alien customs of Persia was tempered by an acknowledgement of the trustworthiness which the eunuchs displayed to their royal masters”¹¹. This hateful characterization of eunuchs has even extended down to modern times. Bevan vividly represents this position. For example, he explained Antiochus IV’s great success thus: “instead of growing up in a palace among eunuchs and courtiers, he had grown up in Rome”¹². Charged as effeminate because of their castration and deemed ‘pleasure-boys’¹³ because of their favoured positions and service to queens and princesses, the condemnation of eunuchs has been an unfortunate course of scholarship¹⁴. However, a closer investigation of their importance shows how unfounded and unjust this view is.

Eunuchs were, in fact, a highly intelligent and loyal group of slaves and advisors¹⁵. Cleopatra I’s retinue included eunuchs and they may have been quite important in her bid for the regency. Institutionalised in the Ptolemaic court by Cleopatra I, eunuchs continued to appear sporadically at important positions at the Ptolemaic court as personal advisors and attendants¹⁶. Their worth to their royal masters seemed well-founded, even statesmen of the Roman Empire

---

¹⁰ Castration was viewed in antiquity as “barbaric” (cf. Herodotus: “... ἀνήρ Χιος, ὃς τῆν ξόνην κατεστήσατο ἀπ’ ἱερῶν ἀνοσιωτάτων· ὅς γὰρ κτήσατο παιδός εἶδος ἐπεμένους, ἐκτόμινον ἀγιένον ἐπάλεε ἐξ Σάρδις ἐκαὶ Ἐφεσον χρησάτων μεγάλων, παρά γὰρ τούτοι βαρβάροι τιμωτεροί εἰσί ὁ εὐνούχοι πίστοις εἰνέκα τῆς πάσης τῶν ἐνοχεῶν.” [8.105]).
¹¹ OCD², 569. Cf. Herodotus, 8.105 and Xenophon, Cyrenaica, 7.5.58ff.
¹² Bevan, Seleucus, II.128.
¹³ Guyot, section 3.3.
¹⁴ For more on this negative opinion of eunuchs, cf. Guyot, section 2.2.
¹⁵ A point also argued by Callisthenes of Olynthus, the nephew of Aristotle.
¹⁶ Cf. Table #10.
employed them in their households as early as Augustus\textsuperscript{17} and as late as Septimius Severus\textsuperscript{18}. Augustus, Gaius Maecenas\textsuperscript{19}, and Tiberius’ advisor, Lucius Aelius Seianus\textsuperscript{20} all employed eunuchs in their households. They were soon found in the entourage of Roman emperors such as Claudius\textsuperscript{21}, Nero\textsuperscript{22}, and Septimius Severus\textsuperscript{23}. By Diocletian’s time (A.D. 285), imperial court eunuchs were courtiers “on whom the whole palace and the emperor himself depended”\textsuperscript{24}. And by the fourth century A.D., it became common for Roman senators to possess “throngs of eunuchs”\textsuperscript{25}. Although classical authors do them no justice, their institutionalization in the most prominent and powerful empires of Persia, Syria, Egypt, and Rome as slaves, tutors, guardians, commanders, and advisors leaves no doubt about their abilities and worth to their masters.

2.1 Aristonicus\textsuperscript{26}

It is very surprising to find Aristonicus, the first known eunuch, in the Ptolemaic kingdom, among the most honoured individuals at Ptolemy V’s court. Not unexpectedly, there is much mystery surrounding Aristonicus’ appearance. First, we do not know when Aristonicus arrived in Egypt or who was behind his promotion. Presumably, he was from the Near East where eunuchs were most prominent and numerous. Second, it is very odd that Polybius did not criticize and

\textsuperscript{17} Emperor of Rome from 27 B.C. to A.D. 14.
\textsuperscript{18} Emperor of Rome from A.D. 193 to 211.
\textsuperscript{19} Seneca, \textit{Ep.}, 114.6.
\textsuperscript{20} Pliny, \textit{HN}, 7.129.
\textsuperscript{22} Suetonius, \textit{Nero}, 28.
\textsuperscript{23} Cassius Dio, 75.14.
\textsuperscript{24} Lactantius, 15.
\textsuperscript{25} Amm. Marc. 14.6.17.
\textsuperscript{26} PP II.2152, 2194; III.5022; IV.8079, 10147; VI.14895, 15187; \textit{RE} 2 (1896) col. 961, no. 8; and Mooren, \textit{Titulature}, 146-149. This Aristonicus is not to be confused with Aristonicus, the illegitimate half-brother of Attalus III of Pergamum (cf. Green and \textit{OCD} \textsuperscript{3}), nor with Aristonicus, son of Perilaos, the Priest of Alexander during Ptolemy II’s reign (\textit{PP III}.5021; \textit{VI}.14897; and Clarysse & Van Der Veken, 6-7).
condemn Aristonicus as he did in the case of Eulaeus later\textsuperscript{27}. Significantly, Aristonicus was seldom referred to in antiquity as a eunuch, but as an Alexandrian and the son of another Aristonicus\textsuperscript{28}, that is, a Greek. Although his origins are unclear, it is certain that he was a eunuch in the service of a Ptolemy: ""Οτι Ἀριστόνικος ὁ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ βασιλέως Αἰγύπτου εὐνούχος μὲν ἡν""\textsuperscript{29}.

Aristonicus’ pre-eminence at the court is undisguiseable. Ascending through the ranks of ministers and courtiers like any other noble, he attained very distinguished positions under Ptolemy V. In the words of Hölbl:


Aristonicus’ career and life - acquired from both classical and modern sources - have been compiled in the following table:

\textsuperscript{27} Cf. section 2.2 below. Polybius is ruthless in portraying Eulaeus and blames all the faults and downfalls of the dynasty on him.
\textsuperscript{28} Cf. Syll.\textsuperscript{3} 585, l. 140 (the Second Decree of Philai) and Guyot, 103, 183.
\textsuperscript{29} Polybius, xxii.22. Cf. Walbank, III.205, 213.
\textsuperscript{30} Hölbl, 127.
Table #7: Aristonicus, First Palace Eunuch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eunuch</th>
<th>Masters Served Under</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARISTONICUS, son of Aristonicus</td>
<td>Ptolemy V</td>
<td>σύνεργος of the king[^31]</td>
<td>- Eunuchs were sometimes brought up with the young princes and sometimes were even admitted into the prince’s presence[^36].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188/7 B.C.: an active envoy for Ptolemy V[^32]</td>
<td>- As the priest of Alexander, Aristonicus was in charge of the various ceremonies that were to be held for the royal couple[^37].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>187/6 B.C.: priest of Alexander and the Lagides[^33]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>185 (?)B.C.: sent to recruit mercenaries abroad for the upcoming battle(s) against Antiochus III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other ranks and titles:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bore the Hellenistic court rank of ἀντιπρότατος[^34]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>182 (?)B.C.: bore the title Oberst der Hipparchen[^35]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supreme commander of a fleet and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was the case with the prominent ministers and courtiers[^38], Aristonicus also appeared very suddenly in the innermost positions of the Ptolemaic court. His first position as a σύνεργος (that is, a childhood companion[^39]) to Ptolemy V was a very distinguished post:

[^31]: PP II.2152. Cf. Polybius, xxii.22.1; the Second Decree of Philai (Syll. 3 585, l. 140); and Walbank, I.547; III.213.
[^32]: Aristonicus’ outstanding diplomatic skills are commented on by Polybius (xxii.22.4). Cf. Walbank, I.213.
[^33]: Second Decree of Philai (Syll. 3 585, l. 140). Cf. Ijsewijn, 94, no. 100 and Clarysse & Van Der Veken, 22.
[^34]: Aristonicus was only one of two eunuchs at the Ptolemaic court to bear a Hellenistic court rank; the other was Archias (cf. section 2.3). Guyot (115) believes that these two appointments were made mainly on the strength of personal merit. Both eunuchs were mentioned as close personal attendants to their kings.
[^36]: Guyot (109): “Eunuchen waren Sklaven, aber gewöhnlich wurden nur Kinder vornehmer Familien zusammen mit der Prinzen erzogen. Es wird hier deutlich, daß gelegentlich auch Sklaven in die Umgebung des Königs aufgenommen wurden”.
[^37]: Höbl (147) has listed several of such ceremonies: “Die in Alexandria anwesenden Priester beschließen daher Ehrungen für das Königspaar, die denjenigen der Dekrete von 217 und 196 sehr ähnlich sind: Zusätzliche Statuen des Königspaares zusammen mit dem jeweiligen Stadtgott sollen in den Heilig tümern des Landes aufgestellt werden und einen Kult erhalten; der Tag der Schlacht und der Tag der Siegesmeldung (= Tag des Synodalbeschlusses) sollen künftig in den Tempeln als Festtage begangen werden”.
[^38]: Cf. chapter one.
[^39]: A σύνεργος was normally a Greek boy from a prominent family who was around the same age as the young prince and who would go on to be a life-long advisor and loyal friend to the king.
Most of the ministers serving under Ptolemies IV and V had been promoted to their positions through their association with either Sosibius or Agathocles. However, the individual at the court responsible for installing Aristonicus as a *σύντροφος* of Ptolemy V is not known. Considering the general hostility toward eunuchs, one can surmise that the individual who installed this first eunuch into the Ptolemaic court and to a position so close to the heir apparent kept his identity anonymous to prevent any repercussions on himself and his career. This post was always given to young members of powerful aristocratic families who would bring prestige and influence to their families when the heir apparent became king and his *σύντροφοι*, his chief advisors. It was not an insignificant appointment. However, Aristonicus was neither a member of a prominent family nor was he an aristocrat, which makes his supporter difficult to determine.

---

41 Cf. chapter one.
42 This assumption is based on the fact that the Ptolemaic court was still following traditional Greek customs and thus a similar anti-’oriental’ reaction like the one Alexander the Great faced when he tried to mix Greek with ‘barbarian’ customs would be expected. Thus, based on Macedonian protocols and attitudes, it is very unlikely that Sosibius, an Alexandrian (and so Greco-Macedonian), would have supported and promoted Aristonicus since he probably despised this group as much as any other Greco-Macedonian. However, the fact remains that the individual who supported Aristonicus had to be a member of some prominent family during Ptolemy IV’s reign, not Greco-Macedonian, and thus one who migrated to Egypt. Therefore, Agathocles could have possibly been the one who promoted Aristonicus. Not only had Agathocles’ family migrated to Egypt, but upon the accession of Ptolemy V, Agathocles did not have as much political influence at the court as Sosibius and so it is very plausible that Agathocles promoted Aristonicus to secure important future connections at the Ptolemaic court (for further, cf. chapter one, section 1.1.2). Aristomenes could also have installed Aristonicus into the Ptolemaic court because he was also an emigrant to Egypt, but more importantly, his foreign policies were very different from those of any other aristocrat. Aristomenes had pro-Seleucid views which would explain his neutrality toward eunuchs (who were prominent in the Persian Empire and then in the Seleucid kingdom) and his understanding of their usefulness and loyalty. By promoting Aristonicus, Aristomenes was strengthening his position at the court and establishing important, and necessary, internal court connections for his future endeavours (for further, cf. chapter one).
43 This “institution of the Old Macedonian Kingdom was kept up by the Ptolemies of Egypt, as it had in other Hellenistic courts of those days and gave social prestige to a certain number of families” (Bevan, *Egypt*, 123).
Aristonicus appears to have escaped much of the slander normally directed at eunuchs. Polybius not only mentioned Aristonicus’ background as a eunuch, but also openly praised his abilities both as a military advisor and as an able diplomat to Ptolemy V:

Regardless of how esteemed Aristonicus’ role at the Ptolemaic court appeared, he has still been unanimously regarded by scholars as a slave. The message was clear, Greek antiquity did not wholly trust eunuchs, still termed ‘barbarians’ at this time, nor accept them into the inner circles of society normally reserved for more ‘noble’ individuals. However, he was a slave who had far exceeded the positions normally attained by eunuchs and this was what distinguished Aristonicus from the other *ovvxpocpoi* and ministers at the court: “…viele von ihnen haben im Auftrag des Herrschers Funktionen erfüllt, die weit über die Aufgaben und Möglichkeiten der Hofdienerschaft hinausgingen…”

Contrary to how ancient sources normally portrayed ‘his kind’, the fact that Aristonicus had a very successful career at the Ptolemaic court before eunuchs were formally introduced to the Ptolemaic court by Cleopatra I - most notably Eulaeus - makes him one of the most intriguing figures in Ptolemaic history. It is no coincidence that eunuchs after him reached even more prestigious and respected positions in Egypt. Aristonicus no doubt paved the way for the

---

44 Polybius, xxii.22. Cf. footnotes 29, 31, and 32.
46 Guyot, 103.
47 The eunuch who served Cleopatra I and, who later himself, became the regent of the Egyptian kingdom (cf.
eventual rise in power and rank of Eulaeus, and afterwards of Archias. However, as in the case of other ministers and courtiers, Aristonicus soon disappeared from the Ptolemaic scene around the same time as Epiphanes’ death (180 B.C.).

2.2 Eulaeus

After Aristonicus, Eulaeus became the next prominent eunuch at the Ptolemaic court. It is likely that Eulaeus was part of Cleopatra I’s retinue when she came to Egypt, since eunuchs had already been used at the Seleucid court. A famous episode that involved eunuchs at the Seleucid court in the reign of Cleopatra I’s father, Antiochus III, was when Antiochus III utilised a eunuch to murder his own son,

\[
\text{Magnus luctus in regia fuit magnumque eius iuvenis desiderium; id enim iam specimen sui dederat ut, si vita longior contigisset, magni iustique regis in eo indolem fuisse appareret. Quo carior acceptiorque omnibus erat, eo mors eius suspectior fuit, gravem successorem eum instare senectuti suae patrem credentem per spadones quosdam, talium ministeriis facinorum acceptos regibus, veneno sustulisse. Eam quoque causam clandestino facinori adiciebant...}
\]

Cleopatra I’s importation of new supporters (i.e. eunuchs from her personal retinue) to Egypt provided the strong foundation on which she might rely instead of the manipulative and unreliable support of the prominent courtiers at the Ptolemaic court. Earlier precedents in Pharaonic history also show powerful queens utilising their personal retinue to achieve goals.

footnote 48).

48 PP VI, 14602; RE 6 (1909), col. 1063, no. 2; Otto, Iff.; Mørkholm, Eulaios and Lenaios, 32-43; Bikerman, E.

49 “Sur la chronologie de la sixième guerre de Syrie”. Chronique d’Egypte 54 (1952), 396-403; and Gnomon 35 (1963), 71-75.

50 Livy, xxxv.xv.3-5. Cf. Hitti, chp. xixff.

51 Cf. chapter three (on the abusive treatment of Arsinoe III at the hands of the ministers).

52 For example, in the Twentieth Pharaonic Dynasty, there was a royal woman named Tiy who wanted to assassinate Ramses III and to put her own son on the throne. It has been recorded that among her supporters of this crime were other palace women and a small group of palace officials, most likely officials in her own retinue. This is a practice not confined to royal women in Egypt alone, but is a practice for any court cabal or conspiracy (Robins, 38). Cf. Tyldesley, 200-202 and De Buck, A. “The Judicial Papyrus of Turin.” JEA 23 (1937), 152-64.
Furthermore, the loyalty of, specifically, eunuchs was well known in antiquity. Cleopatra I, however, went one step further and took steps to install her own supporters as a permanent fixture of the Ptolemaic court. Eulaeus and Ptolemaic court eunuchs after him reveal her success at doing just that.

Eulaeus, although initially still in the role of a slave, acted as a powerful court figure under several successive rulers. This longevity in remaining in the service of the Ptolemies was a privilege of members of the most prominent families at the Ptolemaic court, since only they had enough support and internal connections to maintain such a position at the court. The following chart outlines what is known of Eulaeus’ career:

Table # 8: Eulaeus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eunuch</th>
<th>Masters Served Under</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EULAEUS</td>
<td>• Ptolemy V</td>
<td>in the service of the women</td>
<td>&quot;Eulaios war Kämmerer der königlichen Frauen am Ptolemaerhof.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cleopatra I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ptolemy VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 180-176 B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Nutritius&quot; became the official term for an attendant of a child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• advisor to the regent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• σύντροφος (&quot;tutor&quot;) for Ptolemy VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• appointed guardian and regent for the young king</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 176 B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• commanded the campaign against Antiochus IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eulaeus’ career, at first, was neither significant nor distinguished. We first hear of him as an attendant of the royal women – the most typical post, from Persian times, for eunuchs. At this

52 Cf. footnote 10 for Herodotus’ passage on the loyalty of eunuchs to their masters.
54 For Eulaeus as guardian, cf. Diodorus Siculus, xxx.15, 16 “ἐκτροφοτικός” and Livy, xlii.29 “tutor regis”. Duties of the guardian (Guyot, 112): i) die Personenfürsorge, ii) die Vermögensfürsorge, iii) Vertretung des Mündels.
55 Guyot, 105. Cf. Diodorus Siculus, xxx.15. Guyot also believes that the eunuchs of Cleopatra III and Cleopatra VII also occupied these initial positions.
56 This classification was first developed by Otto, 3.
post, Eulæus was considered a slave and nothing more, "Am Ptolemäerhof war Eulaios ehemals ein Sklave gewesen..."57.

Thereafter, he became a personal advisor to the regent, Cleopatra I. One can only surmise from this promotion from an insignificant position to that of a powerful advisor that Eulæus, from the beginning, was a close personal attendant and advisor of Cleopatra I. Thus, Eulæus is important because his career is a reflection of Cleopatra I’s own career at the court. It is no coincidence that he became powerful and influential at the court when Cleopatra I became regent in 180 B.C. Likewise, his exclusion from Ptolemaic politics prior to this time reflected Cleopatra I’s own lack of power. Shortly after his promotion to ‘the regent’s advisor’, he was soon further promoted by Cleopatra I to the prestigious position as the young Ptolemy VI’s σύντροφος (i.e. personal tutor).

Finally, with the very sudden death of Cleopatra I in 176 B.C.58, Eulæus became the guardian and regent for the young Ptolemy VI, “Ptolemaeus propter aetatem alieni tum arbitrii erat; tutores...”59. Eulæus’ prominence at the Ptolemaic court from the moment he became advisor to Cleopatra I to the time of his own regency raises many questions. Most suspicious is the mystery behind Cleopatra I’s premature death which, I believe, Eulæus very possibly had some part in. Unfortunately, no extant evidence survives to resolve these and many other problems. The extant evidence that does survive on Eulæus is misleading and is very biased against the class of eunuchs as a whole60.

57 Guyot, 102-103.
58 Cf. introductory chapter.
59 Livy, xlii.xxix.7.
60 Eulæus did manage to have coins with mint marks bearing his initials which suggests his attempts at justifying his political position and influence (cf. Jouguet, Pierre. “Eulæos et Lénaeos. Observations sur la sixième guerre syrienne.” Bulletin de l’institut d’égype 19 [1936-37], 157-174 describes how they made many preparations before
The literary tradition treating Eulaeus' career is even more limited than many other ministers. Although Eulaeus' direction of Ptolemaic affairs matched the dominance of Sosibius and Agathocles, he has been subject to the abuse and hostility of the ancient sources. Everything that went wrong during Ptolemy VI's reign has been blamed on Eulaeus and his co-regent, Lenaeus. Such negative opinions are no doubt a result of his background and origin. The most damaging misconception results from a misinterpretation of the ancient texts themselves with regard to Eulaeus' and Lenaeus' regency. Eulaeus and Lenaeus are portrayed as being lazy and idle when, in fact, a more correct description was that of inexperience. As Lewis points out, one important word, inertia, from a Livian passage has continuously been incorrectly translated as "lazy" or "idle" due to scholars' biases, "...est-il dans le sens de paresse qu'inertia s'est établie dans la traduction anglaise du texte livien sous nos yeux". The other translation for inertia is "inexperience", but this translation is not used. It is evident from the ancient sources that this latter meaning was meant to describe Eulaeus and Lenaeus: "Les historiens - de nos jours comme dans l'antiquité - ont manifesté bien peu de sympathie envers les parvenus Eulaeus et Lenaeus. Mais l'inactivité est assurément une faute...tout au contraire, de leur activité intense, de leurs préparatifs de guerre...". Our extant knowledge concerning Eulaeus, both with regard

---

62 Lewis, "Ad Livium 42.29.5: Appendicule A „Eulaeos et Lenaeos.” Journal of Juristic Papyrology. IV (1950), 265. This negative opinion of Eulaeus and Lenaeus stems from the Polybian tradition, which unfortunately is still accepted without question.
63 For examples cf. Livy, xlii.xxix.7.
64 The bias opinion of Eulaeus' and Lenaeus' rule, because of the Polybian tradition, is evident in the following translations of Livy's line: "The inactive disposition of his guardians" (Baker, George. The History of Rome by Titus Livius. Vol. VI. [1823] Philadelphia, 83; Vol. II. [1830 and 1855] London and New York, 425: "his unenterprising guardians", "the sluggishness of his guardians").
65 Lewis, "Ad Livium 42.29.5: Appendicule A „Eulaeos et Lénacos”, 266.
to his rise to power and his ability, dispels this negative image of eunuchs as useless, idle, and lazy individuals.

There have been several comments on Cleopatra I's aims with regard to her use of eunuchs, but the most damaging speculation was made by Macurdy who said: "Whether by design of the queen-regent [Cleopatra] or by accident, the control of her three children and the management of the government passed into the hands of a eunuch Eulaeus and a man from Coele-Syria, Lenaeus, who had been a slave". Surely Cleopatra I did not intend to hand over ruling power to her ministers especially when she was always acting in the best interests of the kingdom and her son! Even if Cleopatra I had not wanted to hand power to her son when he came of age, both Pharaonic and Greek custom demanded patrilineal descent and the country, its inhabitants, and Egyptian religion would have forced her to do so. It is certain that Cleopatra I worked hard to establish and legitimise her progeny into the Ptolemaic framework and had no intentions of allowing ministers or attendants to deny her children their right to the throne. Indeed it was her sudden death that spelt ruin for the kingdom since it became temporarily controlled by her attendants.

Eulaeus represented a new breed of ministers at the Ptolemaic court, since, although Aristonicus was the first palace eunuch, his origin was not portrayed as such in the ancient sources. Eulaeus' importance, like Cleopatra I's regency, however, lies mainly in the precedent his powerful position provided for future eunuchs; their permanent installation at the court and a marked increase in power when compared to earlier eunuchs. Likewise, Cleopatra I's regency

---

66 Macurdy, 148.
67 The danger to the kingdom under the control of powerful ministers has already been stressed in the last chapter.
68 Cf. chapters five (and four) below. The kingdom during Cleopatra I's regency enjoyed several years of peaceful
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saw a marked increase and equality in power for future Ptolemaic queens. Many of these unprecedented events, such as Cleopatra I’s regency and the installment of eunuchs in the Ptolemaic court, continued after their deaths.\(^{69}\)

2.3 Archias\(^{70}\)

Archias' historical significance is not so much his relationship with Ptolemy VI as it was his appearance at the court immediately following Eulaeus’ demise. Archias and all subsequent eunuchs mentioned in the extant literary tradition confirm Cleopatra I’s success at instituting eunuchs into the Ptolemaic court. Archias served Ptolemy VI Philometor in the mid-second century B.C. after the deaths of Eulaeus and Lenaeus (cf. below, Table #9). His position was more like that of Aristonicus than the much more powerful Eulaeus, not only in significance, but also in the length of time he remained prominent at the court. The following table outlines Archias’ career:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eunuch</th>
<th>Master Served Under</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCHIAS</td>
<td>Ptolemy VI</td>
<td>164 B.C.:</td>
<td>accompanied Philometor to Rome(^{71})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>164/3 B.C.:</td>
<td>(\sigma\rho\pi\alpha\tau\iota\varepsilon\gamma\omicron\varsigma) of Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158/7 (?) B.C.:</td>
<td>involved in some sort of conspiracy involving his strategia in Cyprus; he committed suicide after being exposed(^{73})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bore the highest Hellenistic court rank of (\sigma\upsilon\gamma\nu\gamma\epsilon\nu\iota\varsigma)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and quiet foreign politics. Immediately before and after her regency, the Ptolemaic kingdom was at war.

\(^{69}\) It should be noted that although eunuchs' political power declined after the death of Eulaeus, they continued to be employed at the court (cf. below, Table #10). Their presence at the court after Cleopatra I and Eulaeus proves Cleopatra I’s accomplishment at successfully installing them as a Ptolemaic institution.

\(^{70}\) P\(P\). VI.15037; RE 2 (1896), col. 463, no. 18; 23 (1959), col. 1714; Bagnall, 257; Otto, 92, 112 n. 4; and Mooren, Titulature, 188-9, no. 351.

\(^{71}\) Cf. Diodorus Siculus, xxxi.18.1-2 and Polybius, xxxiii.5. Cf. Walbank, III.547.
We first hear of Archias accompanying Philometor to Rome (in 164 B.C.): “"Οτι ὁ Πτολεμαῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου, ἐκπεσὼν τῆς βασιλείας παρὰ τοῦ ἰδίου ἄδελφου, ἐν ἰδιώτου σχήματι οἴκτρῳ κατήντησεν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην μετὰ σπάδωνος ἕνος [Ἀρχιάν] καὶ τριῶν παιδῶν."\textsuperscript{74}

As a confidant of Ptolemy VI Philometor, he accompanied the king on embassies and most likely as a result of his loyalty and service was promoted.

He then received the exalted governorship of Cyprus upon his return from Rome\textsuperscript{75}. As στρατηγὸς of Cyprus, he had one of the highest ranks at the Ptolemaic court since starting with Archias’ predecessor, Ptolemy Makron, the στρατηγοὶ began to bear the highest aulic titles, that of “kinsman” (συγγενῆς)\textsuperscript{76}. Thus, it is without a doubt that Ptolemy VI regarded Archias’ service quite highly with this important appointment. Diodorus Siculus\textsuperscript{77}, gives the impression that Ptolemy VI found Archias a loyal and useful attendant. A few years later, Archias was mentioned in the sources for the last time. While still the στρατηγὸς of Cyprus, he was involved in a conspiracy that forced him eventually to commit suicide\textsuperscript{78}. Little else is known about Archias’ career and nothing is known about his relationship with Ptolemy VI.

No comparison can be made between the amount of influence Eulaeus and Archias had at the Ptolemaic court. Eulaeus was one of the most powerful eunuchs during the Hellenistic period. However, Archias’ more limited role at the Ptolemaic court was a direct result of a

\textsuperscript{72} Guyot (182) suggests that Archias bore this title uninterrupted from 163-158/7 B.C.

\textsuperscript{73} For more on this cf. Guyot, 182 and Polybius, xxxiii.5.

\textsuperscript{74} Diodorus Siculus, xxxi.18.2.

\textsuperscript{75} Cf. Diodorus Siculus, xxxi.18.1; Polybius, xxxiii.5; Bagnall, 257; and Walbank, III.547.

\textsuperscript{76} “‘Ο συγγενὴς καὶ στρατηγὸς καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς νήσου” (Mitford, T. B. Annual British School of Athens 56 [1961], 20). Cf. Table #5 on Mooren’s ranking of the titulary honours.

\textsuperscript{77} Cf. Diodorus Siculus, xxxi.18.1-2.

\textsuperscript{78} While στρατηγὸς of Cyprus, Archias tried to give this province over to Demetrius I Soter, the Seleucid, for 500 talents. His treason was discovered and he committed suicide (cf. Polybius, xxxiii.5.1-3; Guyot, 182; and Walbank, III.547).
policy of Comanus and Cineas, chief advisors to Ptolemy VIII, which limited the amount of political influence eunuchs after Eulaeus could possess: “campaigns were no longer to be conducted after the notions of eunuchs.” Their policy succeeded in suppressing the political influence of eunuchs at the Ptolemaic court. Despite this limitation eunuchs’ worth and importance to their masters were still apparent with their continued service to the Ptolemies as a result of their successful institutionalisation into the Ptolemaic structure by Cleopatra I. The following table demonstrates this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTOLEMAIC RULER</th>
<th>IMPORTANT FIGURE AT THE COURT</th>
<th>POSITION OF THE EUNUCHS AT THE COURT</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy V Epiphanes (Cleopatra I)</td>
<td>(Aristonicus)</td>
<td>- (180’s B.C.) σύντροφος of the king - probably also bore the title τῶν φίλων</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy VI Philometor</td>
<td>Eulaeus</td>
<td>- Advisor to the regent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eulaeus</td>
<td>- Philometor’s tutor (i.e. σύντροφος) - (176-169 B.C.) Guardian and Regent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archias</td>
<td>- (164/3 B.C.) στρατηγὸς of Cyprus - (163-158/7 B.C.) held court rank of συγγενῆς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy XII Auletes</td>
<td>Potheinos</td>
<td>- “gehört wahrscheinlich zur Hofdienerschaft” (^{83}) - Guardian of Auletes' son, Ptolemy XIII (51-48 B.C.) Regent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra VII</td>
<td>Mardion (^{85}) and Anonymous</td>
<td>- &quot;Hofeunuchen der Kleopatra VII, sind für das Jahr 48.&quot; (^{86}) - special mention of a eunuch in the last year of her reign (^{87})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ganymedes (^{88})</td>
<td>- (48/7 B.C.) was Arsinoe's, Sister of Cleopatra VII, Guardian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{79}\) PP VI.14611, 16865; RE II (1922), col. 1128, no. 2; RE Suppl. 7 (1940), coll. 332-334; Polybius, xxviii.19.1; Solmsen, Classical Philology 40 (1945), 115-116; Peremans-Van’t Dack, Studia Hellenistica 9 (1953), 22-33; and Walbank, III.353.

\(^{80}\) PP II.1926; III.5169; VI.14610; RE II (1922), col. 477, no. 22; Polybius, xxviii.19.1; Ijsewijn, 100-101, nos. 110-117; and Walbank, III.253-4.

\(^{81}\) Bevan, Egypt, 138.

\(^{82}\) Guyot, 97. Cf. Porphyrius, FGrHist. 260, F. 2, 8 and Justin, xxxix.4.1.

\(^{83}\) PP VI.14620 and RE 22 (1953), coll. 1776-77, no. 1.

\(^{84}\) Guyot, 97.

\(^{85}\) PP VI.14615.

\(^{86}\) Guyot, 97. Cf. Lucan, 10.133ff.

\(^{87}\) Cf. Cassius Dio, 50.5.2; 50.25.1.

\(^{88}\) PP II.2156; VI.14643; RE 7 (1912), col. 749, no. 3; and Heinen, H. Rom und Ägypten, 106-30.
Thus, Archias is important proof of Cleopatra I’s successful insertion of eunuchs into the Ptolemaic political structure. Unlike ministers from prominent families who obtained offices and posts hereditarily and through internal connections and promotions, Ptolemaic eunuchs, early on, were present at the court only because of their presence in a royal retinue; Cleopatra I’s royal retinue. However, it was this important connection to the monarchy and to their masters that made eunuchs more reliable and loyal attendants than the courtiers who worked independently from the monarch. After the assassination of Arsinoe III by the aristocratic circle, the loyalty and support of eunuchs became a necessity to Cleopatra I if she had any intentions of becoming guardian for her son and not suffering the same fate as her predecessor.

2.4 The Regency of Eulaeus and Lenaeus

After the sudden death of Cleopatra I, mother of Ptolemy VI, Eulaeus and Lenaeus became guardians over the young king’s remaining years as a minor\(^89\). Their extraordinary appointment as the new regents amidst the more highly qualified Alexandrian families in and around Alexandria has not been considered or discussed adequately.

The first instance of real power resting not in members of the royal family, but in courtiers and ministers was in the reign of Ptolemy IV with Sosibius\(^90\). However, with the custom that the king’s most important ministers were also his most loyal and trusted confidants, their influence and control over the weak monarch was not inconceivable nor condemned as long as they shared the same interests as the king. Eulaeus’ and Lenaeus’ appointment was something altogether different. Not only were they not members of important aristocratic families, but they

---

\(^89\) Otto (3-7) tells us that Ptolemy VI was only seven to ten years old at the time of his mother’s death (in 76 B.C.).
altogether different. Not only were they not members of important aristocratic families, but they were also the basest individuals in society; one a eunuch, the other a slave. Even though it is very likely that they were both part of Cleopatra I's retinue, this does not explain their promotion. Thus, it seems impossible that they did not receive some support from the aristocracy, since the importance of popular and courtly support of the regency has already been established in these first two chapters. In the first chapter, it was revealed how behind every conspiracy, a good foundation of support and political control was needed. Thus, I believe that Eulæus and Lenæus received more support from the high Greek court circles of the Alexandrian court than is generally believed. Proof of this support is revealed by the careers of the aristocratic ministers and their families as the same aristocratic families who were prominent during Ptolemy IV's reign were the same ones serving Ptolemy VI and his sister, Cleopatra II, after the deaths of Eulæus and Lenæus. A brief look at the prominent families during Eulæus' and Lenæus' regency demonstrates to a certain degree that Eulæus and Lenæus were supported by the aristocratic families. Clearly an understanding must have been reached between Eulæus and Lenæus and these prominent families. Eulæus and Lenæus were given the regency in exchange for the prominent families remaining in their high positions. Presumably, both parties co-existed and appeared to understand their roles at the court. By allowing Eulæus and Lenæus to become regents for the young Ptolemy VI, everything that went wrong during this period could be blamed on them and they alone would be the scapegoats to society. In this way, the

91 * Cf. chapter one.

92 * This explanation possibly explains why the most prominent Greek families in the second century B.C. remained in their respective offices and positions both before and after the rule of Eulæus and Lenæus. * Cf. Appendix G reveals this.
prominent families would not suffer the same fate as Agathocles and his circle when the blame fell upon them.

Thus, the regency of Eulaeus and Lenaeus is important in showing how the regency was obtained largely with the support of a courtly group such as the courtiers for Eulaeus and Lenaeus and eunuchs for Cleopatra I. Although I do not believe that Eulaeus and Lenaeus were incompetent in running the kingdom, they lacked experience and foresight in realising that everything that went wrong during their regency would be blamed upon them. It appears that the prominent courtiers were once again dictating Ptolemaic affairs.

2.5 Summary

The presence and rise of eunuchs at the Ptolemaic court during Cleopatra I’s queenship and then her regency raise several important issues. First of all, it was apparent from the last chapter that Cleopatra I did not want to rely on the aristocratic families in Alexandria, but still needed support at the court to become regent. Thus, she introduced another courtly faction drawn from her own kingdom, Syria, to counter the power of these families, namely eunuchs. Second, Cleopatra I’s unprecedented regency without the aid of the usual aristocratic faction and the success of Eulaeus and Archias at the Ptolemaic court are proof of the regular employment of eunuchs as important and powerful courtiers and attendants. The establishment of eunuchs into the Ptolemaic court and their importance as an institution help further understand how Cleopatra I became regent, since it is obvious who became her advisors instead of the usual prominent aristocrats.
She would owe her dynamic personality to three ancestresses who were outstanding in a line of powerful queens.¹

Cleopatra I's predecessors set entirely new standards for the position and power of Ptolemaic queens. Before describing Cleopatra I's own career, it is necessary to discuss these important predecessors, since their influences and precedents were as much a factor in Cleopatra I's success as her own accomplishments. In turn, Cleopatra I influenced her successors and namesakes; especially Cleopatras II, III, and VII. The following discussion is also crucial since the involvement of these queens in Hellenistic politics is little documented in both our primary and secondary sources. For instance, in Claire Préaux's *Le monde hellénistique*, which remains one of the most insightful and complete compilations of the Hellenistic period, the role of the Hellenistic king is discussed in detail in chapter one². However, within this entire chapter, passages totaling only a single page relate to the role played by Hellenistic queens³. Nor is this an isolated case. Macurdy discusses most of the Hellenistic queens and speculates about the rule of each. However, she provides little proof to back up her claims. Of our primary sources, Plutarch, in his *Life of Cleomenes*, is the only one writer who provides a glimpse into the history of influence the royal women of Egypt had over their husbands. Plutarch⁴ comments on the ease with which a queen could gain influence in the state through her husband early in the reign of Ptolemy IV (222-205 B.C.). He stresses, as I strongly believe, that the combination of a weak sovereign and a strong queen makes this episode very feasible. This brief acknowledgement of

---

¹ Wells, 28.
³ Préaux, 192, 219, 285, 286.
womanly influence in the period immediately preceding Cleopatra I's time is important in revealing the true extent of political control queens before Cleopatra I possessed. This passage is one of the only surviving descriptions which unabashedly condemns the weak Ptolemaic kings and acknowledges the strength of the queens:

...όστε...τὸν Κλεομένη διαφέρονταί καὶ πλανᾶσθαι κατὰ τὴν πόλιν, οὐδὲνος αὐτῷ προσχωροῦντος, ἀλλὰ φευγόντων καὶ φοβουμένων ἄπαντων. οὕτως οὐν ἀποστάζαι καὶ πρὸς τοὺς φίλους εἰπὼν, Ὅδεν ἢν ἄρα θαυμαστὸν ἄρειν γυναικῶν ἀνθρώπων φευγόντων τὴν ἐλευθερίαν... ⁵

Cleomenes made other such remarks during his stay in Egypt under the reign of Philopator, Epiphanes' predecessor. Cleomenes' comments reflect his disgust at the weakness of the sovereign, his effeminacy and pursuit of licentiousness, but above all, the power and influence of the women. I believe that these are fairly accurate observations of the Ptolemaic government under Ptolemy IV especially since Cleomenes was also present and was witness to the strong rule and government of Ptolemy III. Furthermore, Cleomenes' remarks are also supported by other ancient authors, who comment on the inner-strength and popularity of these earlier Ptolemaic royal women ⁶. The prime example of an influential Ptolemaic queen before Cleopatra I who greatly influenced the kingdom's affairs was Arsinoe II ⁷. Arsinoe II's influence over her brother, Ptolemy II, was considerable. Following Arsinoe II, Arsinoe III ⁸ became the first Ptolemaic and Hellenistic queen to be offered a regency despite the ill-will of the courtiers and ministers against this unprecedented notion. Thus, because of this lack in sources, one must understand the importance, influence, and contributions of Cleopatra I's predecessors in order to

⁵ Plutarch, *Life of Cleomenes*, xxxvii.5: "It is no wonder that women rule over men who run away from freedom!".
⁶ Cf. sections 3.1 and 3.2.
⁷ Cf. section 3.1.
⁸ Cf. section 3.2.
better understand how she herself was able to establish a new type of queenship. Of Cleopatra I’s predecessors, I believe that Arsinoe II, Arsinoe III, and Hatshepsut had the greatest influence upon her, since each queen established a new precedent during her queenship; precedents that enabled and allowed Cleopatra I to become the first female regent.

3.1 Arsinoe II

The internal structure of the Ptolemaic monarchy was most affected by Arsinoe II’s policies. Arsinoe II, the daughter of Ptolemy I Soter and Berenice I, and the second queen of Ptolemy II, her full brother, was responsible for establishing a more defined role and position for the Ptolemaic queen. Her accomplishments greatly influenced all subsequent Ptolemaic queens and, in particular, the example she set at the Ptolemaic court was crucial for Cleopatra I’s success. Having skillfully and successfully combined both Greek and Egyptian elements into her queenship, she influenced the future position of Ptolemaic queens socially, religiously, economically, and politically.

One of Arsinoe II’s most important social policies was her revival of the Pharaonic tradition of sibling marriage, which immediately became a permanent fixture of the Ptolemaic dynasty. The greatest impact of this revival of royal sibling marriage was noticed in the improved relationship between the monarchy and its subjects, but specifically that between the

10 Bevan, Egypt, 61.
11 It is widely believed that the revival of sibling marriage can be accredited to Arsinoe II, who fully understood the advantages this connection to the much older Pharaonic tradition would have on her and her royal status. Macurdy (118) is also an advocate of this view and says: “it seems likely that it was the scheming brain of Arsinoe [II], not that of the invalidish and slothful Philadelphus, that saw the point of the value of the brother-and-sister marriage in this respect and the enormous popularity it would bring them with the Egyptian priests”. Cf. Diodorus Siculus, 1.27.1; Pausanias, 1.7.1; Bevan, Egypt, 59ff.; Pomeroy, 16ff.; Carney, passim; and Pestman, P.W. Marriage and Matrimonial Property in Ancient Egypt. (1961) Leiden, 3, n. 7.
queenship and the dynasty's subjects. Sibling marriage, if we look at Pharaonic instances and precedents, benefited the queenship since it called for equality between the king and queen as co-rulers and thus conferred greater power on the queen; although manifest political power was not seen until Cleopatra I. Arsinoe II and, consequently, her successors were deeply revered and loved not only by Greeks, but also by Egyptian subjects as well. The royal titulature and designation of the Ptolemaic queen as both "wife and sister" also originated from this new brother-sister relationship, borrowed from Pharaonic tradition, between the king and queen. Significantly, after Arsinoe II, Ptolemaic queens adapted these two designations whether they were sisters of the king or not. This designation was especially important to Cleopatra I since, being a foreigner, she was not related to the Ptolemaic house in any way. Furthermore, one of the greatest privileges Arsinoe II acquired from this type of marriage was the bestowal and her usage of the very rare Pharaonic title of "Queen of Upper and Lower Egypt" (nsw-bitj) — a title which, before this time, had been used only rarely by Pharaonic queens — throughout her

---

12 Cf. Theocritus, xiv.vv.59ff.
13 I believe that sibling marriage is one of the quintessential factors that determined whether a queen, or princess, could ever become regent or ruler in one of the Hellenistic kingdoms in which it was institutionalised. For instance, both the Ptolemies and the Seleucids practised sibling marriage. It is by no coincidence that these two kingdoms at certain points in their history had a female ruler (Cleopatra I and Cleopatra Thea respectively). However, the Hellenistic kingdoms that never established nor accepted this custom, the Antigonids in Macedonia and the Attalids of Pergamum, were never subjected to a female ruler. Cf. Green, 198ff.; Macurdy, 8ff.; Whitehorne, 57ff., 72; and Carney, 421ff., 436ff.: "Clearly the growing prevalence of brother-sister marriage in the Ptolemaic dynasty is in some ways linked to the general status of royal women in the Hellenistic period... Whereas in the other dynasties, the role of royal women tended to shrink once the family was well-established on the throne, Ptolemaic royal women continued to have great political power and prestige...".
Arsinoe II also received great homage both during and after her life. For instance, there were many towns named after her throughout the kingdom and it was because of Arsinoe II that a new dynastic cult and new priestesses were instituted. Therefore, by reviving sibling marriage Arsinoe II improved the relationship between subject and ruler and also brought about a change in the political status of the queen. Although sibling marriage did not necessarily grant the queen political power and control, it offered the potential for power by placing the queen in a favourable position to assume greater responsibilities if the opportunity arose.

Some scholars in general have disputed Arsinoe II's political importance and power, especially since her Egyptian title of "Queen of Upper and Lower Egypt" lacked a Greek equivalent. However, proof of her political involvement and activities is recorded on the Pithom Stele and in the Decree of Chremonides. The Pithom Stele tells of Arsinoe II's direct involvement in military affairs: In January of 273 B.C. she accompanied her husband, Ptolemy II, to Heroonpolis on the Isthmus of Suez to inspect the defences of Egypt in the event of foreign attack. Her accompaniment of her brother and husband, Ptolemy II, may suggest political power. However, it may also simply be a reflection of the amount of influence she had with her husband, where she was allowed to accompany him on such military matters and inspections of

---

17 Cf. below, 61 and footnote 32.
18 For instance, the towns of Arsinoe in Cyprus, Arsinoe Ephesos, Arsinoe in Cilicia, Arsinoe on Crete, Arsinoite Nome and so forth.
19 Cf. Carney, 438.
20 Pomeroy, 19. There is certain amount of truth to this, but cf. chapter four where the Greek subjects recognise Cleopatra I's manifest political power and control. Cf. Burstein, Stanley M. “Arsinoe II Philadelphos: A Revisionist View.” In Adams and Borza, eds., 197ff.; and Will, I.40ff.
22 *I.G. II* 332, 333 and *OGIS* 434.
the Ptolemies' military defenses. Better proof of Arsinoe II's political influence is found on the Decree of Chremonides of 266 B.C.: "ος τε βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος ἀκολούθως τῇ σεβομένῃ προγόνῳ καὶ τῇ άδελφῃ προαγρέσει φανερῶς ἐστιν σπουδάζων ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν Ἐλλήνων ἐλευθερίας". This is the first instance in Ptolemaic history where a queen’s policy is mentioned in a public document. Four years after her death, as recorded on the Decree of Chremonides, Ptolemy II continued this policy. As a result of such proof of Arsinoe II’s political involvement, modern scholarship is slowly acknowledging the influence Arsinoe II had on the political affairs of Ptolemaic Egypt. Tarn attributes Egypt's victory over Syria to Arsinoe II, "Ptolemy married her after his defeat in Syria, because things were going badly for him and he needed her strength and brains to manage the war, which he was going to lose, as he lost the Second Syrian War, when she was not there to help him". Although Tarn’s comment may be slightly exaggerated, it points out Arsinoe II’s political prowess and with proof of her direct military involvement it is even more believable. With this knowledge of Arsinoe II’s accomplishments, it is no wonder that Macurdy considered Arsinoe II the greatest politically minded Hellenistic queen, in her eyes, even more so than Olympias and Cleopatra VII.

Arsinoe II became the most honoured Greco-Macedonian woman during her lifetime with her deification as a goddess. She received an abundance of cults, statues, priestesses, and dedications from her subjects and from her husband, Ptolemy II. Her cults continued to

---

23 Cf. I.G. II 332, 333 and OGIS 434.
24 The policy is also mentioned as being one of his προγόνων (i.e. ancestors) referring to the age-old Macedonian and Hellenic tradition of promoting Greek freedom. Ptolemy I had earlier adopted it as one of his policies. Cf. Macurdy, 119ff.
26 Tarn, JHS XLVI (1926), 161.
27 Macurdy, 112.
flourish throughout Ptolemaic history and neither lessened in importance nor abundance. In fact, Arsinoe II’s chief priestess (κανηρός) continued to be appointed from the most prominent and powerful families at the Ptolemaic court at that time. As well, Pharaonic religious customs still thrived in Ptolemaic Egypt. For instance, many of the traditional rituals were still carried on in the same manner as in centuries before. In Ptolemaic times, the Egyptian priesthood with its prestigious offices, sacred wisdom, and teaching was still looked upon by the common people as their national guides and leaders. However, the Pharaoh was still regarded as the head of the priesthood and the queen was held in the same high regard. Bevan best summarises Arsinoe II in the Ptolemaic religious sphere with these remarks:

Of no other queen do we find so many memorials in various parts of the Greek world. She was honoured with statues at Athens and Olympia... The honours done to her in Samothrace and Boeotia, where a town Arsinoe is named, may have been during her early life, when she was queen of Thrace. But beside these, we have votive inscriptions in her honour from Delos, Amorgos, Thera, Lesbos, Cyrene, Cyprus, Oropus, and doubtless yet more will be found. The dedications to her in Egypt are numerous, and are only the formal part of the many exceptional honours heaped upon her by her husband. There seems to have been a statue of her, seated upon an ostrich, at Thespiae in Greece. Though not a coregent in the sense that some later queens were, she was associated in every titular honour with the king. It is noted by Wilcken (Pauly-Wissowa) from Naville’s transcription of the Pithom stele, that the Egyptian priests had even assigned her a throne-name in addition to her ordinary cartouche, an honour quite exceptional for a queen. We have many coins issued with her effigy only, as well as those with the king her brother, as Gods Adelphi. She was deified together with him, and gradually declared co-templar (synnaos) with the gods of the great shrines throughout Egypt.

Arsinoe II’s influence was also felt in the economic sphere. Although it is unknown how much wealth Ptolemaic queens possessed, Arsinoe II was known to have possessed enough wealth to allow her to enlist an army of mercenaries and to engage in military campaigns. Her

---

30 Cf. Fraser, 217 and n. 225.
31 For further, cf. Bevan, Egypt, 80 and Robins, 17ff., 21ff.
32 Bevan, Egypt, 64.
wealth was very unique among Ptolemaic queens, wealth accrued as a result of ties to Macedonia, Thrace, Heracleia, Amastrios, Tios, Ephesus and Cassandreia before she married Ptolemy II. It is very likely that she continued to receive revenues from these cities and regions even after her marriage to her brother, Ptolemy II. Most noteworthy of her economic policies was her transferring of the control of the sacred revenues to the Ptolemaic government. Ptolemy II also reaped great revenues from the areas and “in every temple in Egypt” where Arsinoe II was worshipped as a goddess.

Thus, Arsinoe II expanded the political, economic, and social roles of Ptolemaic queens to such a degree that it became much easier for subsequent queens to gain greater authority and control vis-à-vis the king. The only reason, it seems, why Arsinoe II was not recognised and accepted openly as a co-ruler with Ptolemy II was Ptolemaic Egypt’s unreadiness to accept the concept of a female as their monarch. Greek paternalistic attitudes were still a strong part of Ptolemaic Egypt at this early point in its history. Furthermore, Arsinoe II’s unprecedented influence might have been a little frightful to the Ptolemaic Greeks as well, since their society accepted nothing less than subservient females. Tarn is an advocate of this theory: “The flaw in Arsinoe II was not perhaps her immortality but ambition, an overmastering ambition to which she was ready to sacrifice most things; and it is not necessary to suppose her a bad woman.

---

34 Cf. Macurdy, 118 and Pomeroy, 14.
35 Cf. above, footnotes 17, 32; Macurdy, 117ff.; and Memnon, *F.H.G. III.* 530. Cleopatra I was the next queen after Arsinoe II to have any sort of claim to land outside of the Ptolemaic dynasty (i.e. Coele Syria) because of her foreign status (cf. chapter four).
36 Arsinoe II is accredited with implementing the policy that brought a great deal of money for the monarchy (Macurdy, 128). Arsinoe II diverted the *apomoira* (i.e. the tax on wines and fruits) from the Egyptian priests to the cult of Arsinoe Philadelphus in 262 B.C. thereby giving the Ptolemaic government instead of the Egyptian priesthood control over these sacred revenues (cf. Mahaffy, *The Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, coll. 23-27).
37 Macurdy, 128.
merely because she became a great ruler. Fear to appoint the queen as guardian and regent with the monarch was not overcome until Arsinoe III, the wife of Ptolemy IV.

3.2 Arsinoe III

The impact of Arsinoe III, daughter of Ptolemy III Euergetes and Berenice II, wife of Ptolemy IV, on Cleopatra I was altogether different from that of Arsinoe II. Unlike Arsinoe II, who strove to influence the Ptolemaic court, Arsinoe III never appeared to desire such control and authority. The literary tradition generally portrays her as a very lonely and melancholy individual, whose queenship was one of continuous humiliation and misery. Indeed, she appears to have led an extremely uneventful life during the reign of her husband. Scholars even refer to her as an individual who was "kept more or less a prisoner in the palace." With the premature death of her husband (205 B.C.) and the ascendancy of a child heir, her son, Ptolemy V, her position and situation immediately became threatening to her enemies at the Ptolemaic court. The adulation of her subjects and the fact that her son was so young led the people (the Greek and Egyptian subjects of Alexandria) to demand that she become regent and guardian until

---

38 Tarn, Antigonus, 292.
39 Although Berenice II, the wife of Ptolemy III Euergetes, became regent of Cyrene in the mid-third century B.C. she will not be mentioned here amongst these other influential queens. This is because I believe Arsinoe II and Arsinoe III had the greatest impact on Cleopatra I, whose precedents were set at the Ptolemaic court. This is not to say Berenice II's regency may not have influenced Cleopatra I, however, by Ptolemy V's time, Cyrene was Egypt's dependency and "long-term imperial holding" and functioned quite apart from Ptolemaic Alexandria (cf. Green, 262).
40 PP VI.14492; RE 2 (1896), coll. 1287-88, no. 27; Macurdy, 136-41; and Abel, K. Hermes 95 (1967), 72-90.
41 PP VI.14543, 16297, 16943; RE 23 (1959), coll. 1667-78, no. 21; Samuel, 106-108; and Will, 1.133-86, 216-364 passim.
42 PP VI.14499; RE 3 (1899), coll. 284-86, no. 11; Macurdy, 130-136; Polybius, xv.25.2; and Walbank, II.482.
43 I say, "appeared" since what we know of Arsinoe III's life is extremely scarce. My speculation here, I believe, is well supported by the evidence which we do possess on Arsinoe III.
44 Bouché-Leclercq, Logides, I.338ff. and Bevan, Egypt, 236ff.
45 Bevan, Egypt, 236ff.
46 Cf. Bevan, Egypt, 252ff.
her son had reached the suitable age to rule on his own\textsuperscript{47}. It was this precedent which most affected and influenced Cleopatra I.

It would have been quite easy to accept this portrait of Arsinoe III's private life and isolation, if it were not for references in the ancient sources referring to her rallying troops at the Battle of Raphia (217 B.C.)\textsuperscript{48}. Despite her subdued and quiet nature, as portrayed by both ancient and modern sources, there are hints of her active political participation in military matters. This venture by Arsinoe III either reflects a custom and duty which Ptolemaic queens were obliged to fulfill during their queenship, or a side of Arsinoe III which has been entirely neglected in scholarship. However, unlike Arsinoe II who was mentioned only as accompanying Ptolemy II on his military rounds, Arsinoe III went one step further and was present before the battle. In the case of Arsinoe III, the military position of the queen was much more significant and appears to suggest something more than simply fulfilling a queen's obligation. Unfortunately, neither our main primary source (i.e. Polybius) nor our main secondary source (i.e. Macurdy) elaborate on this incident, a direct result, perhaps, of Polybius' biased and selective opinions. If the literary tradition was not so dependent on Polybius' opinions, it seems likely that Arsinoe III may have been portrayed as more able than we have been led to believe.

Arsinoe III's support in 205 B.C. from her subjects was clearly a shock to her enemies at the court, since they managed, throughout her husband's reign, to keep her in the background as much as possible\textsuperscript{49}. Bouché-Leclercq summarizes her situation most effectively: "Lui vivant, Arsinoé était inoffensive; elle ne devint dangereuse, par conséquent, ne fut séquestrée et

\textsuperscript{47} Polybius, xv.25.2, 26a.1; Justin, xxx.1.7; and Walbank, II.481-482.
\textsuperscript{48} Polybius, v.83.3, 84.1 and Maccabees III 1, 4. \textit{Cf.} Holbl, 115ff. and Walbank, I.611-613.
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Cf.} Bevan, \textit{Egypt}, 242ff.
assassinée, que quand elle fut en passe de devenir régente”\(^{50}\). With the queen appointed guardian and regent to her young son, Ptolemy V, Arsinoe III was associated with Isis and Ptolemy V, with Isis’ child, Horus. Therefore, to the Egyptian subjects, the land (i.e. the kingdom) was being rightfully governed by Arsinoe III (i.e. Isis) until Ptolemy V reached the age to rule on his own\(^{51}\). Furthermore, Arsinoe III was the full sister of Ptolemy IV and by marrying her brother once more reinforced the institution of sibling marriage. Such was the opportunity of the position of Pharaoh’s wife and sister combined with the strength of the respect of her subjects that Arsinoe III would have been the first queen to become regent, instead of Cleopatra I, had she not been murdered by Agathocles and Sosibius\(^{52}\). The amiable relationship between Arsinoe III and her subjects is further reflected with the immediate death of her assassins, when word of their murderous plot was made public (202 B.C.)\(^{53}\).

Arsinoe III also did not thrive in the religious and economic realms as had Arsinoe II. The economic and religious influence of Arsinoe III during her lifetime, that is, aside from the customary honours and titles that each Ptolemaic queen in turn received from Arsinoe II’s time onwards, was minor. These religious protocols became the norm for all Ptolemaic queens after their establishment under Arsinoe II. As already noted, Arsinoe II’s economic situation was unique, since she acquired various personal ties to other cities through previous marriages; a situation never to occur again among the Ptolemaic queens because of the revival and institution of sibling marriage\(^{54}\). There is no information regarding Arsinoe III’s economic status, although

\(^{50}\) Bouché-Leclercq, Logides, I.339.
\(^{51}\) Cf. Koenen, 64.
\(^{52}\) Cf. chapter one.
\(^{53}\) Polybius, xv.25.
\(^{54}\) Arsinoe II’s situation was very unique since her two marriages to Lysimachus, King of Thrace, and to Ptolemy Ceraunus before her last marriage to Ptolemy II gave her ownership of many pieces of land and cities throughout the
it would be safe to surmise that she did not possess much personal wealth, since she was not a foreigner to the Ptolemaic dynasty, nor did she marry anyone else other than Ptolemy IV and therefore followed Ptolemaic standards.

Arsinoe III may never have aimed at power (in the same manner Arsinoe II, and later, Cleopatra I, did), nevertheless, it was handed to her when the people demanded that she become co-ruler and guardian to her young son, Ptolemy V. Thus, the greatest impact Arsinoe III had upon Cleopatra I was revealing the advantages of associating the Ptolemaic queenship with the traditions of Pharaonic queenship. The Ptolemaic queen had, by this time, gained a great deal of support and loyalty from her subjects, both Greek and Egyptian. And now, since she was viewed by her Egyptian subjects as a Pharaonic queen, she might become their divine and political leader as well. As a result, the opportunity arose for the queen to become regent over even the most prominent and important courtiers.

3.3 Hatshepsut

It is very unlikely that Cleopatra I knew anything about the historical precedents set by past female Pharaohs\(^ {55} \). However, considering the Ptolemies' establishment of a kingdom which embraced both new and ancient customs, it would be a mistake to exclude reference to one of the most important Pharaonic queens, Queen Hatshepsut of the Eighteenth Pharaonic Dynasty (c. 1473–c. 1458 B.C.)\(^ {56} \). Yet despite Cleopatra I's unfamiliarity with this queen, Hatshepsut's

---

\(^{55}\) It is generally believed that there were four female Pharaohs: Nitocris (c. 2180 B.C.-?) (cf. Herodotus, 2.100; Robins [50] calls her Nitiquet; Tyldesley, 213-214, 216-218; and Watterson, 138); Sobeknofru (c. 1763-c. 1759 B.C.) (cf. Robins [50] calls her Nefrusobk and believes that she ruled c. 1789-c. 1786 B.C.; Tyldesley, 213-214, 218-220; and Watterson, 138); Hatshepsut (c. 1473-c. 1458 B.C.) (cf. Robins, 45-52, 152-153; Tyldesley, 213-214, 220-230; and Watterson, 138-140); and Twosret (c. 1188-c. 1186 B.C.) (cf. Herodotus, 2.100; Robins [50] calls her Tausret; Tyldesley, 213-214, 237-241; and Watterson, 140-141).

\(^{56}\) Robins and Wells *passim*. The Ptolemies became the Thirty-Second Pharaonic Dynasty.
Past Queens

achievements and precedents may have affected how the Ptolemies’ Egyptian subjects reacted towards Cleopatra I, their queen. Hatshepsut was important to Cleopatra I because of her great achievements in the social and political realms – since Cleopatra I like her ruled at a time when the kingdom was flourishing – but most importantly as representative of what a queen could achieve and aspire to under the Pharaonic model. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that out of the four female Egyptian Pharaohs\(^57\), Hatshepsut’s death did not bring about simultaneously the end of a Pharaonic dynasty followed by several years of anarchy and civil disruption, for “on past experience queens regnant had heralded a period of instability”\(^58\). Instead, Hatshepsut had been a living example of how “theology and ideology made no difference between a male and a female pharaoh; the queen played the male role”\(^59\).

Hatshepsut ruled Pharaonic Egypt as pharaoh from c. 1473-c. 1458 B.C. with her son, Thutmose III, as co-ruler\(^60\). For the first few years of Thutmose III’s reign, Hatshepsut played the role of regent, but by the seventh year of his reign she had discarded this position and publicly announced herself as co-ruler\(^61\). Hatshepsut then remained co-ruler of Pharaonic Egypt until her death in 1458 B.C. This queen’s unprecedented authority was perhaps as shocking to the paternalistic Pharaonic court as Arsinoe II’s authority and control was to the Ptolemaic Greek court. Similar to the situation that would face Cleopatra I, Hatshepsut did not come into prominence until there were no suitably aged male heirs to rule the kingdom.

Hateshepsut’s chief importance to Cleopatra I lies in setting a precedent in Pharaonic

\(^{57}\) Cf. footnote 55.
\(^{58}\) Watterson, 138ff. Watterson uses the term ‘regnant’ to refer to any one of the four female pharaohs.
\(^{59}\) Koenen, 64.
\(^{61}\) Cf. Tyldesley, 223 and Watterson, 139.
tradition for co-rulership: “Originally, it was instituted so that an ageing king might associate his heir with him on the throne in order to accomplish a smooth transfer of power from one ruler to the next”\(^\text{62}\). Hatshepsut was able to take advantage of this custom and was crowned king with the complete male titulary honours along with her young son, Thutmose III, including the title of “Mistress/Queen of the Two Lands”\(^\text{63}\). Officials then used the names of both rulers, Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, in their inscriptions\(^\text{64}\). Similarly, Cleopatra I was able to assume the male position in the dating-formula by appearing first. However, the regnal years continued to be dated according to the king, Ptolemy VI\(^\text{65}\) - a direct reflection of the fact that she was not able to establish herself as an official co-ruler in the brief years before her death. This precedent might have directly influenced Cleopatra I, since she first laid the foundations for her daughter, Cleopatra II, by assuming equivalent queenly titulary honours to the king, fully expecting the crowning of both king and queen as joint rulers to follow. Indeed, this was certainly the case when Cleopatra II, was named joint ruler with her husband, Ptolemy VIII. Furthermore, from these rulers onwards, the regnal years began to be dated according to both the king and queen\(^\text{66}\).

Hatshepsut was also instrumental in changing the way a queen might be portrayed by her titulature. From the outset of her reign, Hatshepsut began to change epigraphic protocols by adopting titles normally reserved, up to that time, for kings and also appearing in paintings with kingly iconography and dress\(^\text{67}\). However, it is the way in which she was received by her subjects, which might have affected Cleopatra I’s own acceptance. It is one thing to adopt titles

\(^{62}\) Robins, 46, 152.
\(^{63}\) ibid. Hatshepsut modelled this title on the king’s titulary honour as the “Lord of the Two Lands”. This title was first adopted by Arsinoe II of the Ptolemaic Dynasty.
\(^{64}\) ibid.
\(^{65}\) Robins, 47.
\(^{66}\) Cf. Appendix B, “The Ptolemaic King List”.
\(^{67}\) Robins, 46 and Tyldesley, 223, 224.
and roles, and quite another to be accepted in these roles and with these titles. Hatshepsut’s reign was unique and important because she was officially accepted with her Pharaonic titles “where officials used titles or phrases that would usually have contained a reference to the king, they substituted a reference to Hatshepsut”\(^{68}\). Cleopatra I also steered away from Greek protocol and was officially acknowledged as the dominant ruler by being named first in the order in the dating formula. Although many centuries separated these two queens, Hatshepsut would have a lasting impact on the Egyptian subjects of the Ptolemies simply because they would remember that in their long history a female ruler existed.

Despite all Hatshepsut’s efforts to legitimise her right to rule, she would not have been officially recognised as a co-ruler without the approval of the Amon priesthood. Throughout her reign, Hatshepsut was supported by the native Egyptian priesthood and commoners. “Her position was strong because of her birth and she had, it seems, the support of the rich temple of Amon”\(^{69}\) including the high priest himself\(^{70}\). This support is also evident in her priestly title as “divine adoratrice” (duat netjer) and the inscriptions and reliefs in the Deir el-Bahri temple which emphasised her divine birth\(^{71}\). Through other propagandistic texts, Hatshepsut displayed her acceptance by the gods as a legitimate pharaoh of Egypt. Thus, by the time of the Ptolemies, native support and the Egyptian priesthood’s support of the queenship were important factors for Arsinoe III’s and Cleopatra I’s appointments as guardians and regents of the kingdom.

\(^{68}\) ibid.

\(^{69}\) Wells, 141.

\(^{70}\) Watterson, 139.

\(^{71}\) Robins, 149; Tyldesley, 227; and Watterson, 140.
Finally, Senenmut\textsuperscript{72}, Hatshepsut's most important and able administrator, who was also the tutor to Hatshepsut's daughter, may have also positively influenced Cleopatra I's situation. Senenmut's immense power within the kingdom was second only to Hatshepsut's. Overshadowed by his great achievements and worth, one is almost surprised to discover that he was originally a man of low birth\textsuperscript{73}. That a man of such low social rank could reach the most prestigious posts in the kingdom and be accepted by the court, priesthood, and populace may explain to a certain extent how Eulaeus' simultaneous appointment as advisor to the regent (i.e. Cleopatra I) and tutor to the heir (i.e. Ptolemy VI) was accepted\textsuperscript{74}.

In a comparison between Hatshepsut and Cleopatra I, we can see the parallelism in their influence and power since both became very powerful and were very popular among their subjects and with the Egyptian priesthood. Both used their influence to achieve their own goals\textsuperscript{75}. Thus, even if Cleopatra I was not aware of Hatshepsut and her great accomplishments, this Pharaonic queen was familiar to the native people and thus of great benefit to Cleopatra I, since the idea of a female ruler was not unknown to them.

3.4 Summary

Each of these queens mentioned, Arsinoe II, Arsinoe III, and Hatshepsut was important to Cleopatra I's success and appointment as regent. First of all, Arsinoe II legitimised the queenship in the eyes of the native Egyptians by associating the Ptolemies with the Pharaohs through divine worship (that is, the revival of sibling marriage) of the rulers. As a result of this association, the native Egyptians were more endeared to the queenship than to the kingship.

\textsuperscript{72} Robins, 47; Tyldesley, 227ff.; and Wells, 187ff.
\textsuperscript{73} Tyldesley, 228.
\textsuperscript{74} Cf. chapter two.
Next, Arsinoe III was crucial to Cleopatra I's own appointment as co-ruler since her precedent revealed how popular opinion could determine a regent in the face of aristocratic opposition. Cleopatra I may also have learned from her how the Egyptianisation of some institutions further strengthened the queenship. Last of all, Hatshepsut was a model for Cleopatra I because of her bravery to steer away from ancient protocols and customs. Hatshepsut wanted to be viewed and regarded as pharaoh, and not as Pharaoh's wife, and not only took kingly iconography but titulary titles as well. I believe that without these influences and precedents that Cleopatra I would not have had the opportunity to become regent.
CHAPTER FOUR

"...she had influence, but he had sole power."1

By the late third and early second centuries B.C., Egypt was in desperate need of stronger leadership. The same problems continued to plague the dynasty from its beginning. Foremost among these problems was the failure of the Ptolemies to assimilate quietly the indigenous people of Egypt. The exigency which required the participation of native Egyptian soldiers (the Machimoi) at the battle of Raphia (217 B.C.) placed an even greater strain on the relationship between the Ptolemaic rulers and their Egyptian subjects than had previously existed. As well, there remained the perennial threat to Egypt from her sister kingdom, that of the Seleucids. Last of all, Rome was quickly emerging as the most powerful force in the Mediterranean and the unquestioned arbiter for the rival Hellenistic kingdoms. It was amidst these very troubled times that a Ptolemaic queen of extraordinary foresight and influence emerged. The fact that Cleopatra I became regent during these tumultuous times prompts one to wonder at the conditions and successive events that eventually established her in such an unprecedented position. The first three chapters discussed these pre-conditions: i) the strength of the ministers and courtiers at the court, but their subservience to a powerful and able monarch; ii) Cleopatra I's support of her personal eunuchs and also her successful institutionalisation of them into the Ptolemaic court; and lastly, iii) the precedents established by past queens that influenced not only her, but also her subjects to accept and tolerate a female ruler. This chapter will first discuss how, from the moment she set foot into Egypt, Cleopatra I gained immense Egyptian support and with it influence; even despite the fact that she was a foreigner.

1 Carney, 428.
Secondly, this chapter will look at all of the areas of the Ptolemaic queenship that Cleopatra I strengthened. This strengthening of the queenship was a crucial precursor to Cleopatra I becoming the first female regent and to her successors becoming the first Ptolemaic queens to become joint co-rulers.

4.1 Titulary Evidence

There are several extant inscriptions mentioning Cleopatra I (below, Table #11), but there are problems with her titulature. Cleopatra I’s titulary inscriptions are rare and oftentimes it is hard to determine whether an inscription is referring to her or to one of her descendants\(^2\). Thus, when a Cleopatra is mentioned in any inscription, exactly which Cleopatra is meant must be very carefully determined.

Most of the early dedications made to Cleopatra I, during the reign of her husband Ptolemy V, are not official, but do show the opinion of the Ptolemaic people towards her\(^3\). Cleopatra I’s earliest titulature reveals an uncanny attraction to her and a wide popularity and adoration among her subjects – noteworthy not simply because she was the first foreign Ptolemaic queen, but because she was a Seleucid. In particular, the

\(^2\) Antiquity did not designate Roman numerals to their dynastic names as we do today (i.e. Cleopatra I, Cleopatra II, etc.) and patronymics were oftentimes too ambiguous to rely on (for example, Ptolemy, the son of Ptolemy can refer to any one of the fourteen Ptolemaic kings).

\(^3\) The type of dedication was very important in revealing what was officially used and acknowledged by the ‘government’ as dynastic inscriptions and what dedications merely reflected the opinions of the monarchs’ subjects. First party, or official, dedications were the standard inscriptions such as the dating-formula reflecting Greek, Macedonian, and Egyptian protocols. Subsequent in importance to official first party inscriptions was the second party dedications best exemplified with the \(\text{Tep}\) (“on behalf of”) inscriptions. Second party inscriptions were especially important in revealing the attitude of the Alexandrians and Greeks towards their rulers outside of the official sphere since such dedications: “if they did not originate in family dedications and dedications of slaves, freedmen, and so on, for the health of relatives, the prosperity of employers and masters, and so on, are closely akin to them” (Fraser, 116). This type of dedication constituted the common “loyalty formula”, which both Alberro (162) and Fraser (116) believed the Greek population employed to express their respects to different members of the royal family and which “revealed that the Greeks had a personal relationship with, and were therefore under the protection of, the sovereign” (Fraser, 116). Although these types of dedications existed wherever Hellenistic monarchies did, this genre was especially popular in Ptolemaic Egypt and thus especially useful in determining the relationship between the Ptolemaic rulers and their subjects throughout history. Cf. Fraser, chp. 5.
bestowal of all of the titulary honours previously granted her Ptolemaic predecessors, such as sister and "Eucharistos", and the new title "Syra" clearly show her subjects’ acceptance of her as their queen.

Table #11: Titulary Titles for Cleopatra I during the Reign of Ptolemy V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date B.C.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type of Dedication</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>193 +?</td>
<td>• &quot;The Syrian&quot; or &quot;Syra&quot;&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Alexandrian</td>
<td>Василеус Птолемаіос και Βασιλіσσα Κλεοπάτρα Θεοί Επιφανείς&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193 +?</td>
<td>• &quot;Thea Epiphanes&quot; (&quot;Goddess Made Manifest&quot;)</td>
<td>Royal Titulature (First Party Inscription)</td>
<td>Василеус Птолемаіос και Βασιλίσσα Κλεοπάτρα Θεοί Επιφανείς και Ευχαρίστοι&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194/3 +</td>
<td>• &quot;Eucharistos&quot; (&quot;The Beneficent God&quot;)</td>
<td>Royal Titulature</td>
<td>Василευς Πτολεμαίος, βασιλεύς Πτολεμαίου και Βασιλίσσης Αρσινόης Θεών Φιλοπατόρων, καί Βασιλίσσα Κλεοπάτρα, ἡ ἀδελφή καὶ γυνή Θεοί Επιφανείς καὶ Ευχαρίστοι, καὶ ὁ γιός αὐτῶν Πτολεμαίος&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191/0</td>
<td>• &quot;Sister&quot;&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt; (Full Form:) &quot;Pharaoh Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy and Arsinoe, the Father-Loving Gods, with his sister, his wife Queen Cleopatra, the Manifest Gods&quot;</td>
<td>Royal Titulature (Second Party Inscription)</td>
<td>Василευς Πτολεμαίος, και Αρσινόης Θεών Φιλοπατόρων και Βασιλίσσης Αρσινόης Θεών Φιλοπατόρων, καί Βασιλίσσα Κλεοπάτρα, ἡ ἀδελφή καὶ γυνή Θεοί Επιφανείς καὶ Ευχαρίστοι, καὶ ὁ γιός αὐτῶν Πτολεμαίος&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204-180</td>
<td>&quot;In the reign of Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy and Arsinoe, the Father-Loving Gods&quot;</td>
<td>DATING FORMULA</td>
<td>Василευς Νον Πτολεμαίος και Αρσινόης, Θεών Φιλοπατόρων</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whitehorne believes that the Alexandrians gave Cleopatra I the nickname, "Syra" or "Syrian", out of their deep affection for her<sup>11</sup>. He believes that from the start there

---

<sup>4</sup> This title is the strongest proof of her acceptance by her varied subjects – a direct reference to her Seleucid origin in spite of the people’s anti-Seleucid feelings (cf. section 4.1 and footnotes).

<sup>5</sup> All bold-faced titles will be discussed following the tables.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Appian, Syriac Wars, I,5 and Strack, 245 no. 70.

<sup>7</sup> This type of inscription has been found at Philai as a temple dedication.

<sup>8</sup> This type of inscription has been found at Philai (cf. SEG 28, 1480), Egypt (cf. OGIS 95 and SEG 15, 874), and Mandarah (OGIS 97). Cf. PP VI.14515; RE II (1922), coll. 738-740, no. 14; Bevan, Egypt, 399; and Macurdy, 141-47.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Strack, 245 no. 71 and OGIS 99, 733.

<sup>10</sup> This inscription was found at Alexandria (cf. SB 8927).

<sup>11</sup> Whitehorne, 84.
Cleopatra I, Wife of Ptolemy V Epiphanes

existed a strong mutual affection between Cleopatra I and her new subjects. Unfortunately, he has no proof to support this view. This title might have been no more than an indication of her foreign birth and origin\textsuperscript{12}. For instance, if a Ptolemaic princess wed into the Seleucid house, she might have been nicknamed “the Egyptian” or “the Ptolemy” because of her foreign background\textsuperscript{13}. The most recent scholarship on this topic also appears to favour this title simply indicating origin and background. Höbl explains this title by saying: “Der sechzehnjährige König hatte jetzt eine etwa zehnjährige Frau, Kleopatra I., die man wegen ihrer Abstammung und ihrer naturgemäß seleukidenfreundlichen Einstellung die Syrerin nannte”\textsuperscript{14}.

The title, “Theos Epiphanes” - granted to Ptolemy V in 199/8 B.C. which designated him as a living god - was given to Cleopatra I after their marriage (193 B.C.)\textsuperscript{15}. Although a foreigner this title, as well as other titles such as “Eucharistos”, which had been granted to her predecessors, was not denied to her. This is very significant since the bestowal of these titles shows not only a good relationship between the Egyptian priesthood and Cleopatra I, but also her acceptance and support by her subjects; a quintessential ingredient for her later success. I believe that it was her acceptance by the Egyptian priesthood through which she gained access to certain religious functions\textsuperscript{16}. Thus, Cleopatra I at this early point of her queenship may have

\textsuperscript{12} It is safe to say that this title was not meant in a derogatory sense, since all of her other titles at this time (193 B.C.) and during the rest of her queenship were bestowed upon her largely with her subjects’ acceptance. Greatest proof of this fact can be seen in her title “sister”.

\textsuperscript{13} Cf. P.S.I. 541.

\textsuperscript{14} Höbl, 125-126. As concerns the notion of deep affection, the title appears to suggest that Cleopatra I’s varied subjects, at the very least, viewed her in a good light and not a hostile one since this open admittance of her foreign background and their acceptance and use of the title is unusually sentimental. (Cf. below, footnote 19).

\textsuperscript{15} Whitehorne, 85.

\textsuperscript{16} The dynastic cult of the Ptolemies, based on Pharaonic practice and custom, gave more influence and recognition to the Ptolemies in the religious realm.
already realised the amount of influence she could possess in the kingdom with the support of her subjects.

Her title, “sister” (ἡ ἀδελφή), also deserves special mention because she was not connected in any way to the Lagid family. The title is good proof of her subjects’, both Greco-Macedonian and Egyptian, acceptance. This title does not contradict but, instead, casts out all doubt of her connection to past Ptolemaic queens; solidifying her position. Many of her Greco-Macedonian subjects considered the Seleucids their bitter enemies, having already fought them in five Syrian Wars (in 343 B.C.)\(^\text{17}\). Her Egyptian subjects felt even stronger against the Seleucids since they scornfully associated the Seleucids with the Persians, who had ruled the Egyptian dynasty twice before – before Alexander the Great finally defeated them\(^\text{18}\). The bitterness of the Egyptians towards their former masters had already been capitalised on by the Ptolemaic government, who used this hatred to rally these subjects in the Second Syrian War against the Seleucids\(^\text{19}\). Fortunately for Cleopatra I, increased concessions and appeals to the native population began with Ptolemy V, whose very coronation was performed in Egyptian fashion\(^\text{20}\).

\(^{17}\) First Syrian War (274-271 B.C.) (cf. Whitehorne, 75 and Bevan, Egypt, 61-63); Second Syrian War (260-ca. 253 B.C.) (cf. Whitehorne, 75 and Bevan, Egypt, 69-71); Third Syrian War/Laodicean War (cf. Whitehorne, 75-76 and Bevan, Egypt, 189-204); Fourth Syrian War (221-217 B.C.) (cf. Whitehorne, 76-77 and Bevan, Egypt, 226-231); and Fifth Syrian War (cf. Whitehorne, 77-78 and Bevan, Egypt, 254ff.).

\(^{18}\) “Thereafter, for twenty years [343 – 323 B.C.] Egypt, and Kyrene also, were reduced to the status of a satrapy, and the humiliation wrought by this second era of Persian rule would later be remembered with bitterness as an abuse of all that was humane and decent” (Manley, Bill. The Penguin Historical Atlas of Ancient Egypt, 126ff). The Persians ruled Egypt as the Twenty-Seventh and Thirty-First Pharaonic Dynasties.

\(^{19}\) To the Egyptians, the Seleucids were Persians. An Egyptian demotic text (which was a translation of a Greek original) mentions Antiochus II as a ‘Philopersian king’. Bresciani (Das ptolemaische ägypten, 31-37) mentions how this reference to the Seleucids as Persians was “an attempt to capitalise on the hostility of the Egyptians to their former Persian rulers... the purpose of the survey documented by this text was to provide the basis for raising revenues needed to fight the Second Syrian War”.

\(^{20}\) This need for the Ptolemaic kings to strengthen the kingdom from ‘within’ by making concessions to the native population was a last effort to stabilise their crumbling kingdom. For more discussion on this, cf. Bevan, Egypt, 260.
Furthermore, the adoration towards the queenship thus far displayed towards earlier queens\textsuperscript{21} suggested that she would also receive their support. As regards political power that may have accompanied this title, the attitudes of her varied subjects were also mixed. To the Greeks, unless the queen was referred to specifically in their documents as possessing power (as was the case with Cleopatra I during the early years of Ptolemy VI's reign), they did not consider her a co-ruler of Egypt. To the Egyptians, though, their queen, the sister of the king, was considered a co-ruler who played an active part in public life, policies, and in court ceremonies\textsuperscript{22}. According to Egyptian law and custom, the 'sister of the king' shared in the administration of the kingdom\textsuperscript{23}. Because of the higher status and roles of royal women according to Egyptian law and custom, I believe that the Egyptianisation of certain institutions during Cleopatra I's lifetime was not a coincidence, but a deliberate attempt to bring herself more influence and, possibly one day, power.

The dating-formula before Cleopatra I’s regency still followed traditional Greek protocol whereby the king’s name was mentioned first and foremost\textsuperscript{24}. The dating-formula at this time in Ptolemaic history did not necessarily reveal where true power resided. For example, the throne was manipulated, controlled and run by the king’s ministers in the reign of Ptolemy IV, since Sosibius held control at the Ptolemaic court\textsuperscript{25}. Despite Sosibius' control, it was still the norm for the king's name to be found on the dating formula as the reigning monarch. The king was merely a figurehead.

\textsuperscript{21} Cf. chapter three.
\textsuperscript{22} \textit{CAH VII}, 164.
\textsuperscript{23} Cf. Sage’s note on Livy, xxvii.iii.9-11.
\textsuperscript{24} Change in the dating-formula occurs immediately after the death of Ptolemy V and in the reign of his son, Ptolemy VI. Cf. section 5.1 below.
\textsuperscript{25} Cf. chapter one.
Cleopatra I’s titulary evidence during the reign of her husband, Ptolemy V, suggests that her position was very unique in light of Ptolemaic queenship to date. The most significant difference of her position was her foreign descent. Contrary to expected reaction of the Ptolemaic subjects, both Greek and Egyptian, to this foreigner, Cleopatra I was accepted - the bestowal of titles and honours on her proves this fact. These honours should not be taken lightly, especially from the Egyptian point of view, since these titles, albeit superficial to a Greek, suggested certain responsibilities whether religious or ceremonia. Thus, Cleopatra I’s honours, while the wife of Ptolemy V, clearly reveal her support by her Egyptian subjects and by the Egyptian priesthood. To her Egyptian subjects, the fact that she and her husband, the king, represented religious leadership was unquestioned; a constant of Egyptian worship and loyalty. Furthermore, this earliest support from her Egyptian subjects, I believe, influenced her to further Egyptianise the Ptolemaic dynasty in the ultimate hope of gaining real power.

4.2 Literary Evidence

Cleopatra I is not mentioned in the ancient sources until her betrothal to Ptolemy V Epiphanes. Appian is the only ancient source to report this incident and to mention Cleopatra I by name:

"Ἡδη δὲ τὸν πρὸς Ρωμαίους πόλεμον ἐγνωκὼς ἀποκαλύπτειν, ἐπιγαμίας τοῖς ἐγγὺς βασιλέας προκατελάμβανε, καὶ Πτολεμαῖος μὲν ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἐστέλλε Κλεοπάτραν τὴν Σύραν ἐπίκλησιν, προϊκὰ Συρίαν τὴν κοίλην ἐπιδιδοῖς, ἢν αὐτὸς

---

26 Cf. chapter three for previous titles held by Arsinoe II.
27 Cf. section 4.3, below.
28 Cf. Appendix BB (for literary evidence for Ptolemy V) and Appendix CC (for literary evidence for Cleopatra I).
29 Appian, Syrian Wars, I.5. Cf. Polybius, xviii.51.10; Livy, xxxiii.40.3; and Walbank, II.623.
There are only a few other direct references to Cleopatra I mentioned by Livy, although none of these passages give any hints to the degree of influence Cleopatra I had with her husband. However, the amount of influence already displayed by previous Ptolemaic queens – mentioned by Plutarch – is an important fact to keep in mind. Plutarch stressed, as I strongly believe, that the combination of a weak sovereign and a strong queen made the possibility of an influential queen very feasible. We can also apply this scenario to Cleopatra I and Ptolemy V. Ptolemy V, like Ptolemy IV, was controlled and dominated by his powerful courtiers and was known as a weak king. There are many references to Epiphanes’ weak political and administrative position and to the constant threat he faced from the Seleucids, Romans, and his native Egyptian subjects throughout his lifetime. Cleopatra I’s strong character, on the other hand, is revealed immediately upon her husband’s death when she becomes the first female regent. Even before the death of her husband, Cleopatra I reveals herself as an exceptional queen through the many refinements she makes to the queenship to which I now turn.

30 Also important from Appian’s passage is the mention of Cleopatra I’s dowry. I will not discuss all of the different views concerning what Antiochus III’s intentions were in giving Coele-Syria as part of his daughter’s dowry or who had rights to the area after her death. However, as regards her dowry, Mahaffy provides the best comments on its consequences: “Her dowry of the revenues of Coele-Syria was very great, but gave rise to political complications in the sequel” (160). It must also be made clear that despite how scholarship has treated her dowry it did not empower her in any way nor give her any sort of elevated political position at the Ptolemaic court (Macurdy, 6). Cf. RE II (1922), col. 748 for the Egyptian, Seleucid, ancient, modern, and Jewish views on her dowry; Polybius, v.67.6-10; xxviii.1.2ff., 20.9; Josephus, A.J., xii.154ff.; Eusebius, II.124ff.; Daniel, 11.17; Bouché-Leclercq, Logides, I.385ff.; III.190; Green, 305; Walbank, I.592-593; III.356; and Will, II.162-163, 190-192.
31 Cf. Appendix CC.
32 Cf. Chapter three, footnotes 4 and 5.
33 Mahaffy notes the decline of the Ptolemaic Empire under Epiphanes (162ff.); Bevan also mentions Epiphanes’ suppression of military control by Polycrates, Epiphanes’ chief counsellor (Egypt, 276). Plutarch mentions time and again the weakness of Epiphanes and his constant desire for hunting. Cf. Appendix C for other references to the character of Epiphanes.
4.3 Cleopatra I as the Pharaoh’s Wife

The Ptolemaic rulers possessed a very unique advantage over their contemporaries in the other Hellenistic kingdoms. Respect for the Egyptian priesthood and the adoption of Pharaonic customs won them recognition and designation as a legitimate Pharaonic dynasty. Alexander the Great had begun the policy where each ruler of Egypt was consecrated as pharaoh on his accession\textsuperscript{34}. This policy was regularised among the Ptolemaic rulers under Ptolemy V\textsuperscript{35}. The implementation of this policy to gain the support of the indigenous Egyptian population and the powerful priesthood with the building and restoration of temples throughout the empire\textsuperscript{36} had very different results. Far from receiving uniform acceptance from their Egyptian subjects, the Ptolemaic kings had to constantly suppress revolts and uprisings from the Thebaid region; where the majority of the native Egyptian population resided. Furthermore, the native subjects, instead, adored and revered their queens\textsuperscript{37}. These royal women benefited the most from their designations as Pharaonic queens despite the turmoil that surrounded the monarchy and the Ptolemaic rulers. Pharaonic royal women were revered and held respectable roles in many spheres of Egyptian life\textsuperscript{38}. Cleopatra I took full advantage of this association and took steps to establish permanently the same privileges for her descendants by capitalising on Pharaonic women’s rights to ownership of land and guardianship, roles in the Pharaonic dynastic religion, and the privileges gained from permanently instituting sibling marriage into the Ptolemaic monarchy.

\textsuperscript{34} Alexander was enthroned as Pharaoh at Memphis (cf. Ps-Callisth. 1.34.1-2.).
\textsuperscript{35} Ptolemy III as Pharaoh. See OGIS 56.1-20. (Cf. Préaux, 1.259-260.)
\textsuperscript{36} Cf. OGIS 56.8-12 for temple building under Ptolemy IV; Bevan, Egypt, 238; and Green, 348, 355-358.
\textsuperscript{37} Cf. chapter three.
\textsuperscript{38} Cf. chapter three (especially “Arsinoe II” and “Arsinoe III”).
Egyptian women, in Pharaonic and Hellenistic times, had greater roles, status, and a wider range of rights, in general, than their Greek contemporaries. This is in stark contrast with the restrictions placed on ancient Greek and Mediterranean women. In Egypt, the higher the woman's position in society the more she was considered the equal to her husband in every role. One of the most unique rights Egyptian women enjoyed was their right to own land. The fact that Egyptian women had a right of ownership is a commonality, but rare among the Ptolemaic queens. Egyptian women owned their own land, and like the men, managed it in any way they saw fit: "It is a well-established fact that in the Greco-Egyptian law there was no limitation on the capacity of women to take part in any sort of private commercial transaction." The profits and revenue from their lands was also their own; thus a very economically-minded manager - even if female - could accumulate great personal wealth. Both Arsinoe II and Cleopatra I had personal wealth not as a direct result of the use of this Pharaonic law, but as a result of their status and holdings before they became Ptolemaic queens. This Pharaonic law was, however, significant because it allowed them to keep the revenue, which they had already accrued. The adoption of this Pharaonic law, thus, allowed other queens, like Arsinoe II and Cleopatra I, to gain greater prominence and influence at the court and greatly strengthened the queen's position at the court.

39 Carney, 436 and n. 38.
40 Cf. Pomeroy, 157ff.
41 Taubenschlag, 175.
42 Arsinoe II, wife of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, had accumulated so much money from her two previous marriages that she could easily support her own mercenary army (cf. chapter three, section 3.1) and Cleopatra I's dowry of Coele-Syria was also a source of wealth, which the Ptolemies and Seleucids immediately fought for the rights of after her death. Greek rule in Ptolemaic Egypt entitled a woman rights to her dowry: "The dowry is always the property of the wife, but the husband has the right of use" (Taubenschlag, 16, 127).
Apart from land, though, Pharaonic women also had matrimonial, inheritance\textsuperscript{43}, and guardianship rights. The one which most affected Cleopatra I was the guardianship rights. In the event of a deceased husband, the mother had the right to appoint a guardian for her child and then to act on behalf of her child in financial transactions. The woman, in this case, had a great deal of authority: "Les droits de la mère dans la famille en vertu de l’autorité paternelle, si l’on peut s’exprimer ainsi, n’étaient donc en rien inférieurs à ceux du père"\textsuperscript{44}. In the cases of Arsinoe III and Cleopatra I, the guardianship of the child, the heir, was placed on the mother. Normally, under Greek law the guardianship would fall on the next male of paternal relation. The Ptolemaic queenship’s association to a Pharaonic custom, however, allowed the queen to act as guardian. By the time of Cleopatra II, Cleopatra I’s daughter, this guardianship had gained strength and importance where the throne could legally belong to a widowed queen, as long as a male ruler from her family was associated with her on the throne\textsuperscript{45}. Thus, I believe, the legal status of Egyptian women allowed the Ptolemaic royal women to gain greater influence and that eventually allowed Cleopatra I to become the first female guardian and regent of the Ptolemaic dynasty. Cleopatra I’s attempts to Egyptianise certain Greek institutions are very clearly seen in her attempts to capitalise on this Pharaonic law.

Pharaonic royal women were also exalted and greatly honoured in the divine and religious realm. In this realm, the female members of the royal family represented family continuity\textsuperscript{46} and renewal, since they produced the male heirs to the throne\textsuperscript{47}. It is because

\textsuperscript{43} Taubenschlag, 6, 16, 22, \textit{passim}.
\textsuperscript{44} Taubenschlag, 52.
\textsuperscript{45} Taubenschlag, 563ff. Cf. Macurdy, 153 and Strack, 75.
\textsuperscript{46} Carney (437) believes this to be one of the main functions and responsibilities of the royal women.
\textsuperscript{47} Robins saw this as a vital function of the royal women, which can be traced back to the creation of their gods in Egyptian mythology.
of these two roles and responsibilities that Egyptian royal women in some respects were considered even more important than their male counterparts. In fact, it is because of their importance towards the continuance of the royal line that the Pharaonic monarchy is considered by some scholars to have been matrilineal 48.

Cleopatra I could not follow the normal tradition of sibling marriage her predecessors, Arsinoe II and Arsinoe III 49, had followed. However, recognising the need and importance to continue this custom for her children, she betrothed her first two children, Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II, at a very early age. The advantages of continuing the tradition of sibling marriage among her descendants are threefold. Firstly, sibling marriage was essential for maintaining and unifying the royal family’s past, present, and future 50. This association with past and present Ptolemaic rulers was more important to Cleopatra I than to, say, Arsinoe II, since Cleopatra I’s, and especially her children’s, legitimacy needed to be solidified and verified. With her own legitimacy reinforced, the legitimacy of her own children was also guaranteed. Secondly, through sibling marriage, Cleopatra I strengthened the queenship for her female successors and did not need to worry whether or not their daughters would be supplanted by rival relatives — as Arsinoe II had done to Arsinoe I when she returned to Egypt 51 — but knew that each in turn would become the Ptolemaic queen alongside her brother and king 52. Cleopatra I made further

48 For more on this, cf. Robins and Troy passim. Caanning (27) was one who believed that the “purity of descent was reckoned through the female, rather than the male line”.
49 Cf. Appendix A.
50 Carney, 429.
51 Arsinoe I was the step-daughter of Arsinoe II. Having been accused of plotting against her husband, Ptolemy II, Arsinoe I was banished to the Thebaid. Ptolemy II then married Arsinoe II c. 275 B.C. (Macurdy, 116). Cf. Appendix A.
52 Yet ironically, it was the lack of real sibling marriage with Ptolemy V that gave Cleopatra I the throne. Had Ptolemy V married a real sister, matters might have been different. Cf. Appendix A.
attempts to guarantee her children rights to the throne ensuring that her dynastic name be continued by her descendants much as Ptolemy I Soter had for his progeny.

The result of Cleopatra I’s successful assumption of important roles and functions created an uncharacteristic “polarity between the sexes” for her successors. With the greater respect and reverence towards the queen, as Pharaoh’s wife, and greater influence and roles that accompanied this stature, it is not surprising to find Ptolemaic queens in the “traditionally male spheres of government and warfare” immediately following the death of Ptolemy V Epiphanes, Cleopatra I’s husband. Cleopatra I’s success at associating herself with the Pharaonic queens gave her queenship greater influence and also legitimised her children in their subjects’ eyes.

4.4 Cleopatra I’s Position at the Court

The change in the political position and power of Ptolemaic queens and the way the queenship would be viewed occurred immediately after Ptolemy V Epiphanes’ premature death (in 180 B.C.). After Ptolemy V’s death, as was the case with Ptolemy IV, the throne was inherited by a child. However, unlike the defenceless Ptolemy V, Ptolemy VI was protected by his mother, Cleopatra I, who immediately became more influential and powerful at the court. The literary tradition supports the changed status of Cleopatra I after her husband’s death. There is a keen sense of not only Cleopatra I’s superior position over her son, Ptolemy VI, but also Cleopatra I’s internationally recognised status as Ptolemy V’s equal by Rome and the other Hellenistic kingdoms.

---

53 Pomeroy, xviii and 23ff.
54 Pomeroy, xviii.
According to Polybius and Livy, Cleopatra I acquired equal status with her deceased husband. This can be inferred from their passages which mention the sending of envoys from the various surrounding kingdoms to renew friendships and treaties with Egypt during Philometor’s *Anakleteria* (“coming of age”) festival; an event which occurred nearly eight years after the death of Epiphanes. The passages are as follows:

καὶ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν καὶ περὶ τοῦ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου προσπεσόντος τοῖς Ἀχαῖοι διὸτι γέγονεν αὐτῷ τὰ νομίζόμενα γίνεσθαι τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν, ὅταν εἰς ἡλικίαν ἔλθωσιν, ἀνακλητηρία, νομίζοντες σφίζα καθήκειν ἐπισημήνασθαι τὸ γεγονός, ἐγγράσαντο πέμπειν πρεσβευτὰς ἀνανεωσμένους τὰ προὐπάχοντα τῷ ἐθνὶ φιλάνθρωπα πρὸς τὴν βασιλείαν, καὶ παρατηράντησαν Ἀλκίθων καὶ Πασιάδα.\(^{56}\)

and

*Per idem tempus quinque legati ad regem missi, qui res in Macedonia aspicerent.*

*Alexandriam iidem ad Ptolemaeum renovandae amicitiae causa proficiscere iussi.*\(^{57}\)

The general delay of Egypt’s neighbours to send envoys to renew the treaties between themselves and Egypt immediately after Ptolemy V Epiphanes’ death suggests Cleopatra I’s recognised and acknowledged role as the continued ruler of Egypt. Treaties as a rule, during this period in history, lasted only as long as the monarch and had to be renewed with his successor, or with his heir’s guardians, immediately after his death. However, after Epiphanes’ death and for the next decade\(^ {58}\) until Ptolemy VI reached the “age of majority” when he became old enough to rule on his own, no envoys appeared in Egypt. Instead, Cleopatra I was recognised as the ruler of Egypt, in her husband’s place.

---

\(^{55}\) There is another passage by Livy which mentions the kingdom ruled by a Ptolemy and Cleopatra equally as co-rulers, although Livy has accidentally mistaken Cleopatra II for Cleopatra I (xxxviii.9-11). *Cf.* Appendix H.

\(^{56}\) Polybius, xxviii.12.8-9 (170-169 B.C.) and Walbank, III.345.

\(^{57}\) Livy, xlii.vi.4.

\(^{58}\) Livy’s passage is placed in the year 173 B.C., Polybius’ passage in 170/169 B.C. Although there is a difference between the dates, this merely reflects the controversy concerning the time of Cleopatra I’s death. The renewal of the treaty in 173 B.C. is generally agreed by scholars such as Macurdy, Stähelin, Strack, and Otto to have coincided with the year of Cleopatra I’s death (*cf.* chapter five, footnote 7).
This appears to be one of the only possible explanations to explain the ten-year gap of foreign embassies between Epiphanes’ death and Philometor’s Anakleteria festival.

The extremely smooth transition from Ptolemy V Epiphanes to Cleopatra I is the other main argument which appears to suggest that Cleopatra I was viewed as Ptolemy V’s equal. Cleopatra I’s acceptance as the ruler of Egypt not only by her subjects, but also by Rome and the Hellenistic kingdoms was unprecedented in Ptolemaic history. It is certain from these two references that she possessed a great deal of respect from the surrounding kingdoms after his death. Furthermore, being the sister of Seleucus IV who was ruler of the Seleucid dynasty, Cleopatra I was the only Ptolemaic ruler to date who did not have to worry about clashes between Egypt and Syria; no doubt a relief both to the Seleucid population and to Egypt’s subjects.

Lastly, this transition of power from Ptolemy V Epiphanes to Cleopatra I and her universal acceptance as a co-ruler of Egypt with her son, Ptolemy VI, hint at her involvement in her husband’s death. However, the best evidence of Cleopatra I’s involvement in the premature death of Ptolemy V comes from the literary evidence, which mentions Epiphanes preparing his forces to reacquire Coele-Syria from the Seleucid kingdom just prior to his death in 181/0 B.C. At this time, the king of Syria, Seleucus IV, was the full brother of Cleopatra I. We know that Cleopatra I and Seleucus IV had no ill-will against each other because during Cleopatra I’s regency, there existed peace between these two kingdoms, a peace not yet seen before this time. Even with evidence of Epiphanes’ war preparations against Seleucus IV, there are two further pieces of evidence, which indicate that his death was a timely one; and therefore not at all

60 Cf. Diodorus Siculus, xxix.29; Porphyrius, FGrHist. no.260, F. 48; and Morkholm, Antiochus, 180.
Cleopatra I, Wife of Ptolemy V Epiphanes

coincidental. First of all, Ptolemy V had just put down the very last of the native insurgents in the Delta region (184-3 B.C.). This native unrest had plagued the dynasty since his father’s, Ptolemy IV’s, rule. Second of all, upon the death of his father, Ptolemy VI was not old enough to rule on his own. According to the Pharaonic guardianship law, his mother was entitled to this appointment. Cleopatra I was also as extremely popular with her subjects, both Greek and Egyptian, as Arsinoe III, who had set the earliest precedent of being appointed guardian by her subjects. With the relief of not having to deal with the major revolts and battles which had plagued the kingdom for several years both at home and abroad, and her certain appointment as her son’s guardian, Cleopatra I was in an ideal situation after the death of her husband.

4.5 Summary & Cleopatra I’s Influences

To the time of her husband’s death, Cleopatra I’s political position was no more, but no less than the position held by Arsinoe III. However, her status and the status of successive Ptolemaic queens changed with the very premature death of Ptolemy V Epiphanes. Cleopatra I’s achievements became the starting block and model for her female successors.

Cleopatra I strengthened the position and role of the queen to such an extent that her female successors had the luxury of a well-established foundation from which they could draw their power. The greatest impact Cleopatra I had on the Ptolemaic dynasty was her refinements to the role and position of Ptolemaic queens in the hierarchic structure of the court. Cleopatra I achieved this principally by exploiting, first, the extent of power and control - political and religious, and private and public - she could possess through her association as “Pharaoh’s wife”. This connection to the Greco-Egyptian
dynastic cult exalted the position of the queen to a godly status in the eyes of her subjects, especially the Egyptians, and guaranteed their loyalty to the queenship. Fortunately, even before reaping the benefits and honours that came with her role as the Pharaoh’s wife, Cleopatra I already enjoyed a much higher status as an “Egyptian” royal woman. Her esteemed position greatly contrasted the much inferior position of women – even aristocratic women - in the majority of the other Mediterranean societies. Furthermore, through her exploitation of sibling marriage, Cleopatra I established continuity for her female successors as each in turn attained the status of Pharaoh’s wife and also all of the honours and roles she herself possessed and established. Especially noteworthy was the adoption and use of the Pharaonic law of guardianship by Cleopatra I. Through this law, queens now had a right to become guardians for their underage sons. Last of all, from sibling marriage, the foundation was established for future queens, from which they could draw support and influence, if the situation required them to be stronger and if the chance was open to them.
...She was also the first Ptolemaic Queen to serve as regent and co-ruler with her son.¹

The death of Ptolemy V and the accession of his heir, Ptolemy VI, brought a whole new era to Ptolemaic queenship. This was the result of the policy of Cleopatra I, who brought about several unprecedented events²: i) Cleopatra I ended the manipulation and influence of the powerful court aristocrats on the monarchy, ii) and instead, relied on her own personal attendants to serve as her chief advisors; iii) the titulary was also affected by Cleopatra I’s regency, since she was able to have her name placed even before the king’s name in the dating formula; and iv) beginning with Cleopatra I, portraiture began to depict the Ptolemaic queens more realistically and accurately³. All these innovations in the queenship suggest Cleopatra I’s control over Ptolemaic affairs during her regency, and the continuation of these innovations by later queens is the most obvious indication that the queenship’s increased influence and power was established.

Cleopatra I was the first official female regent of Ptolemaic Egypt and along with this regency came great changes to Ptolemaic institutions and Greek-based protocols⁴. Unfortunately, the exact period during which she ruled is unknown; ranging from a four-year reign (180-176 B.C.) to a seven-year reign (180-173 B.C.). However, these specifics although important are not critical since they do not change our view of the impact her regency had on Ptolemaic Egypt. According to the epigraphic evidence, by

¹ Whitehorne, 88.
² These points will be discussed in detail in this chapter.
⁴ Macurdy, 147.
175 B.C., her son, Ptolemy VI\(^5\), and her daughter, Cleopatra II\(^6\), had already replaced her in the dating formula. This, therefore, supports the theories of Pestman, Samuel, and Whitehorne that Cleopatra I must have died sometime between April and July of 176 B.C.\(^7\)

5.1 Titulary Evidence

Before Cleopatra I’s unprecedented regency, each new ruler and his consort were regularly added into the dating formula, a formula which gave the name of the reigning king followed by the name of the priest of Alexander and then each dynastic pair who preceded the king. For example, during the reign of Ptolemy III the dating formula was:

In the reign of Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy and Arsinoe\(^8\), Brother-and Sister Gods, year 9, Apollonides son of Moschion being priest of Alexander and the Brother-and Sister Gods and the Benefactor Gods, Menecrateia daughter of Philammon being Kanephoros of Arsinoe Philadelphos...\(^9\)

By Ptolemy V’s reign, the dating formula had a standardised formula wherein the king was mentioned first, followed by: the king’s many titles, the priest of Alexander, a complete list of the dynastic pairs beginning with Ptolemy I and Berenice I, the ‘Gods Soteres’, and finally a list of the priestesses:

---

\(^5\) PP VI.14548, 17233; RE 23 (1959), coll. 1702-19, no. 24; Otto, passim; and Morkholm, Antiochus, 64-101. Cf. Appendix DD.

\(^6\) PP VI.14516; RE II (1922), coll. 740-44, no. 15; Bevan, Egypt, index; Macurdy, 147-61; and Otto, 1-23.

\(^7\) Cf. Pestman, no.9, note a; Samuel, 140; Whitehorne, 87; Koenen, 64; and Skeat, 33. The other dates proposed for her year of death are: before 173 B.C. - Otto, 1; in 173 B.C. - Livy, xlii.6.4 (i.e. based on the Roman embassy that came to Egypt to renew their treaty of friendship); RE II (1922), col. 740; Bouché-Leclercq, Lagides, II; Mahaffy, 166, Strack 183, 196ff.; before 171 B.C. - Livy, xlii.xxix.5.

\(^8\) Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II.

\(^9\) Canopus Decree (239 B.C.) (for the translation of this, cf. Bevan, Egypt, 208ff.). The dating formula, at this time, was still not entirely complete. For instance, the first dynastic pair of Ptolemy I Soter and his wife, Berenice I, were excluded from the dating formula. However, what is obvious in this early dating formula is the importance of including Arsinoe I’s priestess in the formula; attestation to the popularity and adoration of the people (Greco-Macedonian and Egyptian) towards the queenship.
In the reign of the young one... a king, like the Sun, the great king of the upper and lower regions; offspring of the Gods Philopatores...son of the Sun, Ptolemy Living-For-Ever Beloved of Ptah, in the 9th year, when Aetus, son of Aetus, was priest of Alexander, and the Gods Soteres, and the Gods Adelphoi, and the Gods Euergetai, and the Gods Philopatores, and the God Epiphanes Eucharistos; Pyrrha daughter of Philinus being Athlophoros of Berenice Euergetis, Area daughter of Diogenes being Kanephoros of Arsinoe Philadelphus, Irene daughter of Ptolemy being Priestess of Arsinoe Philopator, the 4th of the month Xandikos, according to the Egyptians the 18th of Mechir.

This standard formula was utilised by each successive ruler and was one propagandistic method revealing how royal power resided in the king (and not the queen). However, this dating protocol did not always accurately indicate where real political authority and power within the dynasty actually resided. Two of the weaker monarchs, Ptolemy IV and Ptolemy V, were controlled by the leading ministers and aristocrats at the court, although the dating formula shows no sign of this weakness in the monarchic rule. Instead, the systematic use of the king’s name first in all royal inscriptions instilled an important propagandistic image of the kingdom being ruled successively by powerful Ptolemaic kings. This was essential to maintain the image of a strong and united dynasty at a time when the Ptolemies had to battle constant civil uprisings and revolts both at home and abroad. Cleopatra I’s regency saw a deviation from this patriarchal norm and for the first time in Ptolemaic history the king’s name was not mentioned first, but followed the queen’s name (below, Table #12 “Dating-Formula”). It was a remarkable feat for this Seleucid princess.

10 Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II.  
11 Ptolemy III and Berenice II.  
12 Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe III.  
13 Another title for Ptolemy V.  
14 From the Rosetta Stone (ca. 196 B.C.) (cf. Bevan, Egypt, 263ff. for the full translation).  
15 Ptolemy IV and the early years of Ptolemy V. Cf. chapter one (especially, “Sosibius” and “Agathocles”).
Table #12: Titulature during the Rule of Cleopatra I and Ptolemy VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date B.C.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type of Dedication</th>
<th>Titles/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>186-180</td>
<td>• “Ptolemy the Son”</td>
<td>Royal Titulature</td>
<td>• Cleopatra I’s eldest son was known only by this title from the time he was born up to the time of his father’s death in 180.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after 180</td>
<td>• “Ptolemy VI Philometor”</td>
<td>Royal Titulature</td>
<td>• Ptolemy VI has become co-ruler of Egypt with his mother, Cleopatra I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179/8+</td>
<td>• “King Ptolemy Philometor”</td>
<td>Royal Titulature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>• “Queen Cleopatra and King Ptolemy”</td>
<td>in Greek texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Queen Cleopatra Manifest Goddess and King Ptolemy, and her other children and to themselves”</td>
<td>Second Party Inscription18</td>
<td>• found on the base of a broken statue base in Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-176</td>
<td>• “In the reigns of Cleopatra the Mother, the Manifest Goddess, and Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy, the Manifest God20,”</td>
<td>DATING-FORMULA</td>
<td>• found in lines 14-15 of P.Coll.Youtie 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “In the reigns of the Female King, Cleopatra, and the King, Ptolemy the Son, Manifest Gods.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cleopatra I’s titulary innovation reflected and would continue to represent the amount of political influence and power Ptolemaic queens would have. From Cleopatra I’s regency onward, the titulature more accurately revealed who had political influence and power within the dynasty. In Cleopatra I’s case, the years she appeared first in the

---

16 Cf. Whitehorne, 86 and OGIS 98.
18 The acceptance of the court and her subjects of her position and the lesser role of her son are clearly revealed in the second-party inscriptions from the period during Cleopatra I’s regency.
19 Cf. SEG xvi.788 and Whitehorne, 87 for the inscription. Burstein (202ff.) believes that Cleopatra I received praise from her Greco-Macedonian subjects because her intentions towards the dynasty and everything and everyone within it were good.
20 Cf. RE, s.v. 14 “Kleopatra”, col. 740.
21 For further comments on this cf. Whitehorne, 86.
titulature were accurate representations that royal power resided in the queen. This innovation continued after Cleopatra I’s death. Already by Cleopatra II, the titulature in the dating formula indicated royal power being equally shared by both king and queen. The most obvious indication of this is seen in the Greek inscription where the participle used in Cleopatra I and Ptolemy VI’s time (\(\text{Βασιλεύοντες}\), translated as “in the reigns of”) continued to be used in the plural by Cleopatra I’s descendents: “\(\text{Βασιλεύοντες Πτολεμαῖος καὶ Κλεοπάτρα οἱ Πτολεμαίου καὶ Κλεοπάτρας θεῶν Ἐπιφανῶν}\)”.

Aside from Cleopatra I’s dominance at the court as revealed by her position in the dating formula\(^{23}\), the manner in which her son, Ptolemy VI, was portrayed throughout his mother’s regency in the titulature (180-ca. 176 B.C.) is equally noteworthy.

Immediately after the death of his father, Ptolemy V (in 180 B.C.), Ptolemy VI acquired a new title – “Philometor” (“Mother-Loving”)\(^{24}\) – a title acknowledging his mother as the more dominant figure at the court\(^{25}\). A similar occurrence already occurred in Ptolemaic history where the king took a title to form closer ties to a queen both more influential and more beloved by the people. Ptolemy II took the title, “Adelphus” (“Brother-Sister Gods”) as part of his inclusion into the dynastic cult revealing his high regard for his sister, Arsinoe II. Whereas Ptolemy II’s title revealed equality between

---

\(^{22}\) Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II (SEG xvii.700). When the royal power was represented only by the king, the participle was only found in the singular.

\(^{23}\) “Wir können jetzt durch die Datierungsformel einiger Papyri aus dem 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Ptolemaios’ VI. nachweisen, daß Kleopatra I. nicht nur Vormund ihres Sohnes gewesen ist, sondern auch als Regentin offiziell anerkannt war” (Otto, 1).

\(^{24}\) Cf. Whitehorne, 86.

\(^{25}\) I do not believe that this title, “Philometor”, was given to Ptolemy VI to emphasise his mother’s Syrian connections and to emphasise his territorial expectations in that area (Coele-Syria) since this title was given to him when he became co-ruler with his mother. (Cf. This is the theory of Green, 840; Grant, 21; and Gruen, HW, 687.) The claims to Coele-Syria are premature for this title since this title clearly reveals that Cleopatra I was the dominant co-ruler. The former could have been argued if Ptolemy VI acquired this title long after his mother’s death and when he was much older and ruled on his own.
king and queen in rank, Philometor’s title clearly proved his subordination to his mother, who was his co-ruler, but clearly, he was not her equal:

At this point the name [Philometor] was clear in its meaning for the Greeks: it put the son and male partner of the joint rule in the second place and appealed to his obligation toward his mother, who continued to be called Theos Epiphanes.  

Cleopatra I’s dominating influence is also confirmed by the fact that neither Ptolemy VI’s name nor the title of his dynastic priest (“and of King Ptolemy Philometor”) appeared first in the dating formulae until after her death. Last of all, the dedication found in SEG XVI.788 is very important in showing Ptolemy VI’s subordinate position to his mother, who, in this inscription, is deified while Ptolemy VI is not. Although both were rulers (Cleopatra I, the regent, and Ptolemy VI, the king), the titulature clearly reveals that Cleopatra I was the more influential and recognised ruler.

The royal titulature of the kingdom also reveals the acceptance of the majority of her subjects - the royal officials, ministers, and her varied subjects - by her authoritative position as the “senior partner” in this relationship. The acceptance by the court of this arrangement was unprecedented in Ptolemaic history, although already witnessed in Pharaonic history. The demotic form of the dating formula, which mentions Cleopatra I first, clearly reveals the Egyptian people’s recognition of Cleopatra I’s reign as a joint

---

26 Koenen, 64 and Hölbl, 128.
27 In the subsequent dating-formula when Ptolemy VI Philometor’s name precedes a Cleopatra, the Cleopatra named is his sister and the daughter of Cleopatra I, Cleopatra II. Cf. Koenen, 64 and Koenen, L. “Die demotische Zivilprozessordnung,” APF 17 (1960), 11-16.
30 Although Ptolemy V also had guardians (Sosibius and Agathocles), these individuals were male and were members of important aristocratic families. Cleopatra I, however, was a woman and a foreigner making her acceptance by all levels of the dynasty that much more remarkable.
31 Cf. chapter three, section 3.3.
rule\textsuperscript{32}. The constraints of Greek tradition and bureaucracy visibly weakened by Cleopatra I's time. Most notable is a Greek dedication\textsuperscript{33} made by a commoner who acknowledged and addressed Cleopatra I first before mentioning the king, Ptolemy VI. Furthermore, another inscription made by a senior officer from among one of the Ptolemaic garrisons on Cyprus addressed the Ptolemaic rulers by also naming Cleopatra I first\textsuperscript{34}. Not only did Cleopatra I break with normal dating protocols by placing her name first in the dating formula, but her subjects through their dedications did so as well and openly accepted her authority. The nature and origin of Cleopatra I's support, thus, becomes much less of a surprise based on the extant evidence.

The titulature during the reign of Ptolemy VI, after his mother's death, once again returned to the more customary Greek protocol where the king was mentioned first. However, Cleopatra I "like her predecessors Arsinoe II (sister-wife of Ptolemy II), Berenice II (the wife of Ptolemy III) and her own mother-in-law, Arsinoe III, who all had their own cults and priestesses in Alexandria, [she] was rewarded with one in the Thebaid\textsuperscript{35}". This honour once more attests to the amount of influence Cleopatra I exerted on her subjects and on the Egyptian priesthood\textsuperscript{36}.

\textsuperscript{33} Referring to the inscription: "Queen Cleopatra and King Ptolemy" (\textit{P.Coll.Youie} 12).
\textsuperscript{34} Referring to the next inscription: "Queen Cleopatra Manifest Goddess and King Ptolemy..." (\textit{SEG xvi.788}).
\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Cf.} Whitehorne, 87.
\textsuperscript{36} \textit{Cf.} Whitehorne, 87 and Pestman, \textit{op. cit.}, 142-143.
Cleopatra I, Mother of Ptolemy VI Philometor

Table #13: Titulature During the Reign of Ptolemy VI After Cleopatra I’s Death

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date B.C.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type of Dedication</th>
<th>Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>after her death from 165/4 onwards</td>
<td>• “of Ptolemy and Cleopatra his mother”</td>
<td>in Upper Egypt</td>
<td>• Both Whitehorne and Pestman believe that she was honoured with this Eponymous priesthood after her death.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “of Cleopatra, the Mother, the Manifest Goddess”</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (Rewarded with the Posthumous Honour of an Individual Cult)</td>
<td>in the Thebaid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was the first time that a queen assumed full political control and was acknowledged as possessing this power. Such rare occurrences, I believe, foreshadow the political vicissitudes that would continue to plague the kingdom in the reigns of the later Ptolemies. From Cleopatra I’s time onwards, the addition or omission of later sovereigns or queens from this list were key indicators to such shifts of political power between the later strife-stricken dynastic family. The presence and order of a ruler’s name in the dating formula became a direct reflection of the amount of control that individual had in the Ptolemaic government. Cleopatra I is thus important because she was responsible for this important change to the dating formula, but more importantly because her ability to change this reflected the influence or authority she possessed while regent.

5.2 Cleopatra I and her Portraiture

Cleopatra I utilised coinage as a means to win the support of her many subjects at a time when the monarchy was still unstable. This specific propagandistic function of

37 Cf. RE, s.v. 14 “Kleopatra”, col.740.
38 For further readings on this, cf. Fraser, 1.214ff.
39 Thompson, 91. Cf. Whitehorne, 84.
Cleopatra I, Mother of Ptolemy VI Philometor

Coinage varied greatly from that of Ptolemy I Soter. Ptolemy I Soter coined on a large scale mainly to pay for the extensive economic, military, and civil expenses that were incurred from constant political and military disputes. Aside from the financial stipulations, Ptolemy I inaugurated his (dynastic) image on the obverse side of all Ptolemaic coinage to ensure dynastic continuity within his new kingdom as its founder, intending for each of his successors to mint his image on their coins. Other repetitious standards to maintain a link to himself was the adoption of his name by each successive ruler. On the reverse side of coinage, Ptolemy I and his successors minted images such as eagles and thunderbolts to reflect the dynasty and monarch’s power. Cleopatra I made similar attempts to institute her own set of standards for her female successors by Egyptianising the queen’s portraiture to portray the queen more realistically. Similar to Ptolemy I, Cleopatra I also tried to establish that each of her successors bear her name.

Indeed, little credit has been given to Cleopatra I, who was the first Ptolemaic queen and first female regent to coin money in her own image. Her coinage attests to the unprecedented amount of influence she wielded, since it was generally felt that coinage in that monarch’s name was one of the distinguishing marks of a true ruler. The portraiture of queens from the early second century onwards, thus, reveal the impact of Cleopatra I’s regency and the queen’s unprecedented amount of political control and

40 Morkholm, Coinage, 23, 27.
41 Ptolemies II to IV coined their dynasty’s founder on the obverse side of their coins. Although beginning with Ptolemy V’s reign, the king’s own image was minted (Davis and Kraay, 272ff). Ptolemaic rulers continued to coin Ptolemy I’s image on the obverse side of their coins, but sporadically included coins in their own images (Kyrieleis passim). Cf. Newell, E.T. Royal Greek Portrait Coins. (1937) Racine, Wisconsin.
42 Eagles and thunderbolts were especially popular since these symbols were associated to Zeus, the King of the Greek gods, and so the kingship was also seen as a divine kingship. (Cf. Morkholm, Coinage, 27.)
43 Berenice II of Cyrene of the Ptolemaic kingdom was the first female princess to coin money.
influence with the more accurate portrayal of the Ptolemaic queens from Cleopatra I’s time onwards.

There exists only two or three images of the queen\(^{45}\). These portrayals of Cleopatra I survive in the form of coins, busts, and oinochoai portraits. However, despite the scarcity of examples, several innovations and changes to the queen’s portraiture are seen, namely an Egyptianising of the queen’s portraiture. We can attribute these changes to Cleopatra I’s reign since before her reign the style was more Greek, but beginning with her, Egyptian styles dominated and after her reign, the depictions of the queens became more and more accurate\(^{46}\). The contrast between Cleopatra I’s Egyptianising features and the Greek features of Arsinoe III serve to illustrate this difference best.

The portraits of Arsinoe III and Cleopatra I differ significantly, most obviously, in the manner the face, hair, and diadem were rendered. Arsinoe III’s portrait reveals a long oval face, puffy protruding eyes, a *stephane*, and a melon coiffure (that is, several waves of hair over each ear), all of which are identified as Greek features (below, figures). Cleopatra I’s portrait is quite different with a rounder more girlish face, puffy cheeks, ringed eyes, an Egyptianising smile, hair brushed into a tier of curls on each side of the face with a long set falling on the shoulders\(^{47}\), and a diadem\(^{48}\) sitting loosely on the hair, “just as it lies on contemporary Egyptian statues”\(^{49}\) (below, figures).

\(^{45}\) Cf. Thompson, plates xliii, xlv, lxv, lxxiii.
\(^{46}\) Thompson, 91ff.
\(^{47}\) A feature seen also on the coins of Cleopatra I.
\(^{48}\) Pomeroy (29) explains how the diadem is clear evidence of the queen’s deification, since the diadem was only worn by divinities and by royalty who represented themselves as divinities.
\(^{49}\) Thompson, 92.
The depiction of queens as weak, thin, and nervous before Cleopatra I’s time mirrored the queens’ weaker influences, positions, and roles within the male-dominated dynasty. By the time of Ptolemy VI, because of Cleopatra I’s influence on the queenly portraiture, the trend of the Ptolemies before Ptolemy VI of portraying the king as powerful and the queens as weak had reversed itself. Not only had queens’ portraiture become more individualised, but the king now was the one who appeared weak, thin, and nervous. It was mainly the later hairstyle, the Egyptianising smile and features that led Thompson to confidently claim this portrait as that of Cleopatra I. Furthermore, by the time of Cleopatra I’s successors, the coiffure and the style of the face had already changed to depict the queens more accurately, proof of the queen’s increased influence. In some instances, such as with the portrait of Cleopatra III, her depiction resembled the portrait of a Ptolemy, a reflection of her dominance during her and her husband’s, Ptolemy IX,

50 Thompson, plate lxxiii.c.
51 Thompson, plate xliii no. 123.
52 Thompson, plate lxxiv.i
53 Green (348) comments on the representation of queens with: “the air of nuns suffering simultaneously from indigestion and anorexia”.
54 Cf: Appendix I where Green has identified Cleopatra I as the queen depicted on the Farnese Cup. If indeed the figure portrayed is Cleopatra I, Cleopatra I has successfully associated herself as the Pharaoh’s wife and as the God’s wife. Thus, ultimately strengthening the queenship even further.
Cleopatra I's success at instituting a standard style and image of future coinage for the Ptolemaic kingdom is even more noteworthy when one realises that it is virtually only within the Ptolemaic dynasty that such distinction and honour were bestowed on the queens. The portrayal of queens on coinage in the other Hellenistic kingdoms was extremely uncommon. There existed, however, one very rare occurrence of a queen in the Seleucid kingdom who coined her image on her own set of currency. Perhaps this occurrence is not so surprising when one realises that this queen, Cleopatra Thea, of the Seleucid Kingdom was actually a descendant of the Ptolemaic house.

5.3 Cleopatra I’s Political Position

Even though it is clear that Cleopatra I gained the regency through her own efforts, little is known about her regency. Several things, though, can be ascertained and stated confidently: first, the titulature and her name and order within the dating formula during her regency years reveal a certain amount of unprecedented authority, political control, and influence. Second, her assumption of the title as “Ruler of Upper and Lower Egypt” – an esteemed title of the old Pharaonic rulers – during her regency reveals her success at integrating the Ptolemaic queenship with the Pharaonic queenship. Furthermore, this title indicates a certain affinity between Cleopatra I and her Egyptian subjects since such propagandistic methods were aimed mainly to please her subjects, but also to grant her more authority in the Egyptian queen’s spheres of power.

55 For these coins cf. Davis & Kraay, 273.
56 Cleopatra Thea was the daughter of Ptolemy VI and the grand-daughter of Cleopatra I. Cf. above, 4 and 5, and footnote 20
57 Pomeroy, 91.
5.4 Cleopatra I’s Policies

The astuteness of Cleopatra I’s decision not to alienate the priesthood speaks for itself, when one looks at the results she achieved with their support. Her policy was a complete reversal from Ptolemy I’s policy. After Ptolemy I had successfully established himself as king, he suppressed the Egyptian priesthood and relied on the friendship and loyalty of his “Friends” and Greco-Macedonian army for support. Cleopatra I, on the other hand, made an alliance with the first group, the Memphite priesthood, and suppressed the actions of the second group and in doing so secured the support of her Egyptian subjects.

To counter the actions and movements of the Ptolemaic ministers, a group she could not rely on, Cleopatra I successfully instituted eunuchs into the Ptolemaic court. The presence of Aristonicus, the first court eunuch, but particularly his views and policies are early indications of this new group’s importance. Although the amount of influence eunuchs enjoyed at the Ptolemaic court varied with each ruler and master, their presence and employment by future monarchs attest to Cleopatra I’s success at introducing another faction at the court. The Ptolemaic eunuchs proved to be formidable attendants and courtiers, becoming so powerful that their power had to be curbed by a specific policy aimed at them.

Last of all, Cleopatra I’s titulature and portraiture reveal her policy of equating the queen with that of the king by Egyptianising some Ptolemaic institutions – the success of which is clearly seen in the titulature and portraiture of her successors. For instance,

---

58 Green, 191.
59 Cf. Appendix G (“Comanus” and “Cineas”).
among her successors like Cleopatra III, the queen’s name once again preceded the king’s in the dating formula. Furthermore, the queen’s portraiture was depicted with more detail and with more accuracy. Cleopatra I implemented this Egyptianising policy to the queenship’s titulature and portraiture so that Ptolemaic queens would become more powerful and important due to their association to Pharaonic queens, who enjoyed greater rights, powers, and roles.

Thus, I believe that Cleopatra I’s Egyptianising of the Ptolemaic queenship allowed her to successfully utilise her own retinue, become the first female regent, and in the process, equate the queenship with the kingship. Her attempts at Egyptianising the queenship are clearly seen in her adoption and exploitation of sibling marriage (by betrothing her son, Ptolemy VI, to her daughter, Cleopatra II), her successful association as Pharaoh’s and god’s wife, and her changes to the queen’s titulature and portraiture. However, the most significant of the Egyptianising circumstances that led to her regency, I believe, was her successful implementation of the Egyptian guardian law that allowed women to fulfil the guardianship role.

Although most scholars have adopted the ancient viewpoint that Cleopatra I’s reign was a period of tranquillity both abroad and within Egypt itself, both Bevan and Mahaffy give no credit to Cleopatra I for maintaining friendly relations with the two kingdoms of Rome and Syria. Instead they explain her reign as a time when there was peace and tranquillity because the Romans and likewise the Seleucids chose to leave

---

60 Cf. chapter four.
61 The re-revival of sibling marriage into Ptolemaic Egypt by Cleopatra I was one of the most crucial sources for the existence of shared political power among the later Ptolemaic Queens. In this respect, I agree with Carney (437) that the growing prevalence of this type of marriage was linked to the general status of royal women in the Hellenistic period.
Egypt alone. I believe, however, that the peace in Egypt was a result of Cleopatra I’s diplomacy. There are a number of very important factors. On the one hand, her peaceful co-existence with the Seleucids during her regency (mainly over possession of Coele-Syria) and her pro-Seleucid policy are direct results of her good relationship with her brother, Seleucus IV, the Seleucid king:

On the other hand, while she was alive, she continued to collect the revenue from Coele-Syria that was part of her dowry; territory that belonged to the Seleucid kingdom. Thus there was neither any reason for Cleopatra I to claim a territory which she already partially owned, nor was there any reason for her brother to invade Coele-Syria since his sister represented no threat to him. According to Whitehorne: “As long as she was regent, we should hear nothing more of these plans to attack Syria, ruled now by Cleopatra’s brother, Seleucus IV.”

Furthermore, following her husband’s death, Cleopatra I must have maintained a strong government to keep the Romans out of Egypt. This is important and shows that the Romans regarded Cleopatra I the ruler of Egypt as much as her husband because the Romans did not send an envoy to renew their ties of friendship when Ptolemy V died.

---

62 Cf. introductory chapter.
63 Höbl (125-126) believes this pro-Seleucid policy was the reason why she was nicknamed the “Syrian” although this cannot be the case since she had acquired this title when she married Ptolemy V. Her policies do not become apparent until her regency.
64 Höbl, 128.
65 Cf. chapter four, footnote 30.
66 Cf. Whitehorne, 87.
5.5 Summary

Cleopatra I’s importance in developing a strong queenship, by creating not only family solidarity (most notably seen in Ptolemy VI’s epithet “Philometor” and the use of Cleopatra I’s name for future Ptolemaic queens), but also a greater equality between king and queen, is sadly ignored. Cleopatra I was the first queen to assume full political control, but even more importantly was the widespread recognition of her control and greater status, thereby guaranteeing the same rights to her successors. The immediate consequences of Cleopatra I’s success are already apparent in the case of her daughter, Cleopatra II, who enjoyed an equality to her husband which no queen before her had ever experienced. Cleopatra II was a recognised co-ruler in every way; an equal to her husband. Nor does Cleopatra I’s influence falter after that but, indeed, become stronger. Immediately after Cleopatra II, an even more powerful queen comes to the forefront, Cleopatra III. Cleopatra III epitomises those very aspects of queenship which Cleopatra I had established earlier – the queen was equal, if not more, powerful than her husband. The strength of the Ptolemaic queenship eventually ended with another namesake, Cleopatra VII, who ruled Egypt virtually alone from her adolescent years until her death. With such powerful progeny succeeding her, it is impossible to deny the monumental effect Cleopatra I’s career had on the political position and influence of future Ptolemaic queens. Without Cleopatra I’s achievements, precedents, and policies, I believe that the careers of Cleopatra II, Cleopatra III, Cleopatra Thea, and Cleopatra VII would not have been possible since these queens would not have been accepted and viewed, at home and abroad, as equals to their kings. Furthermore, Cleopatra I began a new era for the queenship in the areas of queenly titulature and portraiture. However, as well established
as this foundation was, the succeeding queens had to possess exceptional qualities themselves, since only their own competence would enable them access to this cauldron of power and intrigue.
The career of Cleopatra I has been little documented in our sources, both ancient and modern, and as a result not given due credit for not only suppressing the political influence of the powerful aristocratic families at the Ptolemaic court, but also for placing Ptolemaic queens on an equal status with the king. These were Cleopatra I’s greatest accomplishments and contribution to Ptolemaic queenship. Up to the time of Cleopatra I’s husband, Ptolemy V, Ptolemaic aristocrats and ministers were extremely influential on the monarchy; the dominance of Sosibius and Agathocles in Ptolemaic affairs is well known. As well, before Cleopatra I, the Ptolemaic queenship as an institution was not recognised as possessing manifest influence and authority in any sphere – economic, political, or religious. It is, thus, disappointing that such an important figure, who contributed so much to the power and position of future Ptolemaic queens, is so neglected in the literary tradition. For instance, one can not deny the fact that Cleopatra I was the first ‘Greek’ queen to gain the position of regent; an inconceivable concept in Greek society. There are two things that prove that Cleopatra I gained the regency on her own merits and not under the sway and control of the aristocrat families who had controlled Ptolemy IV and Ptolemy V. During her regency, Cleopatra I solidified the greater status of the queen. This innovation to the queenship was immediately apparent with the equality between queen and king in her daughter’s, Cleopatra II, time. It is clear that no courtier would have wanted a strengthened queenship, since this would mean a decrease in their own influence on the now strengthened monarchy. Also, considering the appearance of eunuchs at the court, which coincided with Cleopatra I’s appointment as regent and guardian, and their continued presence thereafter, I believe that it is hard to deny the fact

1 Although Arsinoe II dominated the economic, political, and religious spheres during the reign of her
that Cleopatra I was responsible for institutionalising them in the Ptolemaic court. We know that she must have been responsible for these innovations since these things appeared during her regency and continued after her death.

Many factors also had to be in place long before this first female regent came to power, as well as some important precedents that she could capitalise on and utilise for her own purposes. For instance, her success can be attributed to the timely accession of her child heir, her son, Ptolemy VI. At the age of five, Ptolemy VI was too young to rule the kingdom on his own and so required a guardian and regent. This was the second time in two successions that a queen had the chance to become both guardian and regent. However, Cleopatra I was successful, having adopted the Egyptian guardianship law, which allowed a female to become guardian. Secondly, the fact that Cleopatra I was the first Ptolemaic queen who was a foreigner and not related directly to the Ptolemaic royal house gave her several advantages. First and foremost, Cleopatra I had direct ties to the Seleucid kings. This allowed the two kingdoms, which had up to this point been at constant war, to coexist peacefully while she was regent of Egypt. Furthermore, the fact that Cleopatra I came to Egypt with a dowry and with her own retinue explains how she could act so independently from the Ptolemaic court. Her dowry provided her with revenue and her retinue, her advisors and attendants. Thus, it is very hard to imagine a queen of Ptolemaic lineage being able to achieve what Cleopatra I had, simply because that queen would not have owned a substantial piece of personal property nor would she have had a husband, Ptolemy II, her position and power were not official.

2 The first queen to have this chance was Arsinoe III, the mother of the young heir, Ptolemy V.
have a strong enough retinue since the aristocratic families were so powerful and interconnected\(^3\).

Looking back at the events surrounding one of the most important Ptolemaic queens, I think that Cleopatra I was at the right place at the right time in history. She brought with her a new retinue of supporters totally detached from the Alexandrian court and she adopted only those qualities of the Pharaonic kingdom that would serve her best – seen best through the adoption of some Egyptian customs, such as her association as the Pharaoh’s wife, to endear herself to her Egyptian subjects. Furthermore, we know that Cleopatra I wielded influence and power during her regency, with the presence and position of her name in the dating-formula and titulature. Faced with a literary tradition determined to keep her in the past, this study provides some of the only clues that specifically show how much influence and authority she may have possessed.

\(^3\) Arsinoe II was the only other Ptolemaic queen who owned property (cf. chapter three), but again, her queenship was not recognised as an equal to the kingship.
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GENEALOGICAL TREE OF THE EARLY PTOLEMIES AND THE EARLY SELUCIDS TO 176 BC
## APPENDIX B: THE KING LISTS

### PTOLEMAIC KING LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King Name</th>
<th>Reign Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy I Soter</td>
<td>305-282 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy II Philadelphus</td>
<td>282-246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy III Euergetes</td>
<td>246-222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy IV Philopator</td>
<td>222-205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy V Epiphanes</td>
<td>204-180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra I</td>
<td>180-176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy VI Philometor and Cleopatra II</td>
<td>180-145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ptolemy VI, Ptolemy VIII, Cleopatra II</td>
<td>170-164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II</td>
<td>163-145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy VII Neos Philopator</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II</td>
<td>145-116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra II, Cleopatra III, Ptolemy IX</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra III and Ptolemy IX Soter II</td>
<td>116-107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra III and Ptolemy X Alexander I</td>
<td>107-101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy X Alexander I and Cleopatra Berenice</td>
<td>101-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy IX Soter II</td>
<td>88-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra Berenice and Ptolemy XI Alexander II</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy XII Auletes(^2)</td>
<td>80-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berenice IV</td>
<td>58-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy XII</td>
<td>55-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra VII and Ptolemy XIII</td>
<td>51-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra VII and Ptolemy XIV</td>
<td>47-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra VII and Ptolemy XV (Caesarian)</td>
<td>44-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. All dates are B.C.
2. Also known as: Theos Philopator Philadelphus Neos Dionysus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Reign (B.C.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seleucus I Nicator</td>
<td>311-281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus I Soter</td>
<td>281-261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus II Theos</td>
<td>261-246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seleucus II Callinikos</td>
<td>246-225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seleucus III Soter</td>
<td>225-223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus III The Great</td>
<td>223-187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seleucus IV Philopator</td>
<td>187-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus IV Epiphanes</td>
<td>175-164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus V Eupator</td>
<td>163-162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrius I Soter</td>
<td>162-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Balas</td>
<td>150-145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrius II Nicator</td>
<td>145-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus VI Epiphanes</td>
<td>145-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus VII Sidetes</td>
<td>138-129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrius II Nicator</td>
<td>129-125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra Thea</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra Thea and Antiochus VIII Grypus</td>
<td>125-121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seleucus V</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus VIII</td>
<td>125-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus IX Kyzikenos</td>
<td>115-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seleucus VI Epiphanes Nicator</td>
<td>96-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrius III Philopator</td>
<td>95-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus X Eusebes</td>
<td>95-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus XI Philadelphus</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip I Philadelphus</td>
<td>94-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus XII Dionysus</td>
<td>87-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigranes I of Armenia</td>
<td>83-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus XIII Asiatikos</td>
<td>69-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip II</td>
<td>65-64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C: EVENTS DURING THE PERIOD 202 – 169 B.C.
(Events are derived from Green, Mørkholm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE B.C.</th>
<th>PTOLEMIES</th>
<th>SELEUCIDS</th>
<th>ROME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>- Announcement of Ptolemy IV Philopator’s death in Alexandria</td>
<td>- Fifth Syrian War (Antiochus III invades Coele-Syria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>- Antiochus III in Coele-Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>- Antiochus III defeats Ptolemy V at Panion</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Roman envoys warn Antiochus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Antiochus III in Asia Minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Antiochus III completes subjugation of Coele-Syria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>- Consecration of Ptolemy V in Memphis</td>
<td>- Antiochus III crosses Hellespont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Peace between Antiochus III and Ptolemy V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194/3</td>
<td>- Marriage of Ptolemy V and Cleopatra I at Raphia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rome declares war on Antiochus III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>- Antiochus III defeated at Thermopylae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>- Ptolemy V’s offer of support rejected by Rome</td>
<td>- Antiochus’ fleet defeated at Side and Myonnesos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Antiochus III defeated at Magnesia</td>
<td>- Romans occupy Sardis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- (Spring) Antiochus IV becomes a hostage in Rome (ca. 176)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- (Autumn) Seleucus IV appointed co-regent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Eumenes II (of Pergamum) and Rhodians share Seleucid spoils</td>
<td>- Treaty of Apamea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td>- (June-July) Death of Antiochus III</td>
<td>- Seleucus IV becomes sole ruler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Roman envoys at Philip’s court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>- Ptolemy V revives alliance with Achaean League?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181/0</td>
<td>- Death of Ptolemy V Epiphanes</td>
<td>- Accession of Ptolemy VI</td>
<td>- Roman intervention in Asia Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cleopatra I becomes Regent</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Marriage of Laodice, Seleucus IV’s daughter to Perseus of Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
176 - Death of High Priest Simon in Judaea, succeeded by Onias III
- Death of Cleopatra I

176/5 - Demetrius I replaces Antiochus IV as hostage in Rome (162/1)
- Antiochus IV resides in Athens

175 - (Sept. 3) Seleucus IV assassinated by Heliodorus
- (Nov.) Antiochus IV becomes co-regent with Seleucus IV’s son, Antiochus

173 - Envoys from everywhere come to Ptolemy V’s Anakleteria to renew friendship
- Antiochus IV renews alliance with Rome
- Syrian embassy in Rome

172 - Addition of titles “Theos Epiphanes” on silver coins from Antioch
- Roman embassy to Antioch
- (Spring) War Between Rome and Perseus (Third Macedonian War)

171 - Antiochus IV in Tyre, prepares for war against Egypt

171/0 - Sixth Syrian War (Antiochus IV vs. Ptolemy VI/Eulaeus and Lenaeus)

170 - Ptolemy VI’s anakleteria
- Joint reign of Ptolemy VI, Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II in Egypt
- Murder of the boy king, Antiochus, co-ruler of the Seleucid kingdom
- Antiochus IV becomes sole ruler
- Battle near Pelusium: Antiochus totally defeats Eulaeus and Lenaeus

169 - (March-April) Antiochus IV occupies Pelusium
- (Summer) Antiochus IV and Ptolemy Philometor reconciled.
- Antiochus IV lays siege to Alexandria

- (Jan.-Feb.) Negotiations in Rome about Syro-Egyptian crisis
- Egyptian and Syrian embassies arrive at Rome
APPENDIX D: MAPS

Map A: Map of Egypt (332 B.C. – A.D. 642) (Bowman, Fig.1)
## APPENDIX E:
### IMPORTANT MINISTERS AND COURT-FIGURES AT THE PTOLEMAIC COURT
### (DURING THE REIGNS OF PTOLEMY III TO PTOLEMY VI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTOLEMAIC RULER</th>
<th>IMPORTANT FIGURE AT THE COURT</th>
<th>BACKGROUND OF THE INDIVIDUAL</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy III Epiphanes</td>
<td>• Sosibius</td>
<td>(Alexandrian)</td>
<td>- Θεοποίησις of Alexander, of the</td>
<td>- name was used in the dating formula for the year (235-234 B.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brother-and-Sister Gods, and of</td>
<td>- innovation in the army: inclusion and training of an Egyptian Phalanx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agathocles</td>
<td>(Samian)</td>
<td>the Benefactor Gods at Alexandria (235-234 B.C.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy IV Philopator</td>
<td>• Sosibius</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Regent (202-201 B.C.)</td>
<td>- First minister to become co-regent and co-guardian to the Ptolemaic king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agathocles</td>
<td>(Samian)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- First minister to become co-regent and co-guardian to the Ptolemaic king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sosibius</td>
<td>(Greek soldier)</td>
<td>- Regent (201-192 B.C.)</td>
<td>- Chief Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aristomenes</td>
<td>(Acarnanian)</td>
<td>- Regent (201-192 B.C.)</td>
<td>- Chief Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Polycrates</td>
<td>(Argive)</td>
<td>- Chief Counselor</td>
<td>- Commander of the Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aristonicus</td>
<td>(Eunuch)</td>
<td>- &quot;σύντροφος of the King&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cleopatra I)</td>
<td>• Eulæus</td>
<td>(Eunuch)</td>
<td>- Chief Advisor to the Regent</td>
<td>- First eunuch to reach the highest position of regent in the Ptolemaic kingdom Policy: &quot;in silly opposition to the policy of the late queen... (Eulæus and Lenaeus) began a war against Antiochus [IV] Epiphanes of Syria...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lenaæus</td>
<td>(former Syrian slave)</td>
<td>- Chief Advisor to the Regent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy VI Philometor</td>
<td>• Eulæus</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Philometor’s tutor (i.e. σύντροφος) (180-176 B.C.) - Regent (176-170 B.C.)</td>
<td>- First eunuch to reach the highest position of regent in the Ptolemaic kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lenaæus</td>
<td></td>
<td>- διωκτητὴς - Regent (176-170 B.C.)</td>
<td>- First Syrian and first slave to reach the highest position of regent in the Ptolemaic kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comanæus</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Advisor (169-?) B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cineæus</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Advisor (169-?) B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Archias</td>
<td>(Eunuch)</td>
<td>- στρατηγὸς of Cyprus (164-157 B.C.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Cf. appropriate chapters for each individual listed. 
2 Davis and Kraay, 167.
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APPENDIX F: OTHER PROMINENT FAMILIES

The following is a brief discussion of two other prominent aristocratic families in Ptolemaic Egypt during the reign of Ptolemy V. Both families are very significant, as is evident from the number of family members also found in important posts.

**Family of Ptolemy, Son of Agesarchos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prominent Families (First Important Member)</th>
<th>Related Family Member in a High Position (relation in brackets)</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTOLEMY¹, Megalopolitan, son of Agesarchos</td>
<td>(between 203-202 B.C.):</td>
<td>• sent to Rome (by Agathocles)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• στρατηγός of Cyprus (followed Polycrates at this post)³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGESARCHOS⁴ (father)</td>
<td>under Ptolemy III:</td>
<td>• eponymous military commander⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIRENE⁶ (daughter of Ptolemy)</td>
<td>199/8-172/1 B.C.:</td>
<td>• eponymous priestess to Arsinoe Philopator at Alexandria</td>
<td>“The eponymous offices of priesthood at Alexandria and Ptolemais were on the whole held by the most influential members of the administration and their relatives.”⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDROMACHOS⁸ (son of Eirene)</td>
<td>190's B.C.:</td>
<td>• with the court rank τῶν διαδόχων 155/4 B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Philometor's ambassador to Rome⁹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• τροφεῖς (&quot;tutor&quot;) for Philometor's son Ptolemy Neos Eupator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• στρατηγός of Cyprus (until 145 B.C.)¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ PP VI.15068, 16944; RE 23 (1959), coll. 1762-63, no. 43; and Ijsewijn, 89-90, no. 88.
³ Polybius, xviii.55.6-9 and SB VII.10013 II. 1-4.
⁴ PP II.1825.
⁵ For this cf. Bagnall, 255.
⁶ PP III.5104.
⁷ Mørkholm, Antiochus, 37. The length of time Eirene held this post, Bagnall (255) believes that she must have held this post for life.
⁸ PP VI.14637. Bevan, Egypt, 295 calls Andromachos Ptolemy’s grandson.
⁹ Polybius, xxxiii.11.4.
¹⁰ Otto, 9, n. 9 and Ijsewijn, 89-90, no. 88.
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The career of Ptolemy, son of Agesarchos, was uneventful. However, we know that he was an important aristocrat because of the threat he posed to Agathocles upon the accession of Ptolemy V (204 B.C.), a result of which he was sent to Rome to act as an ambassador. Soon after the death of Agathocles, Ptolemy returned to Egypt and immediately was promoted to the very prestigious post of στρατηγός of Cyprus. The στρατηγοί, as Bagnall states, were men of the highest rank who either were eponymous dynastic priests themselves or had children or other relatives who served in these posts. Ptolemy’s father, Agesarchos, was neither an eponymous priest nor appeared extremely prominent during Ptolemy III’s reign. Nevertheless, Ptolemy is appointed to his position upon this return to Egypt.

Ptolemy’s family continued to remain prominent at the Ptolemaic court. Most noteworthy was his daughter, Eirene, who not only became the priestess of Arsinoe Philopator, but also retained this post uninterrupted for twenty-seven years. Furthermore, her son, Andromachos, also became very prominent at the Ptolemaic court during Ptolemy VI’s reign.

---

11 Bagnall, 46.
The family of Pelops also held important posts. Most noteworthy is Pelops’ son, Pelops, who was also banished from Egypt upon Ptolemy V’s accession under Agathocles’ guardianship. Unlike Ptolemy, son of Agesarchos, whose promotion to the στρατηγός of Cyprus was mysterious because of the lack of influence his ancestors enjoyed, Pelops’ ancestors had held the distinguished office of eponymous priest.

---

12 PP III.5227; VI.14618; RE 19 (1937), coll. 392-93; and Ijsewijn, 67-68, no. 22.
14 PP VI.15064.
15 PP II.1829.
16 PP III.5227; VI.14618.
17 PP III.5151.
18 P. Lond. dem. ined. 10389.
APPENDIX G:
MEMBERS OF PROMINENT FAMILIES DURING THE
REGENCY OF EULAEUS AND LENAEUS

A brief look at the prominent families during Eulaeus’ and Lenaeus’ regency will show the influence and control prominent families continued to retain in Ptolemaic Egypt. This strongly suggests an agreement made between Eulaeus and Lenaeus and the prominent families at the Ptolemaic court.

Family of Hippalos, son of Sos

Table C¹: Family of Hippalos, son of Sos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prominent Families (First Important Member)</th>
<th>Related Family Member in a High Position (relation in brackets)</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIPPALOS², son of Sos</td>
<td>(updateable – pre-176 B.C.):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ἀρχηγοσαιτοφιλας (a lower rank)³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 186/5-169 (Mar.) B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• eponymous priest to Ptolemy Soter &amp; Ptolemy Epiphanes in Ptolemais⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 176 (May/Jun. or Nov./Dec.) B.C., 173 (Aug.) &amp; 172 (May) B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ἐπιστρατηγὸς with civil and military authority over all the Egyptian chorai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• in the sources, he now bears the high court title τῶν πρῶτων φίλων</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The post of ἐπιστρατηγὸς is one of the most important ones of the kingdom with almost complete independence from the central government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATRA⁶ (daughter)</td>
<td>191/0 B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• priestess at Alexandria⁷</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEOMNESTOS⁸ (son)</td>
<td>173-69 B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• στρατηγὸς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 172/1 B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• priest to the reigning king Ptolemy VI Philometor in Ptolemais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ All of the information obtained for the tables in this Appendix was compiled from Morkholm’s article “Eulaios and Lenaios”.
³ P. Lond. 610.
⁴ P. Lond. dem. 10226 II 2-3.
⁵ For more on this position cf. Bengtson, Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit III 1952 (Männchen), 121-127.
⁶ PP III.5051.
⁷ P. Lond. dem. 10560.
⁸ PP I.260; III.5147.
Hippalos' appointment to the office of eponymous priest to Ptolemy I Soter and Ptolemy III Epiphanes in 186/5 B.C. (during Ptolemy V's reign) down to 169 B.C. (during Ptolemy VI's reign) is the best indication of his internal connections, since this period saw several changes in rulers, regents, and ministers. Apart from holding this position uninterrupted from Ptolemy V's reign until the first invasion of Egypt by Antiochus IV, Hippalos was appointed to an even more powerful position as ἐπιστρατηγὸς. Although Hippalos is not mentioned in the papyri as ἐπιστρατηγὸς until 176 B.C., Mørkholm believes that he may have possibly already obtained this high position before that time. A hint to the amount of support he offered to Eulaeus' and Lenaeus' government may be reflected in his coincidental demise when Antiochus IV invaded Egypt for the first time in 169 B.C. – the year in which Eulaeus and Lenaeus also perished. Although Hippalos died, his son, Theomnestos, continued to be appointed to important posts. This situation is indicative of the fate of families after the deaths of Eulaeus and Lenaeus.

Family of Noumenios, son of Herakleodoros

Noumenios' career is also very important in supporting the argument that families supporting Eulaeus and Lenaeus retained their positions even after the deaths of Eulaeus and Lenaeus. Noumenios' situation is different from Hippalos' because, although Hippalos perished at the same time as Eulaeus and Lenaeus, Noumenios and members of his family continued to hold important posts. Regardless of this difference, the fate of these families was the same, that is, remaining prominent at the court.

---

10 Mørkholm believes that Hippalos only lost this post because it coincided with the time of his death (38).
11 ibid.
Table D: Family of Noumenios, son of Herakleodoros

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prominent Families (First Important Member)</th>
<th>Related Family Member in a High Position (relation in brackets)</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOUMENIOS 12 son of Herakleodoros</td>
<td>171/0 B.C.: first appears as στρατηγός of the important district of Thebais with the rank of ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Noumenios’ post as προξενὸς is believed to signify that he was a “person sufficiently influential to be able to safeguard the interests of strangers at Alexandria.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>168 B.C.: προξενὸς of the city of Gortyn 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sent as an ambassador to Rome to convey the thanks of the two Egyptian kings for the intervention of Rome against Antiochus IV during the second attack on Egypt 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>165/4 B.C.: priest to Ptolemy Soter and Ptolemy Epiphanes in Ptolemais 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(two of his daughters) KLEAINETE &amp; ? 16</td>
<td>166/5 B.C.: appears on the list of eponymous priests and priestesses at Alexandria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noumenios’ first recorded post was the στρατηγός during the time of Eulaeus and Lenaeus’ regency. His future political career, though, was not affected by his obvious amenable relationship to the two regents who had initially promoted him, since his career continued to thrive even after their deaths.

Ptolemy

Table F: Ptolemy (patronymic unknown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prominent Families (First Important Member)</th>
<th>Related Family Member in a High Position (relation in brackets)</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTOLEMY 19</td>
<td>183-164 B.C.: στρατηγός and ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ 20 from the important nome of Arsinoeis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 PP I.196; II.1966; III.5213; VI.14617. For further information on his career cf. Peremans-Van’t Dack, Historia 93 (1953), 46-51.
13 Inscriptiones Creticae IV (1950) no. 208A II. 4-5.
17 PP III.5172; P. Tebt. III.811 ll. 8-9 as Priestess of Arsinoe Philopator.
18 PP III.5336; P. Tebt. III.811 ll. 6-7 as ἀδελφόφρος.
19 PP I.312.
20 P. Tebt. III.8951. 5.
Similar to Eirene’s eponymous priesthood (from 199/8-172/1 B.C.) and Hippalos’ eponymous priesthood (from 186/5-169 B.C.), Ptolemy remained at the office of στρατηγος in Cyprus (197-180 B.C.) for a very extensive period. Such examples of longevity during such drastic changes in the Ptolemaic dynasty suggest important internal aristocratic connections in place in Egypt.

Family of Cineas, son of Drimylos

Table F: Family of Cineas, son of Drimylos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prominent Families (First Important Member)</th>
<th>Related Family Member in a High Position (relation in brackets)</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOSITHEOS 21 son of Drimylos</td>
<td></td>
<td>222/1 B.C.:</td>
<td>eponymous priest to Alexander and the Lagides at Alexandria 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>217 B.C.:</td>
<td>the rescuer of Ptolemy IV on the eve of the battle of Raphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Famous for being mentioned in the Third Book of the Maccabees who saved the king’s life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINEAS 23 (son)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1776-170/69 B.C.:</td>
<td>priest to Ptolemy VI Philopator and his mother Cleopatra I at Ptolemais 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>173 B.C.:</td>
<td>eponymous cavalry officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>169 B.C.:</td>
<td>chief advisor to Ptolemy VI Philometor 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERENICE 26 (Cineas’ daughter)</td>
<td></td>
<td>170/69 B.C.:</td>
<td>priestess to Arsinoe Philopator at Alexandria 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 PP III.5100.
22 P. Hib. 190 II. 2-3; P. Tebt. III.815.
23 PP II.1926; III.5169; VI.14610; RE II (1922), col. 477, no. 22; and Ijsewijn, 100-101, nos. 110-117.
24 P. Lond. dem. 10230 III II. 1-2, 10518.
26 PP III.5060.
27 P. Lond. dem. ined. 10513.
Appendices

Comanos

Table G: Comanos (patronymic unknown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prominent Families (First Important Member)</th>
<th>Related Family Member in a High Position (relation in brackets)</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMANOS 28</td>
<td></td>
<td>188/7 B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• appears for the first time in a list of πρόξενοι at Delphi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• sent as a member of an embassy to Greece by Ptolemy V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>187 B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• bears the high court title ῬΩΝ πρώτων φίλων</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>186 B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• entrusted with duty to suppress the rebellion in the Thebais</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>169 B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• chief advisor to Ptolemy VI Philemetor 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLEAINETE 32 (daughter)</td>
<td></td>
<td>173/2 B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ἀθλοφόρος at Alexandria 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172/1 B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• καννηφόρος at Alexandria 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARSINOE (daughter of Ptolemy, brother of Comanos)</td>
<td></td>
<td>172/1 (?) B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• priestess to Queen Cleopatra II at Ptolemais</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTOLEMAIS (niece of Comanos)</td>
<td></td>
<td>172/1 (?) B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ἀθλοφόρος at Alexandria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERENICE 35 (daughter of Aratomenes, niece of Comanos)</td>
<td></td>
<td>172/1 (?) B.C.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• καννηφόρος at Alexandria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cineas’ and Comanus’ importance at the deaths of Eulaeus and Lenaeus is not as surprising and unusual as the literary tradition leads us to believe. For instance, as the tables have shown (cf. Tables F and G), both Cineas and Comanus were not in opposition to other prominent family members already mentioned. The evidence instead reveals that these two individuals held very prominent positions throughout the first half of the

28 PP I.270; II.1833; IV.10087a; VI.14611, 16865; RE Suppl. 7 (1940), coll.332-34, coll.1625-26; Peremans-Van’t Dack, Studia Hellenistica 9 (1953), 22-33; and Ijsewijn, 102-103, no. 114.
29 SIG II 585, II. 141-44.
30 PP I.270.
31 Polybius, xxviii.19.1.
32 PP III.5171.
34 P. Lond. dem. ined. 10517 and P. Tebt. III.819 1. 3.
second century B.C. and, in fact, their designation as Ptolemy VI Philometor’s chief advisors in 169 B.C. was not surprising. Furthermore, contrary to one opinion stressing “the difference between the ‘oriental’ rulers and their Greek successors...those gentlemen of quite a different cast...”\(^{36}\), recent investigation into the backgrounds of some of these prominent members have revealed that individuals such as Cineas were very possibly of Jewish descent\(^{37}\).

This survey of some of the most prominent aristocratic families at the Ptolemaic court in the second century B.C. reveals one important similarity between them, members of these prominent families retained their positions before and after Eulaeus’ and Lenaeus’ co-regency. This possibly suggests that the co-regency of Eulaeus and Lenaeus was not entirely shunned by the aristocratic families, but in return for allowing Eulaeus and Lenaeus to control Ptolemaic affairs, members of these families kept their posts.

\(^{35}\) PP III.5059 and P. Lond. dem. ined. 10513.
\(^{36}\) Morkholm, 39ff.
\(^{37}\) The Jews in Alexandria represented the second largest population in Alexandria. Their support of the monarchy was important for this very reason.
The only direct literary work, which refers to Cleopatra I’s political position during her husband’s reign, Ptolemy V, is found in Livy:

*Legati ab Ptolomaeo et Cleopatra regibus Aegypti gratulantes, quod M’. Acilius consul Antiochum regem Graecia expulisset...reges Aegypti ad ea, quae censuisset senatus, paratos fore. Gratiae regibus actae; legatis munera dari iussa in singulos quaternum milium aeris.*

Although Livy has placed this embassy from Ptolemy (V) and Cleopatra (I) in 190 B.C., he is actually referring to the reign of Cleopatra I’s children, Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II. The Ptolemaic queens had not become *co-rulers* of Egypt until after Cleopatra I, beginning with her daughter, Cleopatra II. Another clue in this passage which reveals that Livy had been too hasty to place future events into the reign of Ptolemy V and Cleopatra I can also be seen in his mentioning here of Egypt’s subservience to Rome. Egypt’s submission to Rome did not occur until the crucial moment when Egypt pleaded with Rome to intervene against the attempts of Antiochus IV, who sought to conquer the Ptolemaic dynasty. Egypt’s subservience began only at this time. Unfortunately, then, although this is the only direct literary reference to Cleopatra I’s political position during her husband’s reign, this evidence must be discounted. Livy whether due to embellishment for Roman propagandistic purposes or from pure error incorrectly incorporated the reign of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II into the reign of Ptolemy V and Cleopatra I.

---

1 Livy, xxvii.iii.9-11 mentions an embassy from the Ptolemaic Kingdom in 190 B.C. to Rome. *Cf.* Walbank, II.137.

2 The literary evidence from the reigns of Ptolemy V and Ptolemy VI show a different attitude and reliance upon the Romans. The literary evidence is provided in Appendices BB and DD.
One last depiction of Cleopatra I clearly showing her during her co-regency is seen in her portrait on the Farnese Cup (The Tazza Farnese).

The Farnese Cup (The Tazza Farnese) ca. 180-170 B.C.\textsuperscript{1}

\textsuperscript{1} Cf. Green, figure 118.
Cleopatra I had herself represented as the deified wife of the Nile River, Euthenia, on this sardonyx cameo bowl. This was an attempt to justify her position as the more powerful and dominant ruler, since her acceptance as the Nile’s wife grants her this distinction. Furthermore, as wife of the god, Cleopatra I was legitimising her son in the eyes of the Egyptian subjects, since her divine status proved the divine parentage of the king. This cameo was sculpted to show the period soon after the death of Ptolemy V, since after the death of a monarch the Nile was believed to ensure a flood. The image of Cleopatra I, here, in the centre of the bowl clearly bears her features – the chubby cheeks, the ringed eyes, the coiffure and so forth. She rests one elbow on the head of the deceased Ptolemy V and is reverently at the feet of the Nile god, her divine husband, who is seated to the left of her bearing a cornucopia, which represents the fertility of the fruits of the earth and of the monarch. To the right of the Nile god and standing over his mother is Ptolemy VI Philometor, who is representing fertility of the land and of the monarchy, since he grasps a plowshare in his hand and has a seed bag slung over his shoulder. To the right of Ptolemy VI are two seated women representing the Egyptian seasons of harvest and flood and flying above these figures are the Etesian winds, who are vital to the flood since “it is they who ultimately cause the flood and are thus ultimately responsible for fertility”. It is in such rare depictions of Cleopatra I that one realises the power of this queen to have herself portrayed in any setting she wanted, to legitimise her power, her position, and her son’s position in the Ptolemaic dynasty.

2 Troy, 97.
3 Green, 348.
5 Green, 348.
6 Green, 348.
ATHENAEUS
vi.246.c (Ptolemy, son of Agesarchus, comments on the reign of Ptolemy IV)

Πτολεμαῖος δ’ ὁ τοῦ Ἀγησάρχου Μεγαλοπολίτης γένος ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ τῶν
peri τόν Φιλοπάτορα ἱστορίαν συμπότας φησὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ συνάγονται ἐξ
ἀπάσης τῆς πόλεως, οὗς προσαγορεύονται γελοιοστάς.

xiii.577.a (Agathocleia controls Ptolemy IV Philopator)

τοῦ δὲ Φιλοπάτορος βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου οὐκ Ἀγαθόκλεια ἡ ἑταῖρα
ἐκράτει, ἢ καὶ πάσαν ἀνατρέψασα τὴν βασιλείαν;

PLUTARCH, LIFE OF CLEOMENES
xxxiii.1 (Situation of the court after Ptolemy III’s death)

Ὁ μὲν οὖν πρεσβύτερος Πτολεμαῖος πρὶν ἐκτελέσαι τῷ Κλεομένει τὴν
ἐκπεμμένη εὐθύς ὡς πολλὴν ἀσέλγειαν καὶ
παροινιάν καὶ γυναικοκρατίαν ἐμπεσοῦσης ἡμελεῖτο καὶ τὰ τοῦ
Κλεομένους.

xxxiii.3 (Ptolemy IV’s feelings towards his brother, Magas; Ptolemy IV employs
Cleomenes into his privy council)

δεδιῶς γὰρ Μάγαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν Πτολεμαίος, ὡς ἱσχύοντα διὰ τῆς μητρὸς
ἐν τῷ στρατιωτικῷ, τὸν Κλεομένη προσελάβαραν καὶ μετεδίδου τῶν
ἀπορρήτων συνεδρίων, βουλευόμενος ἀνελεῖν τὸν ἀδελφὸν.

xxxiii.5 (Ptolemy IV begins to fear and distrust everyone)

ὑστερον δὲ, τοῦ Πτολεμαίου τῆς ἀσθενείας ἐπιτεινοῦσης τὴν δειλιάν, καὶ
καθαπέρ εἰσθεν ἐν τῷ μηδὲν φρονεῖν, τοῦ πάντα δεδοκίναι καὶ πάσιν
ἐπιστεῖν ἀσφαλεστάτου δοκοῦντος εἶναι...

xxxiv.2 (The interests of Ptolemy IV)

τοῦ μὲν βασιλέως οὐκ εἰσακούοντος, ἀλλ’ ἐν γυναιξὶ καὶ θιάσοις καὶ
κόμῳς συνέχοντος ἑαυτὸν

1 F.H.G.iii.67.
2 Her influence was so dominant that Strabo, 795 calls her his mother. Cf. Polybius, xv.31ff.; Plutarch,
xxxv.2 (Cleomenes condemns the character of Ptolemy IV)

"Εβουλόμην ἂν, ἔφη, σε μάλλον ἠκείν ἄγοντα σαμβυκιστρίας καὶ κιναίδους· ταῦτα γὰρ νῦν μάλιστα κατεπέιγει τὸν βασιλέα."

STRABO, GEOGRAPHY
16.2.31 (Battle at Raphia in 217 B.C.)

Μετὰ δὲ Γάζαν Ραφία, ἐν ἧ μάχη συνέβη Πτολεμαίῳ τε τῷ τετάρτῳ καὶ Ἀντίόχῳ τῷ Μεγάλῳ.

17.1.11 (Disposition of Ptolemy IV)

ἀπαντες μὲν οὖν οἱ μετὰ τὸν τρίτον Πτολεμαίον ὑπὸ τρυφῆς διεφθαρμένοι χεῖρον ἐπολιτεύσαντο, χείριστα δὲ τὸ τέταρτος καὶ ἐβδομος καὶ ὁ ύστατος...

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

JUSTIN
29.1.5 (Ptolemy IV Philopator hastened both his father’s and mother’s deaths)

Aegyptum patre ac matre interfectis occupaverat Ptolomeus, cui ex facinoris crimine cognomentum Philopator fuit.

29.1.8-9 (Ptolemy IV Philopator lives a luxurious and lazy life)

His regibus pueris tametsi nulli senioris aetatis rectores erant, tamen in suorum quisque maiorum vestigia intentis magna indoles virtutis enituit. Solus Ptolomeus, sicut scelestus in occupando, ita et segnis in administrando regno fuit.

30.1.2 (The corrupt character of Ptolemy IV)

quippe regno parricidio parto et ad necem utriusque parentis caede etiam fratris adstructa, veluti rebus feliciter gestis luxuriae se tradiderat...

3 Earlier in the passage Justin mentioned Philip V, Antiochus III, Ariarathes, Hannibal, and Ptolemy IV.
30.1.2-3 (Ptolemy IV Philopator’s luxurious and lazy lifestyle affects everyone)

...Regisque mores omnis secuta regia erat. Itaque non amici tantum praefectique, verum etiam omnis exercitus depositis militiae studiis otio ac desidia corrupti marcebant.

30.2.6 (Death of Ptolemy IV Philopator and the plundering of the Royal Treasury by Agathocleia and Oenanthe)

...cum interim relictó quinquenni ex Eurydice sorore filió moritur. Sed mors eiusmod, dum pecúniam regiam mulieres rapiunt et imperium inita cum perditíssimís societate occupare conantur, diu occultata fuit.

31.1.1 (Death of Ptolemy IV and accession of his young son, Ptolemy V)

Mortuo Ptolomeo Philopatore, rege Aegypti, contemptaque parvuli filii eius aetate, qui in spem regni relictus praeda etiam domesticis erat...

30.2.7-8 (Rioting of the Alexandrians and death of Agathocles and family)

Re tamen cognita concursu multitudinis et Agathocles occiditur et mulieres in ultionem Eurydices patibulis suffiguntur. Morte regis, supplicio meretricum velut expiata regni infamia...

30.2.8 (Justin writes that it was the Alexandrians who asked for Rome’s aid)

...legatos Alexandrini ad Romanos misere, orantes ut tutelam pupilli susciperent tuerenturque regnum Aegypti, quod iam Philippum et Antiochum facta inter se pactione divisisse dicebant.

POMPEIUS TROGUS, PROLOGUES TO THE PHILIPPIC HISTORY
30.2 (Death of Ptolemy IV Philopator)

...ipse amore Agathocleae corruptus decessit relictó filió pupillo, in quem cum Philippo rege Macedonum consensit Antiochus.

Justin is referring to Agathocles, Agathocleia, and Oenanthe.
LIVY

xxiii.x.11ff. (The Capuan Decius Magius takes asylum at Cyrene and then at Alexandria)

Navem Cyrenas detulit tempestas, quae tum in dicione regum erant. Ibi cum Magius ad statuam Ptolomaei regis confugisset, deportatus a custodibus Alexandream ad Ptolomaeum, cum eum docuisset contra ius foederis vinctum se ab Hannibale esse, vinculis liberatur, permissonemque ut rediret, seu Romam seu Capuam mallet. Nec Magius Capuam sibi tutam dicere et Romam eo tempore quo inter Romanos Campanosque bellum sit trans fugae magis quam hospitis fore domicilium; nusquam malle quam in regno eius vivere quem vindicem atque auctorem habeat libertatis.

xxvii.iv.10 (Arsinoe III, daughter of Ptolemy III, sister and wife of Ptolemy IV)

Et Alexandream ad Ptolomaeum et Cleopatram reges M. Atilius et M’. Acilius legati, ad commemorandam renovandamque amicitiam missi, dona tulere, regi togam et tunicam purpuream cum sella eburnea, reginae pallam pictam cum amiculo purpureo.

xxvii.xxx.4 (Ptolemy IV tries to bring peace between Philip and the Aetolians in 208 B.C.)

Eo legati ab rege Aegypti Ptolomaeo Rhodiisque et Atheniensibus et Chiis venerunt ad dirimendum inter Philippum atque Aetolos bellum.

xxxi.xiv.4-5 (Pact between Philip V and Antiochus III at the accession of Ptolemy IV in 200 B.C.)

Neque enim ipse rex Athenas obsidebat; eo maxime tempore Abydum oppugnabat, iam cum Rhodis et Attalo navalibus certaminibus, neutro feliciter proelio, vires expertus; sed animos ei faciebat prae ter ferociam insitam foedus ictum cum Antiocho, Syriae rege, divisaeque iam cum eo Aegypti opes, cui morte audita Ptolomaei regis ambo imminebant.

5 At this time, Cyrene belonged to Egypt. Egypt was currently under the reign of Ptolemy IV Philopator.
6 Sage tells us, Livy here summarises the activities of Philip during the campaign of 200 B.C. before the arrival of Sulpicius in the summer or early autumn of that year. He resumes the narrative dealing with Sulpicius in xxii.4 below.
7 Sage tells us, Philip’s attack upon this famous city on the Hellespont was part of the aggressive campaign against the Greek cities on the islands and in Asia Minor, some of which were free, while others belonged to the Ptolemies, whose empire he had agreed with Antiochus III to dismember. His policy threatened both Pergamum and Rhodes and bought them into the war.
xxxii.xxxiii.3-4 (Philip V is asked by the Romans to give back possessions he had seized)

Deducenda ex omnibus Graeciae civitatibus regi praesidia esse, captivos et transfugas sociis populi Romani reddendos, restitutenda Romanis ea Illyrici loca, quae post pacem in Epiro factam occupasset, Ptolomaeo Aegypti regi reddendas urbes, quas post Philopatoris Ptolomaei mortem occupavisset."
APPENDIX BB: PTOLEMY V EPIPHANES

APPIAN, SYRIAN WARS
I.5 (Betrothal of Cleopatra I to Ptolemy V by Antiochus III)

"Ἡδη δὲ τὸν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμον ἐγκώμιος ἀποκαλύπτειν, ἐπιγαμίας τοὺς ἑγγὸς βασιλέας προκαταλάβανε, καὶ Πτολεμαῖος μὲν ἐς Αἰγυπτόν ἐστελλε Κλεοπάτραν τὴν Σύραν ἐπικλῆσιν, προῖκα Συρίαν τὴν κοίλην ἐπιδιδούς, ἣν αὐτὸς ἀφήνη τὸν Πτολεμαίον, θεραπεύων ἢδη τὸ μετράκιον, ἵν' ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τῷ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἄκριμβης.

DIODORUS SICULUS
xxviii.14 (Ptolemy V’s good disposition under the tutelage of Aristomenes and then his later tyrannical disposition, which alienates the native Egyptians)

"Οτι ο Πτολεμαῖος ὁ τῆς Αἰγυπτίου βασιλεὺς μέχρι μὲν τινὸς ἐπηνεϊτο. Ἀριστομένη δὲ τὸν ἐπιτροπὸν αὐτὸν γεγενημένον καὶ πάντα καλῶς διωρικτὰ τὴν μὲν ἀρχήν ἡγάπα καθαρεύει πατέρα καὶ πάντα ἐπρατεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκείνης γνώμης- μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ὑπὸ τὸν κολακεύουσι τιθηματεῖ τὴν ψυχὴν τὸν τε Ἀριστομένη παρθησιαζομένον ἐμβάλει καὶ τέλος συνηγάγας αὐτὸν πάντα κόνιον τελευτήσας, αἰεὶ δὲ μᾶλλον θηριώμενος καὶ τυραννικὴν παρανομίαν ἀλλ’ ὀβ βασιλικὴν ἐξουσίαν ζηλώσας, ἐμίσθητο μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων, ἐκκόμνευσε δὲ ἀποβαλεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν.

xxix.29 (The corrupt nature of Ptolemy V)

"Οτι τῶν φίλων τίνος εἰπόντος Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ διὰ τῆς Κοίλης Συρίας ὁμιλεῖ αὐτοῦ δικαίως ἀφροντιστεί, πολλὰ περὶ τῶν ἐρησιν αὐτῷ μέλειν, ὑπειράντος δὲ τοῦ προσιτολόγους πόθεν εὑπορήσει χρημάτων εἰς τὸν πόλεμον ὁ βασιλεὺς δειξάς τοὺς φίλους εἶπεν, Ὄρξε τοὺς ἐμοῦς θησαυροὺς περιπατοῦντας.

POLYBIUS
xxiv.6 (Ptolemy V Epiphanes and the Achaean)

"Οτι περὶ τῶν αὐτοὺς καυροὺς Πτολεμαῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς, βουλόμενος ἐμπλέκεσθαι τῷ τῶν Ἀχαίων ἐθνει, διεπόμευσι πρεσβευτὴν, ἐπαγγελλόμενος δεκακαίαν δόσειν ἐντελή πεντηκοντηκρικὸν πλοίων, οὶ δ’ Ἀχαιοὶ καὶ διὰ τὸ δοκεῖν τὴν διορεῖν ἄξιαν εἶναι χάριτος ἀσμένος ἀπεδέξαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. δοκεῖ γάρ ἡ διαπάνη ὅτι πολὺ λείπειν τῶν δέκα τολάντων. ταῦτα δὲ βουλευσόμενοι προεξειρίζοντας πρεσβευτὰς Λυκόραταν καὶ Πολύβιον καὶ σὺν τοῦτοις Ἀρατόν, ιδίν Ἀράτου τοῦ Σικυονίου, τοὺς ἄμα μὲν εὐχαριστήσασθαν τῷ βασιλεὶ περὶ τέ τῶν ὅπλων ἐν πρώτειν ἀπεστείλει καὶ τῷ νομίσματος, ἄμα δὲ παραληγομένους τὰ πλοία καὶ πρόοιν οἰκομένους περὶ τῆς ἀποκομιδῆς αὐτῶν, κατέστησαν δὲ τὸν μὲν Λυκόραταν διὰ τὸ κατὰ τὸν καυρόν, καθ’ ὑποτετοῦ τὴν ἀνανέωσιν τῆς συμμαχίας ὁ Πτολεμαῖος, σταρτηγοῦντα τότε συνεργηθῆναι ἱλιστίμως αὐτῷ, τὸν δὲ Πολύβιον...οὐ μὴν συνέβη γε τὴν πρεσβείαν ταύτην ἐξελθεῖν διὰ τὸ μεταλλάξει τὸν Πτολεμαίον περὶ τῶν καυροὺς τούτους.
xxii.17 (Ptolemy V tries to quell the native revolt at Lycopolis in 186-185 B.C. and mistreats the native chieftains)

"Ὅτι Πτολεμαίος ὁ βασιλεύς Αἰγύπτου ὤτε τὴν Δύσκον πόλιν ἐπολιορκήσε, καταπλαγέλτως τοῦ γεγονός οἱ δυνάσται τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἔδωκαν σφάς αὐτούς εἰς τὴν τοῦ βασιλέας πίστιν. οἱ κακῶς ἐχρήσατο καὶ εἰς κινδύνους πολλοίς ἐνέπεσεν. παραπληγήσων δὲ τι συνέβη καὶ κατὰ τούς καυροὺς, ἤνικα Πολυκράτης τοὺς ἀποστάτας ἐψειρόσατο. οἱ γὰρ περὶ τὸν Ἀθίνην καὶ Παυσαρίαν καὶ Χέσοφον καὶ τὸν Ἰρόβαστον, οὕπερ ἦσαν ἔτι διασωζόμενοι τῶν δυναστῶν, εἰς ταῖς ἡμέραις πράγματος παρῆκαν εἰς τὴν Σαίν, σφάς αὐτούς εἰς τὴν τοῦ βασιλέας ἐγχειρίζοντες <πίστιν>. ὁ δὲ Πτολεμαίος ἀθετήσας τὰς πίστεις καὶ δήσας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους γυμνοὺς ταῖς ἄμμαξις ἐλικτικὲς καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τιμωρησάμενος ἀπέκτεινεν.

xxii.17.6-7 (Polycrates does not allow Ptolemy V to take any part in the fighting; Aristonicus is in a high position at the court)

καὶ παραγενόμενος εἰς τὴν Ναύκρατιν μετὰ τῆς στρατιᾶς, καὶ παραστῆσαντος αὐτὸ τοὺς ἐξενολογημένους ἄνδρας, ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος Ἀριστονίκου, προσδεξάμενος τὸν ἐκ τούτου ἀπέκλεεσαν εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν, τῶν μὲν τοῦ πολέμου πράξεων ὁμοιομορφής διὰ τὴν Πολυκράτους ἀδικοδοξίαν, καὶ περὶ ἕχων ἐτη πέντε καὶ εἴκοσιν.

JUSTIN
30.2.6 (Death of Ptolemy IV Philopator and accession of the young Ptolemy V Epiphanes)

...cum interim relictus quinquenni ex Eurydice sorore filio moritur.

31.1.1 (The child-heir, Ptolemy V, is controlled by the courtiers)

Mortuo Ptolomее Philopatore, rege Aegypti, contemptaque parvuli filii eius acetate, qui in spem regni relictus praeda etiam domesticens erat, Antiocbus, rex Syriae, occupare Aegyptum statuit.

POMPEIUS TROGUS, PROLOGUES TO THE PHILIPPIC HISTORY
30.2 (Death of Ptolemy IV Philopator)

...ipse amore Agathocleae corruptus decessit relictio filio pupillo, in quem cum Philippo rege Macedonum consensit Antiocbus.

34.6 (Mention of Ptolemy V Epiphanes’ two sons)

Ut mortuo Ptolomeo Philopatore, rege Aegypti, contemptaque parvuli filii eius acetate, qui in spem regni relictus praeda etiam domestici erat, Antiocbus, rex Syriae, occupare Aegyptum statuit.

1 Justin is referring to Agathocles, Agathoclesia, and Oenanthe.
LIVY

xxxii.iii.1-4 (Roman envoy to Ptolemy V after Romans defeat of Hannibal in 201 B.C.)

Sub idem fere tempus et ab Attalo rege et Rhodiis legati venerunt nuntiantes Asiae quoque civitates sollicitari...Interim ad Ptolomacum Aegypti regem legati tres missi, C. Claudius Nero, M. Aemilius Lepidus, P. Sempronius Tuditanus, ut nuntiarent victum Hannibalem Poenosque et gratias agerent regi, quod in rebus dubiis, cum finitimi etiam socii Romanos desererent, in fide mansisset, et peterent ut, si coacti inuiiris bellum adversus Philippum suscepissent, pristinum animum erga populum Romanum conservaret.

xxxix.i.1 (Egypt acts like a vassal state to Rome - not acting unless Rome gives her approval. 200 B.C.)

...legati a rege Ptolomaeo venerunt, qui nuntiarent Athenienses adversus Philippum petisse ab rege auxilium; ceterum, etsi communes socii sint, tamen nisi ex auctoritate populi Romani neque classem neque exercitum defendendii aut oppugnandi cuiusquam causa regem in Graeciam missurum esse; vel quieturum cum in regno, si populo Romano socios defendere libeat, vel Romanos quiescere, si malint, passurum atque ipsum auxilia quae facile adversus Philippum tueri Athenas possent missurum. Gratiae regi ab senatu actae responsunque tutari socios populo Romano in animo esse; si qua re ad id bellum opus sit, indicaturos regi...

xxxii.xxxiii.3-4 (Philip V is asked by the Romans/Flaminius to give back seized possessions to their respective parties 197 B.C.)

Deducenda ex omnibus Graeciae civitibus regi praesidia esse, captivos et transfugas sociis populi Romani reddendos, restitutenda Romanis ea Illyrici loca, quae post pacem in Epiro factam occupasset, Ptolomaeo Aegypti regi reddendas urbes, quas post Philopatoris Ptolomaei mortem occupavisset."

xxxiii.xix.8-11 (Antiochus III takes possession of Ptolemy V’s possessions/cities in Asia - first Coele Syria and then Cilicia, Lycia, and Caria 196 B.C.)

Antiochus cum priore aestate omnibus quae in Coele Syria sunt civitibus ex Ptolomaei dicione in suam potestatem...principio veris...ipse cum classe centum tectarum navium, ad hoc levioribus navigis curcurisque ac lembis ducentis proficiscitur, simul per omnem oram Ciliciae Lyciaque et Cariae temptaturus urbes quae in dicione Ptolomaei essent, simul Philippum - neendum enim debellatum erat - exercitu navibusque adiuturus.

2 Cf. Livy, xxxi.xviii.1.
3 Livy later tells us that he is the youngest of the three ambassadors who went to Alexandria (xxxii.xviii.1).
xxxiii.xxxiv.3⁴ (Romans warn Antiochus III to withdraw from Ptolemy V’s cities 196 B.C.)

...sed aperte denuntiatum, ut excederet Asiae urbis, quae Philippi aut Ptolomaei regum fuissent, abstineret liberis civitatibus, neu quam lacereret armis...

xxxiii.xxxix.lff. (Romans side with Ptolemy V against Antiochus III)

Sub hoc tempore et L. Cornelius, missus ab senatu ad dirimenda inter Antiochum Ptolomaeumque reges certamina, Selymbriae substitit, et decem legatorum...Romani omnia acta eius, ex quo tempore ab Syria classem solvisset, displicere senatui non dissimulabat restituisse et Ptolomaeo omnes civitates quae dicionis eius fuissent aequum censebant;

xxxiii.xl.3 (Antiochus III tells the Romans he had already concluded a peace with Ptolemy V in 196 B.C.)

Quod ad Ptolomaeum attineat, cui ademptas civitates querantur, sibi cum Ptolomaeo et amicitiam esse, et id agere ut brevi etiam adfinitas iungatur⁵.

xxxiii.xli.1-3 (Rumours are circulated that Ptolemy V is dead; both Rome and Antiochus III try to win Egypt for themselves 196 B.C.)

His disceptationibus per dies aliquot habitis rumor sine ullo satis certo auctore allatus de morte Ptolomaei regis, ut nullus exitus imponeretur sermonibus effecit. Nam et dissimulabat pars utraque se audisse, et L. Cornelius, cui legatio ad duos reges, Antiochum Ptolomaeumque, mandata erat, spatium modici temporis ad conveniendum Ptolomaeum petebat, ut, priusquam moveretur aliquid in nova possessione regi, praeveniret in Aegyptum, et Antiochus suam fore Aegyptum, si tum occupasset, censebat.

xxxv.xiii.4 (Wedding between Ptolemy V and Cleopatra I in 193 B.C.)⁶

Antiochus rex⁷, ea hieme Raphiae⁸ in Phoenice Ptolomaeo regi Aegypti filia in matrimonium data...

---

⁴ Cf. Polybius, xviii.49-50.
⁵ Referring to Ptolemy V’s marriage at Raphia in 194/3 B.C. to the daughter of Antiochus III, Cleopatra I.
⁶ Cf. Appian, Syrian Wars, 1.5.
⁷ Sage tells us (Livy, x.38 n. 1) that: “Livy makes no effort to report on the recent activities of Antiochus, the last mention of whom, save for the reference in the preceding chapter, was in xxxiv.lxxv.8.”
⁸ This is in the winter of 194-3 B.C. Raphia lay to the south-west of Gaza, on the coast between Cilicia and Egypt, but not, strictly speaking, in Phoenicia.
xxxvi.iv.1 (Ptolemaic offers of supplies against Antiochus III are declined by the Romans 191 B.C.)

Sub idem tempus legati ab duobus regibus, Philippo et Ptolomaeo, Aegypti rege, Romam venerunt, Philippo pollicente ad bellum auxilia et pecuniam et frumentum; ab Ptolomaeo etiam mille pondo auri, viginti milia pondo argenti adlata. Nihil eius acceptum; gratiae regibus actae; et cum uterque se cum omnibus copiis in Aetoliam venturum belloque interfuturum polliceretur, Ptolomaeo id remissum;

xxxvii.iii.9-11 (Rulers of Egypt - Ptolemy V and Cleopatra I - congratulate Rome on defeat of Antiochus III 190 B.C.)

Legati ab Ptolomaeo et Cleopatra\(^9\) regibus Aegypti gratulantes, quod M'. Acilius consul Antiochum regem Graecia ... reges Aegypti ad ea, quae censuisset senatus, paratos fore. Gratiae regibus actae; legatis munera dari iussa in singulos quaternum milium aeris.”

xxxvii.iii.9-10 (Situation in Syria during Cleopatra I’s and Ptolemy V’s reign)

...venerunt adhortantesque, ut in Asiam exercitum traiecerent: omnia perculsa metu non in Asia modo sed etiam in Syria esse...

---

\(^9\) Sage tells us, “the sister of the king, here Cleopatra, by Egyptian custom and law, shared in the administration: hence reges”. It is quite amazing that the Romans regarded Cleopatra I as the full co-ruler with her husband, Ptolemy V.
APPENDIX CC: CLEOPATRA I

PORPHYRY

FgrHist. 260 F. 49a (The period around the time of Cleopatra I’s death)

Up to this point (i.e. Daniel 11.21) historical order has been followed and between Porphyry and us (i.e. Jewish and Christian commentators) there is no dispute. What follows to the end of the book (i.e. of Daniel) he interprets as referring to Antiochus, whose cognomen is Epiphanes, the brother of Seleucus (IV), the son of Antiochus (III) the Great, who ruled after Seleucus for 11 years in Syria and seized Judaea...They say that Antiochus Epiphanes, his brother, stood in the place of Seleucus. At first, those in Syria who favoured Ptolemaeus did not give him royal honours. Afterwards, however, by the pretence of clemency he gained the kingdom of Syria...Not only, he (i.e. Porphyry) says, did he (i.e. Antiochus) conquer Ptolemaeus (VI) by guile, he also overcame Judas Maccabaeus by stratagems. By Ptolemaeus, however, he does not mean Epiphanes, who was the fifth to reign in Egypt, but Ptolemaeus Philometer, the son of Cleopatra, the sister of Antiochus (IV), who was his uncle. When after the death of Cleopatra, Eulæus, the eunuch (and) tutor of Philometer and Leneus, governed Egypt and sought to regain Syria which Antiochus had occupied by fraud, a war broke out between the uncle and the boy Ptolemaeus; and when they joined battle between Pelusium and Mount Casius, the generals of Ptolemaeus were defeated. Antiochus, sparing the boy and feigning friendship, went up to Memphis, and, there, taking possession of the kingdom according to Egyptian tradition and declaring that he would watch out for the boy’s affairs, he subjugated with a small force all Egypt to himself. He entered rich and prosperous cities and did what neither his fathers nor his father’s fathers had done, for no king of Syria had thus ravaged Egypt. And all their riches he dispersed.

Appian, SYRIAN WARS
I.5 (Betrothal of Cleopatra I to Ptolemy V by Antiochus III)

"Ἡδὴ δὲ τὸν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμον ἐγγυμός ἀποκαλύπτειν, ἐπιγαμίας τοῦς ἐγγὺς βασιλέας προκατέλαβαν, καὶ Πτολεμαίῳ μὲν ἐς Αἰγύπτον ἐστελλε Κλεοπάτρα τὴν Σύραν ἐπικλῆσαν, προϊσ Συρίαν τὴν κοίλην ἐπιδιδοὺς, ἢν αὐτὸς ἀφῆσαι τῷ Πτολεμαίῳ, θεραπεύων ἣδη τὸ μειράκιον, ἵν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τῷ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἀκρομῆθ᾽"
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POLYBIUS

xv.25.8-10 (Alexandrians show more love towards their queens than towards their kings)

ἐν δὲ καὶ ρωμαῖοι πάσι, τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀρακινήν συνέβη γενέσθαι δήλα. τὸ δὲ θανάτου φωτισθέντος ὁ τρόπος ἐπεξηγεῖτο τῆς ἀπολείας· οὕτω οὕτας δὲ προφάσεως ἄλλης ὁδηγοῦσα· τῆς θλιψεις φόβης προσπεπτοκυίας, αἰκίνην δὲ ἀφροβηθουμένης, τὸ κατ’ ἀλήθειαν γεγονός ἐν τοῖς ἑκάστοις γνώμαις ἐπεσφαγίσθη. διὸ καὶ συνέβη μεγάλη γενέσθαι τὴν συγχώσιν τῶν χιλιῶν. τὸ μὲν γὰρ βασιλέως οὐδεὶς ὁδηγὸς οὐδεὶς λόγον ἐποιεῖτο, περὶ δὲ τῆς Ἀρακινῆς, ἀνανεούμενοι τινὲς μὲν τὴν ὄρφαναν αὐτῆς, ένιοι δὲ τὴν εἰς ἀρχήν ἐν τῷ ξην ἱδρύναν, ἥν ἠπέμεινε, καὶ τὴν αἰκίαν, σὺν δὲ τούτοις τὸ περὶ τὴν τελευτὴν ἀτύχημα, εἰς τοσάττων παράστασιν ἐνέπιπτον καὶ δυσθυμιάν ὅστε πλήρη γενέσθαι τὴν πάλιν στεναχιοῦ, διακρίνων, οἰμωγῆς ἀκαταπάστου. ταῦτα δὲ ἦν τοῖς ὀρθῶς λογιζομένοις ὁμίχλω τῆς πρὸς Ἀρακινήν εὐνοίας τεκμηρία, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον τῷ ἐν τῷ πρὸς τοῖς περὶ τῶν Ἀγαθοκλέα μίσσους.

xviii.51.10 (Cleopatra I’s father, Antiochus III, arranges a political marriage)

τὰ δὲ πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον αὐτὸς ἐφι πιεξάξειν εὐδοκομένως ἐκεῖνως κρίνειν γὰρ ὡς φιλίαν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ τῆς φιλίας ἀναγκαιότητα συντίθεσθαι πρὸς αὐτὸν.

LIVY

xxxiii.xl.3 (Antiochus III tells the Romans he has already concluded a peace with Ptolemy V in 196 B.C.)

Quod ad Ptolomaeum attineat, cui ademptas civilitates querantur, sibi cum Ptolomaeo et amicitiam esse, et id agere ut brevi etiam adfinitas iungatur.

xxxv.xiii.4 (Wedding between Ptolemy V and Cleopatra I in 193 B.C.)

Antiochus rex, ea hieme Raphiae in Phoenice Ptolomaeo regi Aegypti filia in matrimonium data...

xxxvii.iii.9-11 (Foreign policy of Ptolemy V and Cleopatra I in 190 B.C.)

Legati ab Ptolomaeo et Cleopatra regibus Aegypti gratulantes, quod M. Acilius consul Antiochum regem Graecia expulisset...reges Aegypti ad ea, quae censuisset senatus, paratos fore. Gratiae regibus actae; legatis munera dari iussa in singulos quaternum milium aeris."

---

4 Referring to Ptolemy V’s marriage at Raphia in 194/3 B.C. to the daughter of Antiochus III, Cleopatra I.
5 This is in the winter of 194-3 B.C. Raphia lay to the south-west of Gaza, on the coast between Cilicia and Egypt, but not, strictly speaking, in Phoenicia.
6 Sage tells us, “the sister of the king, here Cleopatra, by Egyptian custom and law, shared in the administration: hence reges”. It is quite amazing that the Romans regarded Cleopatra I as the full co-ruler with her husband, Ptolemy V.
Appendices

xxxvii.iii.9-10 (Foreign policy in dealing with Syria)

...venerunt adhortantesque, ut in Asiam exercitum traeicerent: omnia perculsa metu non in Asia modo sed etiam in Syria esse...

xlii.vi.4 (Rome sends ambassadors to Egypt to renew friendship eight years after Ptolemy VI Philometor ascended the throne in 173 B.C.)

Per idem tempus quinque legati ad regem missi, qui res in Macedonia aspicerent. Alexandriam idem ad Ptolemaeum renovanda amicitiae causa proficisci iussi.  

(Alexandrians possible support of the royalty [cf. Strabo, Geog., 17.1.11 and Plutarch, Cleomenes, xxxvii.5ff.] and the Alexandrians’ refusal to help Cleomenes and remain loyal to the crown)

STRABO, GEOGRAPHY
17.1.11 (Alexandrians come to trust the royal queens - a direct result of the just and fair reigns of Cleopatras I to III; example: Ptolemy XII Auletes is banished by the Alexandrians)

tοῦτον μὲν οὖν οἱ Ἀλεξανδρεῖς ἔξεβαλον, τριῶν δὲ αὐτῷ θυγατέρων οὐσῶν, ὅν μία γνησία ἡ προσβοτάτη, ταύτην ἀνέδειξαν βασιλισσαν· οἱ ίσοί δὲ αὐτῷ δύο γέπαιοι τῆς τότε χρείας ἐξέπτυσαν τελέως, τῇ δὲ κατασταθείσῃ μετεπέμψαντο ἀνδρὰ ἐκ τῆς Συρίας...

PLUTARCH, LIFE OF CLEOMENES

xxxvii.5 (Alexandrians do not help Cleomenes)

...δ’ ὅστε...τὸν Κλεομένην διαφέροντας καὶ πλανᾶντας κατὰ τὴν πόλιν, οὐδὲν δ’ αὐτῷ προσχωροῦντος, ἄλλα φευγόντων καὶ φοβουμένων ἀπάντων. οὕτως οὖν ἀποστάς καὶ πρὸς τοὺς φίλους εἰπόν, Ὁ θανάτων ἡ ἀρα θαυμαστὸν ἀρχεῖν γυναικάς ἀνθρώπων φευγόντων τὴν ἐλευθερίαν...'...

---

7 Ptolemy V Epiphanes had been succeeded in 181 B.C. by his son, Ptolemy VI (Philometor), but Livy has not previously mentioned the fact.
8 According to Dio Cassius (39.13), this was Berenice IV. She reigned with her mother Cleopatra Tryphena for one year (58-57 B.C.) and then alone for one year.
9 Ptolemies XII and XIII.
**APPENDIX DD: PTOLEMY VI PHILOMETOR**

**ATHENAEUS**

v.195ff. (Ptolemy VI perfidiously treated by Antiochus Epiphanes)

"ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων οὐκ ἐβλέπα καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐνοσφίσατο
παρασπονδήσας τὸν Φιλομήτορα βασιλέα παιδίσκοιν δεύτερα..."

xiv.654d (Reference to Ptolemy VI Philometor’s appeals to Rome for aid)

"καταπεφεύγει δὲν ἐπὶ τὴν ιερὰν σύγκλητον, ὡς ὑπὸ τὸν ἀδελφὸν πάλιν τῆς
βασιλείας ἐξεληλαμένος."

**POLYBIUS**

xxvii.13 (The young age of Ptolemy VI 171 B.C.)

"Ὅτι Πτολεμαῖος ὁ στρατηγὸς ὁ κατὰ Κύπρον οὔδαμως Αἰγυπτιακὸς γέγονεν,
ἀλλὰ νουνεχ tỷ καὶ πρακτικός, παραλαβὼν γὰρ τὴν νήσον ἐπὶ νησίου τοῦ
βασιλέως ὄντος ἐγίνετο μὲν ἐπιμελώς περὶ συναγωγῆς χρημάτων, ἐδίδον δὲ ἀπλῶς
οὐδὲν οὐδένι, καίσιν αὐτούμενος πόλλακις υπὸ τῶν βασιλικῶν διοικητῶν καὶ
καταλαλοῦμενος πικρός ἐπὶ τῷ μηθὲν προεισθάνει. τοῦ δὲ βασιλέως εἰς ἡλικίαν
παραγενοῦτος, συνθεὶς πλῆθος ἵκανον χρημάτων ἐξαπέστειλεν, ὡστε καὶ τὸν
Πτολεμαίον αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς περὶ τὴν αὐλὴν εὐδοκήσας τῇ πρότερον αὐτὸν
συστόλη καὶ τῷ μηθὲν προεισθάνα."  

xxviii.1ff. (War between Antiochus IV and Ptolemy VI over Coele-Syria in 170-169 B.C.)

"Ὅτι τοῦ πόλεμου περὶ Κολικνάς Συρίας ἦδη καταρχὴν λαβόντος Ἀντίοχος
καὶ Πτολεμαῖος τοῖς βασιλεῖσιν, ἤκουν πρόσβεσει εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην παρὰ μὲν
Ἀντίοχου Μελέαγρος καὶ Σωσιάνης καὶ Ἡρακλείδης, παρὰ δὲ Πτολεμαίου
Τιμιθέους καὶ Δάμων. συνέβαινε δὲ κρατείν τὸν Ἀντίοχον τῶν κατὰ Κολικν
Συρίαν καὶ Φοινίκης πραγμάτων. ἕξεν γὰρ Ἀντίοχος ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ νῦν λεγομένου
βασιλέως ἐνίκησε τῇ περὶ τὸ Πάνιον μάχη τοῖς Πτολεμαίοις στρατηγοὺς, ἀπ' ἐκείνων τῶν χρόνων ἐπείθον πάντες οἱ προσφερόμενοι τοῖς ἐν Συρίᾳ
βασιλεῖσιν. διότι ὁ μὲν Ἀντίοχος ἠγούμενος τὴν κατὰ πόλεμον ἱσχυροτάτην καὶ
καλλιστὴν εἶναι κτήσιν, ὡς ὑπὲρ ἐκείνων ἐποιεῖτο τὴν σπουδὴν ὁ δὲ
Πτολεμαῖος ἀδίκους ὑπολαμβάναν τὸν πρότερον Ἀντίοχον συνεπιθέμενον τῇ τῶν
πατρὸς ὀρφανία παραγράφει τὰς κατὰ Κολικν Συρίαν πόλεις αὐτῶν, οὐχ οἶδα τ' ἦν ἐκείνη παραχθεῖν τῶν τόπων τούτων.

---

1 Athenaeus, v.193diff.
2 Ptolemy VI Philometor, who had insisted on a division of territory and had obtained from the Roman Senate all but Cyrene and Libya (Gulick Vol.7 p.11, note a). In 163 B.C., he went to Rome to obtain the grant of Cyprus (Polybius, xxxi.18; xxxiii.5).
xxviii.12.8-9 (The Achaean League, upon hearing of Ptolemy VI Philometor’s Anakleteria [“Coming of Age”] Festival, sends envoys in 170-169 B.C.)

καὶ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν καὶ περὶ τοῦ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου προσπεσόντος τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς διότι γέγονεν αὐτῷ τὰ νομιζόμενα γίνεσθαι τοῖς βασιλεύσιν, ὅταν εἰς ἡλικίαν ἔλθωσιν, ἀνακλητήρια, νομίζοντες σφιξὶ καθιεῖν ἐπισημήνασθαι το γεγονός, ἐπηρειασμένοι πέμπειν προσβευτὰς ἀνανεωμένους τὰ προὐπάρχοντα τῷ ἐθνείῳ φιλανθρώπῳ πρὸς τὴν βασιλείαν, καὶ παραυτίκα κατέστησαν Ἀλκιθόν καὶ Πασίδαδαν.

JUSTIN, *EPITOME OF TROGUS*

34.2.7 (Antiochus IV attacks Ptolemy VI)

Dum haec aguntur, rex Syriæ Antiochus Ptolomeo, maiori sororis suae filio, regi Aegypti, bellum infert...

35.1.6 (Ptolemy VI helps the Syrians at Antioch against Demetrius)

Itaque adiuvantibus et Ptolomeo, rege Aegypti...

LIVY

xlili.vi.4 (Rome sends ambassadors to Egypt to renew friendship in 173 B.C.)

Per idem tempus quinque legati ad regem missi, qui res in Macedonia aspicerent. Alexandriam iidem ad Ptolemaeum renovandae amicitiae causa proficisci iussi.

xlili.xxvi.8 (Egypt pledges its loyalty to the Romans in 172 B.C.)

Ex Asia qui circa socios reges missi erant redierunt legati, qui retilerent Eumenen Aeginae Antiochum in Syria, Ptolemaeum Alexandriæ sese convenisse. Omnes...sed egregie in fide permanere pollicitosque omnia quae populus Romanus imperasset praestaturos.

xlili.xxix.5-6 (Livy’s reason why Antiochus IV was again threatening the kingdom of Egypt in 171 B.C.)

Antiochus imminebat quidem Aegypti regno, et pueritiam regis et inertiam tutorum spernens; et ambigendo de Coele Syria causam belli se habiturum existimabat gesturumque id nullo impedimento occupatis Romanis in Macedonico bello;

---

3 Ptolemy V Epiphanes was succeeded in 181 B.C. by his son, Ptolemy VI Philometor, but Livy had not previously mentioned the fact.
xlii.xxix.7 (Because of Ptolemy VI's young age, the kingdom is run by his ministers 171 B.C.)

Ptolemæus propter actatem alieni tum arbitrii erat; tutores et bellum adversus Antiochum parabant, quo vindicarent Coelen Syriam, et Romanis omnia pollicebantur ad Macedonicum bellum.

xliv.xix.6-7 (Egyptian envoys go to Rome in 168 B.C. to beg Rome's aid against Antiochus IV)

Primi Alexandrini legati ab Ptolemaeo et Cleopatra regibus vocati sunt. Sordidati, barba et capillo promisso, cum ramis oleae ingressi curiam procubuerunt, et oratio quam habitus fuit miserabilior.

xliv.xix.8 (Antiochus IV is waging war against Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II 168 B.C.)

Antiochus Syriæ rex...per honestam speciem maiori Ptolemaei reducendi in regnum, bellum cum minore fratre eius, qui tum Alexandriam tenebat...

---

4 Cf. Polybius, xxvii.19. Ptolemy VI Philometor was about 16 at this time, having succeeded to the throne in 181 B.C. His tutors at this time were Eulacus and Lenaeus.

5 History of the possession of Coele Syria (the district of Damascus, and extending to the north, between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon) up to this time: First belonged to Seleucus I; was conquered by Ptolemy II Philadelphus in 280 B.C. and held by Egypt until 218 B.C.; was retaken by Antiochus III the Great in 201-198 B.C.; and given by him as a dowry for his daughter Cleopatra I, mother of the reigning king, Ptolemy VI.

6 Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II and Cleopatra II.

7 Schlesinger (151 n. 2) says that this was part of the envoys' costume to appear like suppliants.

8 The "elder Ptolemy" is Ptolemy VI Philometor; the "young" is Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II.
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APPENDIX EE: SOSIBIUS

PLUTARCH, *LIFE OF CLEOMENES*

xxxiii.4 (Sosibius' influence over Ptolemy IV)

Σωσιβίου δὲ τοῦ πλείστου ἐν τοῖς φίλοις δυναμένου φήσαντος

xxxiv.2 (Sosibius fears Cleomenes and his influence in Egypt)

ὁ δὲ τῶν ὅλων προεστηκός καὶ προβουλεύων Σωσιβίος μένοντα μὲν τὸν Κλεομένη παρὰ γνώμην ἥγετο δυσμενεψειρίστον εἰναι καὶ φοβερόν, ἀφεθέντα δὲ τολμηρόν, ἀνδρὰ καὶ μεγαλοπράγμονα καὶ τῆς βασιλείας νοσούσης θεατὴν γεγενημένον.

POLYBIUS

v.35.7 (Sosibius at the head of the government during the reign of Ptolemy IV)

οἳ δὲ περὶ τὸν Σωσιβίου (οὕτως γὰρ μάλιστα τότε προεστάτει τῶν πραγμάτων) συνεδρεύσαντες τοιαύτας τινὰς ἐκποίησαντο περὶ αὐτὸν διαλήψεις.

v.63.1 (Sosibius and Agathocles control Ptolemaic affairs together)

λοιπὸν δὲ συνεδρεύσαντες οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἀγαθοκλέα καὶ Σωσιβίου, οἱ τότε προεστώτες τῆς βασιλείας

v.65.9 (Sosibius as a military commander)

τὸ δὲ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων πλῆθος ἦν μὲν εἰς δισμυρίους φαλαγγίτας, ὡπετάττετο δὲ Σωσιβίῳ.

xv.25 (As the guardian of Ptolemy IV, Sosibius causes the deaths of many of his rivals)

"Ὅτι Σωσιβίος ὁ γεωδεστρόπος Πτολεμαίου ἐδόκει γεγονέναι σκεδός ἀγχίνουν καὶ πολυχρόνιον, ἔτι δὲ κακοποιοῦν ἐν βασιλείᾳ, καὶ πρῶτῳ μὲν ἀρτύσαι φόνον Λυσιμάχῳ, ὡς ἦν υἱὸς Ἀρσινόης τῆς Λυσιμάχου καὶ Πτολεμαίου, δεύτερῳ δὲ Μάγα τῷ Πτολεμαίου καὶ Βερενίκης τῆς Μάγα, τρίτῃ δὲ Βερενίκη τῇ Πτολεμαίου μητρὶ τοῦ Φιλοπάτωρος, τετάρτῳ Κλεομένει τῷ Σπαρτιάτῃ, πέμπτῃ θυγατρὶ Βερενίκης Ἀρσινόῃ.

Appendices

xv.25.3ff. (Accession of Ptolemy V; false proclamation of Agathocles and Sosibius as his guardians in 203 B.C.)

Metá δ' ἡμέρας τρεῖς ἢ τέταρτας ἐν τῷ μεγίστῳ περιστύλῳ τῆς αὐλῆς οἰκοδομήσαντες βῆμα συνεκάλεσαν τοὺς ὑπασπιστὰς καὶ τὴν θεραπείαν, ἀμα δὲ τούτοις τοὺς πεζοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἱππέας ἤγεμόνας. ἀθροισθέντων δὲ τούτων ἀναβὰς Ἀγαθοκλῆς καὶ Σωσίβιος ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα πρῶτον μὲν τὸν τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τὸν τῆς βασιλίσσης βάναυστον ἀνθρωπολογήσαντο καὶ τὸ πένθος ἀνέφηναν τοὺς πολλοὺς κατὰ τὸ πάρ' αὐτοῖς θός. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα διάθημα τῷ παιδὶ περιβέντες ἀνεδείξαν βασιλέα, καὶ διαδήκησαν τίνα παρανέγγυως πεπλασμένην, ἐν ἢ γεγραμμένον ἦν ὁτι καταλείπει τὸν παιδὸς ἐπιτρόπους ὁ βασιλεὺς 'Ἀγαθοκλῆς καὶ Σωσίβιον' καὶ παρεκάλουν τοὺς ἤγεμόνας εὐνοεῖν καὶ διαφαλάττειν τῷ παιδὶ τὴν ἁρχήν.

SONS OF SOSIBIUS

POLYBIUS

xv.32.4-6 (When the Alexandrian mob demand Ptolemy V as their king, Sosibius, son of Sosibius, at this time is already a member of the bodyguard)

perὶ δὲ τοὺς δόχλους ἐγένετο τις ἀμα χάρα καὶ ἀλζήν· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἦσαν περιχαρεῖς ἐπὶ τῷ κεκομισθαί τὸν παιδὰ, τὰ δὲ πάλιν δυσηρεστῶν τῷ μὴ συνειλῆθαι τοὺς αἰτίας μὴ τυγχάνειν τῆς ἀριμοποίησις τιμωρίας...ἡδὲ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἡμεραμονίας, καὶ τὸν πλῆθους ἐπὶ οὐδὲνα δυναμένου πέρας ἀπερείσκησαί τὴν ὁμήν, Σωσίβιος, ὃς ἦν μὲν υἱὸς Σωσίβου, τότε δὲ σωματοφυλάξ ὑπάρχον μίλιστα τὸν νοῦν προσεχθῇ τῷ τε βασιλεί καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι, θεοροῦν τὴν τε τὸν πλῆθους ὅρμην ἀμετάβετον οὔσαν καὶ τὸ παιδίον δυσκηρτισμένον διὰ τὴν τῶν παρεστώτων ἀσυνήθειαν καὶ διὰ τὴν περὶ τὸν ὅχλον ταραχὴν, ἐπιτυθείν τῷ βασιλέως εἰ παραδώσῃ τοῖς πολλοῖς τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν ἢ τὴν μητέρα τι πεπλημμεληκότας. τοῦ δὲ κατανεύσαντος, τῶν μὲν σωματοφυλάκων ταῖν εἴπε δηλώσαι τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως γνώμην, τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἀναστήσας ἅπηγε πρὸς τὴν θεραπείαν εἰς τὴν ἑαυτὴν οἰκίαν, σύνεγγυς οὔσαν.

xvi.22.1ff. (Sosibius [the son] becomes the guardian of Ptolemy V)

ἐφ' οἷς οἱ περὶ τὴν αὐλῆν ἀσχάλλοντες πάντα παρεσμαίνοντο καὶ βαρέως αὐτοῦ τὴν αὐθάδειαν ὑπέφερον, τὸν δὲ Σωσίβιον ἐκ παραθέσεως ἐθάμβαζον. ἐδόκει γὰρ οὗτος τὸν τε βασιλέα προεστάνει φρονιμωτέρον ἢ κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν, τὴν τε πρὸς τοὺς ἐκτὸς ἀπάντησιν αἰξίαν ποιείσθαι τῆς ἐγκεχειρισμένης αὐτῷ πίστεως· αὕτῃ δ' ἦν ἡ σφραγὶς καὶ τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως σῶμα.

xvi.22.11 (Tlepolemus takes control of Ptolemaic matters from Sosibius, son of Sosibius)

"Ὅτι μετὰ τὴν διημητίαν ἔλαβε καὶ τὴν σφραγίδα παρὰ Σωσίβιον, καὶ ταύτην παρεπληκτῶς ὁ Τληπόλεμος λοιπόν ἤθη πάντα τὰ πράγματα κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ προαίρεσιν ἐπράτην."
PTOLEMY
POLYBIUS
xvi.22.3ff. (Ptolemy, son of Sosibius, returns from exile to challenge Tlepolemus)

κατὰ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν τούτον ἀνακομιζόμενος ἦκει παρὰ τοῦ Φιλίππου Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Σωσιβίου. καὶ πρὶν μὲν οὖν ἐκ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρειας ἐκπλεῦσαι πλήρης ἦν τόφοι διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν φίλοι καὶ διὰ τὴν προσγεγενημένην ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς εὐκαίριαν ὡς δὲ καταπλεῦσας εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν συνέμειζα τοῖς περὶ τὴν αὐλὴν νεανίσκοις, ὑπολαβὼν εἶναι τὴν Μακεδονίαν ἄνδρειαν ἐν τῇ τῆς οὐράνεις καὶ τῇ τῆς ἐσθήτος διαφορά, παρὴν ταῦτα πάντα' ἔξηλωκώς καὶ πεπεισμένος αὐτὸν μὲν ἄνδρα γεγονέναι διὰ τὴν ἐκδημίαν καὶ διὰ τὸ Μακεδονίαν ὀμιλήκεναι, τοὺς δὲ κατὰ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἄνδράποδα καὶ βλάκας διαμένειν, διὸπερ εὐθεῖας ἐξηλοτύπει καὶ παρετρίβετο πρὸς τὸν Τληπόλεμον. πάντων δ’ αὐτῷ συγκατατιθημένων τῶν περὶ τὴν αὐλὴν διὰ τὸ τὸν Τληπόλεμον καὶ τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὰ χρήματα μὴ ὡς ἐπίτροποι, ἀλλ’ ὡς κληρονόμον χειρίζειν, ταχεῖος ἤζηθη τὰ τῆς διαφοράς.
ATHENAEUS
vi.251 c (Philon, an associate of Agathocles, has become a close friend of Ptolemy IV)

εν δὲ τῇ τεσσαρεσκαιδεκατῇ Ἀγαθοκλέους τοῦ Οἰνάνθης υιοῦ, ἑταίρου δὲ τοῦ Φιλοπάτορος βασιλέως Φίλονα.

POLYBIUS
v.63.1 (Sosibius and Agathocles at the head of the government during the reign of Ptolemy IV Philopator)

λοιπὸν δὲ συνεδρεύσαντες οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἀγαθοκλέα καὶ Σωσίβιον, οἱ τότε προεστῶτες τῆς βασιλείας

 xv.25.3ff. (Accession of Ptolemy V; false proclamation of Agathocles and Sosibius as his guardians in 203 B.C.)

Μετὰ δὲ ἡμέρας τρεῖς ἢ τέσταρας ἐν τῷ μεγίστῳ περιστύλῳ τῆς αὐλῆς οἰκοδομήσαντες θῆμα συνεκάλεσαν τοὺς ὑπασπιστάς καὶ τὴν θεραπείαν, ἁμα δὲ τούτοις τοὺς πεζῶν καὶ τοὺς ἱππέας ἡγεμόνας, ἀποριθεῖσαι δὲ τούτων ἀναφέρας Ἀγαθοκλῆς καὶ Σωσίβιος ἐπὶ τὸ θῆμα πρῶτον μὲν τὸν τοῦ βασιλέα καὶ τὸν τῆς βασιλείας θάνατον ἀνθυμολογήσαντο καὶ τὸ πένθος ἀνέφην τοὺς πολλοὺς κατὰ τὸ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἔθος, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα διὰθημα τῷ παιδὶ περιθέντες ἀνέδειξαν βασιλέα, καὶ διαθηκὴν τὴν παρανέγγυσαν πεπλασμένην, ἐν ἢ γεγραμμένον ἢν ὁτι καταλείπε τὸν παιδὸς ἐπιτρόπους ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀγαθοκλέα καὶ Σωσίβιον—καὶ παρεκάλουν τοὺς ἡγεμόνας εὐνοεῖν καὶ διαφυλάττειν τῷ παιδὶ τὴν ἀρχήν—

 xv.25.11 (Realising that his office alone will not gain him the loyalty and support he needs to control the Ptolemaic kingdom successfully, Agathocles resorts to bribery among other things)

ὁ δὲ προειρημένος, ἐπειδὴ τὰς υδρίας εἰς τοὺς βασιλικοὺς οἶκους ἔθηκε, παραγγείλας ἀποθέοσαι τὸ φαῖα, πρῶτον μὲν διμήνου τὰς δυνάμεις ἄγωντας, πεπεισμένος τὸ πάρα τοὺς πολλοὺς μίσος ἀμβλύνειν διὰ τῆς ἀπὸ τὸ λυστέλες ὄρμης αὐτῶν, εἰτ᾽ ἐπεξώρικε τὸν ὅρκον ὅν ἦσαν ὁμοεῖν εἰθησμένοι κατὰ τὰς ἀναδείξεις τῶν βασιλέων.

 xv.12ff. (Agathocles rids the kingdom of his rivals and opponents; his internal policy and politics)

ἐξαπέστειλε δὲ καὶ Φιλόμμωνα τὸν ἑπιστάντα τῷ τῆς Ἀρσινόης φόνῳ, ποιήσας αὐτὸν Λιβυάρχην τῶν κατὰ Κυρήνην τόπον, μετα δὲ ταῦτα Πέλοπα μὲν ἐξέπεμψε τὸν Πέλοπος εἰς τὴν Αἰαῖαν πρὸς Ἀντίοχον τὸν βασιλέα, παρακαλέσαντα συντρέψειν τὴν φίλιαν καὶ μὴ παραβαίνειν τὰς πρὸς τὸν παιδὸς πατέρα συνήθεις. Πολεμαίον δὲ τὸν Σωσίβιον πρὸς Φιλίππον τά τε περὶ τῆς ἐπιγομίας συνθησάμενον καὶ παρακαλέσαντα βοηθεῖν, έκαν ὀλοχερεστερον αὐτοῦ Ἀντίοχος ἐπιβάλλει παρασπονδεῖν, προσεχρίστο τοῦ πολεμαίον τὸν Ἀγαθάρχου προεστήν πρὸς Ρωμαίοις, οὐχ ώσ προσεπνόντα τὴν πρεσβείαν, ἀλλ' ὡς, ἂν ἀνήστη τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ συμμίζῃ τοῖς ἐκεί φίλοις καὶ συγγενεῖσι, αὐτοῦ καταμενοῦντα. προεκέιτο γὰρ αὐτῷ πάντας τοὺς ἐπιφανεῖς ἀνδρὰς ἐκπολ徭ν ποιῆσαι...δύο γάρ ἐσχε προθέσεις ύπὲρ ταύτης τῆς ἐπιβολῆς, μίαν μὲν
Appendices 161

xv.25.20-21 (Agathocles fills up the important governmental posts with his own supporters)

'O δ' Ἀγαθοκλῆς ἐπεὶ τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκποιῶν ἐποίησε, καὶ τὸ πολὺ τῆς τοῦ πλῆθους ὅργης παρακατέσχε τῇ τῶν ὁμοιῶν ἀποδόσει, παρὰ πόδας εἰς τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς συνήθειαν ἐπανήλθε, καὶ τὰς μὲν τῶν φίλων χώρας ἀνεπλήρωσε, παρεισαγάγων ἕκ τῆς δικαστείας καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ὑπηρεσίας τοὺς εἰκαστάτους καὶ θρασυτάτους;

xv.34 (Summary of Agathocles career)

προσαγγίζεις μὲν γὰρ ἔτυχε παραδόξου διὰ τὴν τοῦ Φιλοπάτορος ἀδύναμιαν τοῦ βασιλεύειν' τυχῶν δὲ ταῦτης καὶ παραλαβὼν εὑρεστάτον καρδὸν μετὰ τὸν ἔκεινον θάνατον πρὸς τὸ συντηρῆσαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ἀμα τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὸ δὲ ἀπέβαλε διὰ τὴν ἱδίαν ἀνανθρίαν καὶ ῥαθυμίαν, ἐν πάνο βραχεί χρόνῳ καταγωγεῖς.

xv.25.25 (Agathocles and his family are never accepted by the Alexandrian people)

τῷ δὲ μηδὲν ἔχειν πρόσωπον ἀξιόχρεον τὸ προστήρομενον, καὶ δι' ὅδε τὴν ὀργὴν εἰς τὸν Ἀγαθοκλέα καὶ τὴν Ἀγαθοκλεῖαν ἀπερείστοτο, τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἤγον, ἐπὶ μίαν ἐλπίδα καραδοκοῦντες τὴν κατὰ τὸν Τληπόλεμον καὶ ταύτη προσανέχοντες.

xv.25.35-36 (Agathocles tries to turn the people against Tlepolemus)

καὶ πολλὰς εἰς τὸν ἱερὸ τὸ μέρος εὑρίσκει πιθανότητας, τὰς μὲν ἐκ τῶν συμβαινόντων παρεκδεχόμενος καὶ διαστρέφων, τὰς δὲ καταβολὴς πλάττων καὶ διασκευάζων. ταῦτα δ' ἐποίησε βουλόμενος τὸ πλήθος παροξυώνειν κατὰ τὸν Τληπολέμον συνέβαινε δὲ τοῦναντίον. πάλαι γὰρ ἐπὶ τῷ προερημένῳ τάς ἐλπίδας ἔχοντες οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ λίαν ἰδέας ἔφευραν ἐκκαιομένην τὴν διαφοράν.

xv.31.4ff. (Agathocles realises the threat to him by the Macedonian people)

οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἀγαθοκλέα, βλέποντες ἤδη τὰ καθ' αὐτοὺς, ἐδέωντο τῶν σωματοφυλάκων πρεσβεύσανεν περὶ αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς Μακεδόνας, δηλοῦντας δὲ τῆς επιτροπείας ἐκκουρόσθησον καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἐξουσίας καὶ τῶν τιμῶν, ἦτο δὲ τῶν χρησίμων ών ἔχουσι πάντων, αὐτῷ δὲ τὸ πνευματίκον δεόταυν συγχωρηθῆναι σφίζει μετὰ τῆς ἀναγκαίας τροφῆς. ἦν χρήσκεςτες εἰς τὴν ἐξ ὀργῆς διαθέσειν μηδὲ βουληθέντες ἐτί δύνασται λίπειν μηδένα. τῶν μὲν οὖν ἀλλῶν σωματοφυλάκων οὐδεὶς ὑπήκουσεν, Ἀριστομένης δὲ μόνος ὑπέστη τὴν χρείαν ταύτην ὅ μετὰ τὴν ἥδην ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων γενόμενος.
AGATHOCLEIA & OENANTHE

PLUTARCH, *LIFE OF CLEOMENES*
xxxiii.2 (Plutarch gives the credit of running Ptolemy IV’s government to Oenanthe)

ο μὲν γὰρ βασιλεὺς αὐτὸς οὕτω διέφθαρτο τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὸ γυναικῶν καὶ πότων ὡστε, ὅπως νήφοι μάλιστα καὶ σπουδαίοτατος αὐτοῦ γένοιτο, τελετάς τελείν καὶ τύμπανον ἔχων ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις ἀγείρειν, τὰ δὲ μέγιστα τῆς ἀρχῆς πράγματα διοικεῖν Ἀγαθόκλειαν τὴν ἐρωμένην τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τὴν ταύτης μητέρα καὶ πορνοβοσκὸν Οινάνθην.

POLYBIUS
xv.25.12 (The child-king, Ptolemy V, is placed into the care of Agathoclea and Oenanthe)

...τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἐνεχείρισε ταῖς περὶ τὴν Οινάνθην καὶ Ἀγαθόκλειαν.