Power, Life and Death in the House of Ptolemy: The Years 145-143 BC

Historians studying antiquity are often frustrated by the scarcity of sources and their fragmentary nature and poor state of preservation. They regularly express the wish that new sources could support or correct their hypotheses[1]. It is the intention of this article to illustrate how information from new documents[2] can indeed help to refine or refute certain widely accepted theories. More specifically, I will study the dating and background of some dynastic events from the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II: (1) the return of Ptolemy VIII to Egypt and the beginning of his second reign, (2) the birth of Ptolemy Memphites and the Egyptian coronation of Ptolemy VIII, and (3) the death of the youngest son of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II and the marriage of Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II[3].

The return of Ptolemy VIII to Egypt and the beginning of his second reign

We now have evidence that Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II, after his short reign in 164/3 BC, ruled Egypt again as early as 15 July 145 BC (year 25, 21 Payni): the recently published P.Trier II 15 contains in col. II ll. 40-41 a reference to a *prostagma* of the king issued on that date[4]. This *terminus ante quem* necessitates a new discussion of a heavily debated double dating which equates year 36 (of Ptolemy VI) with year 1, especially since several scholars have associated "year 1" with a co-regency of the son of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II[5] with either his father or his mother.

To make it easier to follow my reasoning, I will first give an overview of all available sources. In addition to the real dates in the table below, I propose an "adjusted" date, taking into account the time a message from Alexandria probably needed to reach specific areas of the Egyptian *chora*; the adjusted dates thus reflect the situation in Alexandria and I have sorted the documents according to these dates. For the purpose of this exercise, I make the following assumptions: Arsinoite or Memphite nome = Alexandria + 3 days; Oxyrhynchite nome = + 4 days; Tentyrite nome = + 11 days; Thebes = + 13 days; Pathyris = + 15 days[6]. The date of the documents in italics is not quite certain.

No	Source	Origin	Real date	Adjusted date (Alexandria)
1	P.Tebt. I 32 (TM 45139)	Arsinoite nome	25 June-24 July 145 BC (**year 36**, Payni)	22 June-21 July 145 BC

[1] See for instance below n. 39.

[2] I am much obliged to Sandra Lippert, who in her e-mail of 4 October 2018 kindly provided me with information on the reading and interpretation of the unpublished demotic document P.Tebt.frag. 14,082, information of which I will make extensive use in my article. In an e-mail of 22 March 2021, she informed me that she will publish P. Tebt.frag. 14,082 in a monograph in the P.Tebt. series together with other demotic legal documents from the notary office of Oxyrhyncha, but that the publication date is not yet known.

[3] These events were recently studied by Bielman Sánchez-Lenzo (2015) 175-189, and Grzybek (2017) 93-111, but I now come to significantly different conclusions. Werner (2019) 18-22 and 31-34, discusses the date and circumstances of Euergetes' return to Egypt, but without making full use of all the available data. For the sake of clarity of argument, the events are not discussed in strict chronological order; however, at the end of my article a chronological overview is provided.

[4] See Werner (2019) 17, for a discussion of the reading of the date, and 18-22 for its historical significance. The fact that the *prostagma* mentions activities in Asia during the 7th Syrian War confirms that the regnal year must be associated with the reign of Ptolemy VIII.

[5] I avoid giving this prince the epithet "Neos Philopator", since it remains unclear whether this title applies to the son of Ptolemy VI or to Ptolemy Memphites, the son of Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II.

[6] These assumptions are partially based on the table (with data from Roman times) in Rathbone (1986) 103: a minimum of 3 days for a message from Alexandria to reach the Arsinoite nome, at least one extra day for the Oxyrhynchite nome and a minimum of 10 additional days (so 13 days in total) for Thebes.

2	P.Stras.Dem. 21 + SB I 5115 (TM 109)	Pathyris	15 July 145 BC (**year 36**, 21 Payni[7])	30 June 145 BC
3	*P.Berol. inv. 12484 (TM 4568)*[8]	*Tentyrite nome*	*16 July 145 BC* ***(year 36**, 22 Payni)?*	*5 July 145 BC?*
4	P.Fouad Dem. 1 (TM 46850)	Memphite, Arsinoite or Oxyrhynchite nome (?)[9]	10 July 145 BC (**year 36 = year 1**, 16 Payni)	6/7 July 145 BC
5	Cairo Eg. Mus. Exc. 1929/30 MH 179 (TM 91821)[10]	Thebes West (Medinet Habu)	24 July 145 BC (**year 36**, 30 Payni)	11 July 145 BC
6	P.Trier II 15 (TM 957786)	Alexandria[11]	15 July 145 BC (**year 25**, 21 Payni)	15 July 145 BC
7	Short Texts III 1497-1498 (TM 81141-81142)	Thebes West (Dra' Abu el-Naga')	4 August 145 BC (**year 36 = year 25**, 11 Epeiph)[12]	21 July 145 BC
8	P.Oxf.Griffith I 59 (TM 45619)	Arsinoite nome	13 August 145 BC (**year 25**, 20 Epeiph)	10 August 145 BC
9	*I.Fay. III 198 (TM 8168, CPI 219)*[13]	*Arsinoite nome*	*21 August 145 BC* ***(year 36 = year 1**, 28 Epeiph)*	*18 August 145 BC*
10	*P.Köln* XIV 564 (TM 697572)	Arsinoite nome	25 July – 23 August 145 BC[14] (**year 25**, Epeiph)	22 July – 20 August 145 BC

To draw conclusions from the above table, we need to look at all sources containing the date "year 36 = year 1":

1. The double date appears on a rare issue of Alexandrian coins[15]. Mørkholm observed that the five specimens known to him in 1975 were all struck from the same obverse die, which was also used for coins dated by year 36 of Ptolemy VI alone. Surprisingly, however, "the specimen dated by Philometor alone was struck *after* the specimen with double date, as the obverse die, when used with the former, shows obvious traces of greater wear"[16]. Mørkholm concludes that the coins with the double date apparently belong to a special issue to celebrate or proclaim the participation of Philometor's youngest son in royal power[17], before the Alexandrian mint returned to dating coins according to the regnal years of the king alone.

2. In 1990 Chauveau published our document no. 4, a private letter written on 10 July 145 BC[18]. Before the publication of P.Trier II 15, the earliest sources mentioning the 25th year of Ptolemy VIII were two demotic graffiti from Dra' Abu el-Naga' on the Theban West Bank (our no. 7), written in "year

[7] This is the date of the Greek subscript.

[8] This ostracon, first published as BGU VI 1311, is now re-edited by Stern (2013) 84-91. The regnal year may refer either to the reign of Ptolemy VI or that of Ptolemy VIII (= 14 July 134 BC).

[9] See Chauveau (1990) 142 n. f and n. h.

[10] This demotic ostracon was published by Kaplony-Heckel (2006) 390-391 no. 4 (see 385-386 for a discussion of the date).

[11] In my opinion, there is no reason to doubt that Ptolemy VIII was already in Alexandria when the *prostagma* was issued: see below p. xxx.

[12] In the Osirian catacombs in Oxyrhynchos we now also have an example of the (retroactive) double date "year 37 = year 26": Coulon (2011) 85-86; Coulon (2018) 175 (M) and 180-181.

[13] See below p. xxx for a discussion of the date.

[14] The indication "Aug. – Sept. 145 v.Chr." in the edition is misleading.

[15] Svoronos 1509; see also Bennett (2001-2013) s.v. Ptolemy VI n. 13, for another specimen.

[16] Mørkholm (1975) 9.

[17] That Ptolemy VI reigned with his son as co-regent has long been the prevailing opinion: Otto (1934) 128 with n. 4; Otto-Bengtson (1938) 25 with n. 2; Samuel (1962) 144; Murnane (1977) 99. See also below n. xxx.

[18] Chauveau (1990) 136-143, with additions and corrections in Chauveau (1991) 133.

36 which makes year 25, 11 Epeiph" (4 August 145 BC)[19]. Taking into account a time of about 10 days for a message from the capital to reach Thebes, Chauveau conjectured that Ptolemy VIII ascended the throne before 25 July 145 BC, and this view is now confirmed. Chauveau considered the double date in document no. 4 as a reference to Philometor's dual kingship over Egypt and Asia (*i.e.*, the Seleucid empire). According to him, this would also explain the strange sequence of regnal years on the Alexandrian coins: Philometor would first have accepted the Seleucid crown (= start of the double date) but later refused it (= return to year 36)[20]. Personally, however, I consider it unlikely that an Egyptian private person would have used the already obsolete double date of the dual kingship in a letter. I rather believe that the demotic letter reflects the uncertainty of the population in the Egyptian *chora* about recent events. From the (adjusted) dates of our documents nos. 1 and 2 it appears that Ptolemy VIII had probably not yet returned to Alexandria in the last week of June 145 BC, whereas it is now confirmed that on 15 July 145 BC he was already ruling the country. The adjusted date c. 6/7 July 145 BC, as seen in document no. 4, may reflect the author's awareness that Euergetes had returned. He may not have known that the king would not start counting his regnal years with year 1, as was usually done, but with year 25, the beginning of his co-regency in 170 BC. If this reasoning is correct, we may assume that Ptolemy VIII had seized power probably after 22 June 145 BC[21] and before 6/7 July 145 BC[22]. Looking at the proposed "adjusted" date of our documents 5 and 7, we conclude that the news of the king's return took longer than the expected (theoretical minimum) time to reach the Theban area[23], but the author of the graffiti from Dra' Abu el-Naga' was already aware on 21 July 145 BC that Ptolemy VIII had officially started his 25th regnal year (and not his 1st).

3. Somewhat problematic is document no. 9, a Greek private inscription which still contains the double date "year 36 = year 1, 28 Epeiph" in the second half of August 145 BC, while document no. 8, also from the Fayum, shows that a scribe in the Arsinoite nome already knew on 13 August 145, more than a week before the date of the inscription, that Ptolemy VIII had started his 25th regnal year. Several proposals have been made to explain this anomaly in the inscription[24] and Bennett even suggested that the double date points to a co-regency of Ptolemy IX and Berenice III (= 5 August 81 BC)[25]. Perhaps we should just accept that the news that Ptolemy VIII used his 25th year to indicate the beginning of his new reign did not reach all layers of the population with the same speed.

[19] Chauveau (1991); cf. Lanciers (1995).

[20] Chauveau (1990) 151-153. His conclusion is accepted by Lanciers (1995) 33; Hölbl (2001) 193; Bennett (2001-2013) s.v. Ptolemy Memphites n. 9 iii and s.v. Ptolemy VI n. 13; Grainger (2010) 347-348.

[21] I hesitate to use the estimated "adjusted" date of document no. 2 – 30 June 145 BC – as a *terminus post quem*, since it may have taken longer than assumed for a message to reach Upper-Egypt: see below regarding the nos. 5 and 7.

[22] Using our documents nos. 1, 2 and 4, Chauveau (1990) 145-146, calculated the time span 15 June – 5 July 145 BC, but not as the period of the return of Ptolemy VIII but of the introduction of the double date "year 36 = year 1".

[23] Rathbone (1986) 103, mentions a minimum of 10 days (used in our table above) to a maximum of 30 days for a message to travel from the Arsinoite nome to the Theban area. The news of the death of Ptolemy VIII took at least 25 days to reach the Theban area: Bennett (2011) 120 n. 106. The possible use of fire signals for communication (cf. Van 't Dack [1962] 341) did not imply that messages about dynastic events rapidly reached every place of the Egyptian interior.

[24] Lanciers (1988) 427-428, suggested that the day and month in the inscription were added at a time when the double date "year 36 = year 1" was no longer in use. This hypothesis was rejected by Chauveau (1990) 145 with n. 24, who considered that the stela might have come from Upper Egypt and not from the Fayum, but as he later acknowledged, this does not offer a solution in the light of the graffiti from Dra' Abu el-Naga' (document no. 7): Chauveau (1991) 132.

[25] Bennett (2002) 144-145; his proposal is not discussed by Grzybek (2017) 96-97, or Werner (2019) 20-21, who simply maintain the previously accepted date.

In my opinion, we should distinguish between an "official" variant of the double date "year 36 = year 1" which appears on coins and the "unofficial" usage attested in private documents. If we accept Mørkholm's conclusion that coins with the double date were followed by coins dated by year 36 only, it is difficult to accept that the date refers to the co-regency of Philometor and his son: there is no obvious reason why this co-regency would have ended at a time when Philometor was still alive and campaigning in Syria. A more likely explanation may be that the date on the coins refers to an ephemeral kingship of Ptolemy VI over Syria. The unofficial double dates, both of the type "year 36 = year 1" and "year 36 = year 25", seem rather to reflect the confusion of individuals in the Egyptian interior about the development of the situation in Alexandria[26].

I do not believe that the double date "year 36 = year 1" is related to a co-regency of Philometor's youngest son[27]. In 2017, so before the publication of P.Trier II 15, Grzybek argued that the double date pointed to a co-regency of Cleopatra II (who would have continued the counting of her husband's regnal years) with her youngest son[28]. He assumes that – before the official reconciliation between Ptolemy VIII and his sister – Cleopatra II and her son were recognised as rulers in Middle Egypt (document no. 4) and the Fayum (document no. 9). Several objections can be made to this hypothesis[29]. First, Grzybek does not explain why coins with the double date are followed by coins of the year 36: if the double date would refer to a co-regency of Cleopatra II and her son after Philometor's death, one would expect the opposite. Moreover, his theory supposes that between the death of Philometor and the return of Euergetes II Cleopatra II had, for a longer period, power over the royal mint in Alexandria. The fact that Ptolemy VIII had certainly returned to Egypt already at the beginning of July 145 BC and that an important production of Alexandrian coins with his year 25 is attested[30], makes this improbable. Also, if we accept on the basis of document no. 9 that Cleopatra II and her son were recognised as rulers in the Fayum, why then is the year 25 of Ptolemy VIII already mentioned at an earlier date in document no. 8 (and perhaps also no. 10) from the same area? In my opinion, Grzybek's theory does not offer a coherent and convincing explanation for our sources[31].

The more precise determination of the date of Ptolemy VIII's return to Egypt unfortunately does not provide any direct information on the exact circumstances of his accession to the throne. However, since the period in which the assumption of power must have taken place is even shorter than previously thought, Justin's account that Ptolemy VIII received the throne *sine certamine* (XXXVIII 8) is certainly to be preferred over Josephus' story that the Jewish general Onias waged war against him on

[26] Chauveau (1991) 132 with n. 6, rightly observes that double dates equating the last year of the former ruler and the first year of the new king are usually retrospective, but he does not exclude that they could be contemporary. For possible cases of double dates reflecting a similar uncertainty during the civil war between Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II, see Lanciers (2020a) 31-32, 32-33, and during the war between Ptolemy IX and X, see Samuel (1965). The theory of Huß (2001) 588 n. 409 (*in fine*): "… daß die Gleichung 36 = 1 auf die kurze Zeitspanne zwischen dem Tod Ptolemaios' VI. und dem Regierungsantritt Ptolemaios' VII. Euergetes' II. zu beziehen ist", does not explain all three cases discussed above.

[27] And certainly not that Philometor's youngest son would have ruled alone for a (very) short period, as is assumed by Mavrojannis (2016) 148 n. 75. His theory is solely based on his very questionable supplement - "on the grounds of historical probability" - for l. 2 of P.Oxy. XIX 2222 fr. A (TM 63166), a very fragmentarily preserved list of Ptolemaic kings: [Πτολεμ]αῖος νεώτερος υἱὸ[ς Πτολεμαίου Φιλομήτορος ἐβίωσεν ἔτη θ, ἐβασίλευσεν ἡμέρας ι].

[28] Grzybek (2017) 102-107. Cf. Sewell-Lasater (2020) 273 n. 129: "… he may have ruled for a very short time as co-ruler in name only, with Kleopatra II being the dominant partner". The opinion of Otto-Bengtson (1938) 28, that a joint reign of Ptolemy VIII, Cleopatra II and her son was established is still accepted in more recent scholarship: see for instance Lampela (1998) 197; Eldamaty (2011) 33.

[29] Grzybek's theory was already met with scepticism by Pfeiffer (2018).

[30] Mørkholm (1975) 10; Cuenod-Olivier (2020) 227-228.

[31] See also below p. xxx for Grzybek's theory that the prince even became sole ruler of Cyrene after the alleged co-regency with his mother.

behalf of Cleopatra II (*Contra Apionem* II 51-52). Moreover, the well-worn idea that Ptolemy VIII did not travel directly from Cyrene to Alexandria[32], but first to Cyprus and then to Pelousion, where he would have met his brother's troops withdrawing from Syria, is further weakened: there does not seem to have been enough time for such journeys[33].

The birth of Ptolemy Memphites and the Egyptian coronation of Ptolemy VIII

If the double date "year 36 = year 1" is not related to a co-regency of Philometor's youngest son, we must reconsider the evidence relating to this prince. Although both literary and documentary sources mention a second son of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II[34], a younger brother of Ptolemy Eupator, scholars such as Chauveau and Huß initially doubted his existence or at least the fact that he was still alive when Ptolemy VIII returned to Egypt in 145 BC[35]. The situation changed after 1997, when P.Köln VIII 350 (TM 41541) was published by Maresch. Lines 1-5 of this document, which according to the editor was written in year 27 of Ptolemy VIII (144/3 BC), were read as follows:

βασ[ιλευόντων Πτολεμαίου] κ̣α̣ὶ Κ̣λ̣ε̣[οπά]τ̣[ρας τ]ῶ̣ν Π̣τ̣ο̣-
λεμ̣[αίου καὶ Κ]λ̣ε̣ο̣π̣ά̣τ̣ρ̣α̣ς θ̣ε̣ῶ̣ν ⟦Ἐπιφανῶν⟧ ἔ̣τ̣ο̣υ̣ς
ε̣.[.....κ]α̣ὶ ε̣ἰκ̣ο̣σ̣τ̣[οῦ] ἐ̣φ̣᾽ ἱ̣ε̣ρέ̣ως Π̣τ̣ο̣λ̣ε̣μ̣α̣ίου
τ̣.[.].....[...] - ca.11 - [..]..... Κ̣λ̣ε̣ο̣-
πάτρ̣α̣ς θ̣[εᾶ]ς Εὐ̣ε̣ρ̣γ̣έ̣[τιδος]

In his commentary on ll. 3-5 Maresch remarked: "Nach den Spuren mehr erahnen als lesen läßt sich τ̣ο̣[ῦ] γ̣ε̣ν̣ο̣μ̣[ένου ἐκ] Π̣τ̣ολε[μαίου] θ̣ε̣ο̣ῦ̣ Φ̣ι̣λ̣ο̣μ̣ή̣[τορο]ς καὶ Κ̣λ̣ε̣ο̣|πάτρ̣α̣ς θ̣[εᾶ]ς Εὐ̣ε̣ρ̣γ̣έ̣[τιδος]. Danach muß Kleopatra oder ihr Sohn noch weiter beschrieben worden sein". Essential here is the reading θ̣[εᾶ]ς: if we accept the *sigma*[36], the eponymous priest would be the son of Cleopatra II and a king who was apparently not Ptolemy VIII, otherwise one would expect the cult title θεῶν Εὐεργετῶν[37]; the only alternative then is Ptolemy VI. The publication of P.Horak 29 (TM 48161) in 2004 has further complicated the matter, since the name of the priest of Alexander and the deified Ptolemies in l. 2 is lost in a lacuna, but was apparently different from that in P.Köln VIII 350 (see further below). Since, in contrast to P.Köln VIII 350, the 27th year is clearly preserved in P.Horak 29, McGing doubted that the

[32] See Huß (2001) 599 n. 12, for the references.
[33] See already Lanciers (1988) 424-426.
[34] The literary sources are discussed below pp. xxx. Indications that could place his birth around 158/7 BC are inconclusive (see Bielman Sánchez-Lenzo [2015] 165-167; cf. Huß [2002] 40 n. 3), but the fact that Ptolemy Eupator is called *pȝ šr ʿȝ* ("the eldest son") in P.Ryl.dem. 16 (= TM 309) of 5 April 152 BC indicates that a younger brother was born before that date (Chauveau's doubt [2000] 157 n. 88, that the expression really points to an elder son seems unfounded in the light of the other evidence). In P.Gen. III 130 l. 2 (TM 43087) the element καὶ Π̣τ̣ο̣λ̣ε̣μ̣α̣ίου τ̣ο̣ῦ̣ [πρεσβυτέρου υἱοῦ αὐτῶν] is restored; Huß [2001] 576 n. 307, initially rejected this supplement (followed in BL XII 75), but see now Huß (2002) 40 n. 3, where also the other testimonies concerning the prince are discussed. Mitford (1961) 23 no. 59 (cf. Bielman Sánchez-Lenzo [2015] 61 n. 58, 86 n. 51, 170 n. 57), also identified the younger brother of Ptolemy Eupator in an inscription from Paphos, which he dated to the period between 150-145 BC, but the restoration and interpretation of this badly damaged text is highly uncertain: Mitford (1938) 115, originally and "quite tentatively" identified the prince as Eupator and not as the youngest son. In another inscription from Paphos the restoration of the prince's name is even more hypothetical: Mitford (1961) 22 no. 55 l. 3.
[35] Chauveau (1990) 156-165; Huß (2001) 597 with n. 2.
[36] P.Köln VIII, 162 commentary on ll. 3-5: "In Z. 5 wohl θ̣[εᾶ]ς und nicht θ̣[εῶ]ν". Chauveau (2000) 257 n. 3, is too categorical: "l'impossibilité de lire θ̣[εῶ]ν au lieu de θ̣[εᾶ]ς exclut Évergète II comme père du personnage".
[37] As far as I know, P. Köln XVI 649 l. 7 (TM 754292) of 142 BC, is the only text in which Cleopatra II is not included with Ptolemy VIII in the pair of the Theoi Euergetai, but is mentioned separately as Thea Euergetis; for a discussion of another supposed example (cf. Nadig [2007] 256 with n. 3), see now Lanciers (2019) 196-197.

Cologne document could date from the same year[38]. Despite these doubts and Maresch's caution[39], most scholars have accepted on the basis of P.Köln VIII 350 that a surviving son of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II was eponymous priest in 144/3 BC[40].

A different interpretation of P.Köln VIII 350 was proposed by Grzybek in 2017[41]. Since he finds Maresch's reading of *sigma* questionable and the proposed reconstruction of l. 4 too long, he proposes the following reading for ll. 3-5:

ἐφ' ἱερέως Πτολ̣εμαίου
τ[οῦ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου καὶ βασιλίσσης] Κλεο-
πάτρας Θ[εῶ]ν Εὐεργε[τῶν]

Consequently, he identifies the eponymous priest not as the son of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II, but as Ptolemy Memphites, the newborn son of Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II. Two problems arise here: McGing's reservations about dating the document in the 27th year are not discussed, and the new reading also is not based on clearly identifiable letter traces. Fortunately, these problems can now be overcome by using information which was not known to Grzybek or ignored by him.

To determine the date of P.Köln VIII 350, the names of the eponymous priestesses can be used: the *athlophoros* was a daughter of Nikomachos (ll. 9-11) and the *kanephoros* was a daughter of Demetrios (ll. 11-12). In P.Horak 29 l. 5, Heliodora daughter of Demetrios is *kanephoros*[42], which corresponds to the preserved patronymic in P.Köln VIII 350. Already in 2008 Lippert mentioned that an unpublished demotic papyrus from year 27 – P.Tebt.Frag. 14,082 – contains a complete set of eponymous priests from that year and gives the additional information that the *athlophoros* was Nanno (?) daughter of Nikomachos; so there can be no doubt that the three papyri belong to the same year, *i.e.*, the 27th year of Ptolemy VIII[43]. It is clear, however, that P.Horak 29 and P.Köln VIII 350 did not contain the name of the same priest of Alexander and the deified Ptolemies. The first three lines of P.Horak 29 were supplemented as follows:

βασιλευό̣[ν]τ̣ω̣ν̣ Πτ[ολεμ]α̣ίου καὶ Κλεοπάτρ̣α̣ς [τῆς ἀδελφῆς θεῶν Εὐεργετῶν τῶν ἐκ Πτολεμαίου καὶ Κλεοπάτρας]
θεῶν Ἐ̣π̣ι̣φ̣α̣νῶν ἐ̣[τους] ἑ̣βδόμου καὶ [εἰ]κ̣ο̣[στ]ο̣ῦ̣ [ἐφ' ἱερέως -ca.? - Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ]
[θεῶν] Σ̣ω̣τήρων κ[αὶ θε]ῶν Ἀδελφῶν κ̣αὶ θεῶ̣ν̣ [Εὐεργετῶν καὶ θεῶν Φιλοπατόρων καὶ θεῶν Ἐπιφανῶν καὶ θεοῦ]

If we accept the proposed supplement, line 1 contains 86 and line 3 81 letters. In line 2, where we now have 58 letters, there seems to be room for about 20-25 letters for the name (and patronymic) of the eponymous priest. Both Maresch's and Grzybek's suggestions for P.Köln VIII 350 are too long to supplement here[44]. It therefore seems almost certain that in P.Horak 29 the eponymous priest was not a royal prince: a sequence of a name of about 10 letters + 3 letters for τοῦ + about 10 letters for the patronymic would completely fill the gap. The conclusion is then inevitable that the eponymous priest

[38] P.Horak I, 151 commentary on l. 2.

[39] P.Köln VIII, 156: "Welcher Ptolemaios in unserem Papyrus Alexanderpriester war, läßt sich – zumal Lesung und Datierung nicht sicher sind – nicht entscheiden. Es bleibt zu hoffen, daß neue Papyri in dieser Frage Klärung bringen".

[40] Chauveau (2000) 257-258; Huß (2002) 40-41; Bennett (2001-2013) s.v. Ptolemy n. 1; Carrez-Maratray (2002) 65 n. 21; Nadig (2007) 37 n. 85; Bielman Sánchez-Lenzo (2015) 176; Cuenod-Olivier (2020) 205 with n. 13; Cuenod (2020) 59.

[41] Grzybek (2017) 109-111.

[42] Clarysse – Van der Veken (1983) 32-33 no. 27. In accordance with Bell's Law she is attested as *athlophoros* in the preceding 26th year: P.Phrur.Diosk. 18 ll. 18-19 (TM 44733) and P.Suzuki 44 (TM 704949).

[43] Lippert (2008) 168.

[44] See McGing, P.Horak I, 151 commentary on l. 2, who also notes that the abbreviated form Πτολεμαίου τοῦ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου is improbable.

changed between 12 July 143 BC, the date of P.Horak 29, and 28 August 143 BC, when P.Köln VIII 350 was written[45].

The question remains, however, which prince was mentioned in P.Köln VIII 350: the son of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II or Ptolemy Memphites? Here, too, P.Tebt.Frag. 14,082 provides the answer. Sandra Lippert gave me the following information about this text: "[E]ven though the dating protocol of P.Tebt.frag. 14,082 is a bit damaged, it does definitely support Grzybek's idea of the prince Ptolemy in question being Ptolemy Memphites, because the priest of Alexander is called *Ptlwmys pȝ /šr pȝ šr pr-ʿȝ Ptlw]/[mys ỉrm Qlwp]/t]rȝ.t nȝ nṯr.w mnḫ.w* "Ptolemy the son, the son of king Ptol[emy and Kleop]atra, the beneficent gods" - there is no doubt possible about the plural[46], so the father is Ptolemy VIII Euergetes and not Ptolemy VI Philometor"[47]. She further mentions: "The exact date of P.Tebt.Frag. 14,082 is not clear, the day is lost and the month damaged, it could be 4th month of *peret* = Pharmouthi or 4th month of *shemu* = Mesore". This means that the document was either written between 26 April and 25 May or between 24 August and 22 September 143 BC. I think the latter date is preferable, given the change of the eponymous priest between 12 July and 28 August 143 BC.

From P.Köln VIII 350 it then appears that 28 August 143 BC is the *terminus ante quem* for the birth of the son of Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II. Is it allowed to consider 12 July of the same year (P.Horak 29) as *terminus post quem*? Diodorus relates the following about the birth of the prince: "While Ptolemy was being enthroned in his palace at Memphis in accordance with Egyptian custom, Cleopatra bore the king a son. Exceedingly pleased, he surnamed the child Memphites, after the city in which he was performing sacrifice when the child was born"[48]. Although some scholars prefer to date Memphites' birth in 144 BC[49], others leave open the possibility that it happened in 144 or 143 BC[50]. In my opinion, a date in the year 143 BC is preferable. I think that the birth of Euergetes' son and heir to the throne[51] was so important to the king that he immediately appointed the newborn prince as eponymous priest[52]. It is not necessary to assume that the incumbent priest died[53]; he was probably just dismissed. I am therefore inclined to consider the beginning of July 143 BC indeed as *terminus post quem* for the birth, taking into account that it could take some time for a message from Memphis to reach the Lycopolite nome, the place of origin of P.Horak 29. If we trust the story of Diodorus[54], we can probably place the Egyptian coronation of Ptolemy VIII in the last months of the 27th year, *i.e.,*

[45] As far as I can see, we have no other examples of a change of eponymous priest within the same year: cf. McGing, P. Horak I, 151 commentary on l. 2.

[46] Theoi Euergetai = *nȝ nṯr.w mnḫ.w.*

[47] E-mail of 4 October 2018 (cf. Lanciers [2020a] 24-25).

[48] Diod. XXXIII 13 (translation F.R. Walton, Loeb edition).

[49] Otto (1936) 13; Mooren (1988) 436; Ogden (1999) 87; Hölbl (2001) 195; Carrez-Maratray (2002) 62; Grzybek (2017) 115.

[50] Otto-Bengtson (1938) 30; Huß (2001) 604; Huß (2002) 41; Chauveau (2002) 258 n. 9; Nadig (2007) 10; Sewell-Lasater (2020) 279. Bennett (2001-2013) s.v. Ptolemy Memphites, places his birth between late 144 and mid 142 BC, and Bielman Sánchez-Lenzo (2015) 186, also keep open the possibility that he was born in 142 BC.

[51] How long he remained the preferred heir to the throne is uncertain: Lanciers (2020a) 24-26; in any case, he was murdered by his father around 130/129 BC: Lanciers (2020a) 45-47.

[52] So also Grzybek (2017) 110. That a baby could become an eponymous priest should not surprise, since Ptolemy V, when he was a baby, was declared co-regent of his father: see P. BM Andrews 18 (TM 47617), a document which is to be dated before 4 February 209 BC (date of the receipt). Another example where a very young princess, Cleopatra Thea, receives the title of queen (SB I 3941 = CPI 133 = TM 44047) may be due to a mistake: see Bielman Sánchez-Lenzo (2015) 163-164.

[53] Cf. P.Horak I, 151 commentary on l. 2: "although the convenience of such a coincidence makes it suspect, there is nothing inherently implausible in a priest dying and being replaced".

[54] Stadler (2012) 70, notes that Diodorus is wrong to have the Egyptian coronation of Ptolemy VIII take place in the royal palace at Memphis and not in the temple of Ptah, but this is insufficient ground to doubt the rest of his story.

somewhere between the beginning of July and the end of September 143 BC. After all, we do not know the exact sequence of events: some scholars have suggested that the birth of the prince – creating a "divine" triad with king, queen, and heir - was in fact the immediate cause for organising the coronation ceremony[55].

The death of the youngest son of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II and the marriage of Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II

In Justin XXXVIII 8.3-4 the death of the prince is connected with the wedding day of Cleopatra II and Ptolemy VIII: *Laetus igitur hoc solo Ptolomeus quod sine certamine fraternum regnum recepisset, in quod subornari et a matre Cleopatra et fauore principum fratris filium cognouerat, ceterum infestus omnibus, statim ubi Alexandriam ingressus est, fautores pueri trucidari iussit. Ipsum quoque die nuptiarum, quibus matrem eius in matrimonium recipiebat, inter apparatus epularum et sollemnia religionum in conplexu matris interficit atque ita torum sororis caede filii eius cruentus ascendit*"[56]. The alleged appearance of Philometor's son as eponymous priest on 28 August 143 BC (P.Köln VIII 350) led to the rejection of Justin's story, since it is generally assumed that the marriage took place before that date. Chauveau supposed that the prince was killed either after the birth of Ptolemy Memphites or at the time of the marriage of Ptolemy VIII with his niece Cleopatra III: according to him Justin would have been mistaken between the two marriages[57]. Huß, on the other hand, rejects the information of Justin XXXVIII 8.3-4 in favour of another passage of the epitomator. In XXXVIII 8.11-13 we find the following story: *Post discessum deinde legatorum (…) iam etiam peregrino populo inuisus cum filio, quem ex sorore susceperat, et cum uxore, matris paelice, metu insidiarum tacitus in exilium proficiscitur, contractoque mercennario exercitu, bellum sorori pariter ac patriae infert. Arcessitum deinde maximum a Cyrenis filium, ne eum Alexandrini contra se regem crearent, interficit. Tunc populus statuas eius et imagines detrahit. Quod factum studio sororis existimans filium, quem ex ea susceperat, interficit, corpusque in membra diuisum et in cista conpositum, matri die natalis eius inter epulas offerri curat*[58]. The events described here must be placed in the context of the civil war between Ptolemy VIII

[55] Whitehorne (1994) 109; Ogden (1999) 87-88; Nadig (2007) 167; Thompson (2012) 141.

[56] "Ptolemy, rejoiced at having recovered his brother's throne without a struggle (for which he knew that his brother's son was intended, both by his mother Cleopatra and the inclination of the nobles), but being incensed at all that had opposed his interests, ordered as soon as he entered Alexandria, the partisans of the young prince to be put to death. He also killed the youth himself on the day of his nuptials (when he took his mother to wife), amidst the splendour of feasts, the ceremonies of religion, and in the very embrace of his parent, and thus went to the couch of his sister stained with the blood of her child" (translation Rev. J.S. Watson). The story that Ptolemy VIII killed his young nephew (and his own son Ptolemy Memphites) is also found in Orosius, Adversum Paganos V 10,7, albeit without a precise chronological indication: … *filium suum, quem ex sorore susceperat, nec non et filium fratris occidit*; for a discussion of this passage, see Heinen (1997) 453-454. Josephus *Contra Apionem* 51, erroneously speaks of "children of the king" (*filios regis*) who were still alive at the time of Philometor's death.

[57] Chauveau (2000) 259; cf. Chauveau (1990) 164-165. In my opinion, however, there is nothing in Justin's account that points to such a mistake, since he is very clear about the identity of the bride: *Ipsum quoque die nuptiarum, quibus matrem eius in matrimonium recipiebat … interficit* (XXXVIII 8.4). Cuenod-Olivier (2020) 224 and Cuenod (2020) 62-63, also assume that the prince was still alive at the time of the marriage of Ptolemy VIII and his niece Cleopatra III, as they regard this ceremony as a deliberate manoeuvre to avoid a marriage between Cleopatra III and her brother.

[58] "After the departure of the commissioners …, finding that he had become hateful even to the foreigners whom he had invited, he withdrew secretly, for fear of plots against his life, into voluntary exile, accompanied by a son that he had by his sister, and by his wife, her mother's rival, and, having collected an army of mercenaries, made war at once upon his sister and his country. He next sent for his eldest son from Cyrene, and put him to death, when the people began to pull downs his statues and images, and he, imagining that this was done to please his sister, killed the son that he had by her, and contrived to have the body, divided into portions and arranged in a chest, presented to the mother at a feast on his birth-day" (translation Rev. J.S. Watson).

and Cleopatra II. "The son he had by his sister" can clearly be identified as Ptolemy Memphites, who was probably killed in 130/129 BC[59]. But who is the *maximus filius* who resided in Cyrene? In earlier studies, this person was also identified as Ptolemy Memphites[60]. However, according to Huß, the "eldest son" must have been the son of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra, who in his opinion was not killed early in the reign of Ptolemy VIII, but during the civil war[61]. His view was accepted by several scholars[62], although the other ancient authors only speak of the murder of Memphites during the civil war[63].

More recently Grzybek – based on his now confirmed identification of the eponymous priest in P. Köln VIII 350 as Ptolemy Memphites – has rightly rehabilitated the story of Justin XXXVIII 8.3-4 and accepted that Philometor's youngest son was murdered at the beginning of the reign of his mother and Ptolemy VIII[64]. In my opinion, however, his reconstruction is distorted by his acceptance of Huß' view that Justin XXXVIII 8.12 (*Arcessitum deinde maximum a Cyrenis filium, ne eum Alexandrini contra se regem crearent, interficit*) indeed refers to the son of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II. Grzybek gives no explanation why Justin would have spoken first of Ptolemy Memphites (8.11), then of the son of Ptolemaios VI (8.12) and then again of Ptolemy Memphites (8.13). Furthermore, the word *deinde* leaves little doubt that XXXIII 8.12 must be dated later than 8.11, where the exile of Ptolemy VIII during the civil war with his sister Cleopatra II is mentioned; this episode can therefore not be dated to the early years of Euergetes' reign. The fact that Orosius mentions the murders of Memphites in 130/29 and of the son of Ptolemy VI in close connection (Adv. Pagan. V 10.7: *filium suum, quem ex sorore susceperat, nec non et filium fratris occidit*) does not prove that Livy, the probable common source of Trogus Pompeius / Justin and Orosius, referred retrospectively to the death of the son of Ptolemy VI in the context of his discussion of the murder of Ptolemy Memphites in 130/29 BC. As Heinen rightly pointed out, Orosius only gives a brief overview of the "criminal record" of Ptolemy VIII, in which the two murders are not arranged chronologically but according to the severity of the crime, first the murder of his own son and then the murder of his nephew[65]. For these reasons, I consider Grzybek's hypothesis that Ptolemy VI's son briefly became king of Cyrene in 145 BC – a view solely based on Justin's *a Cyrenis* - far-fetched and highly improbable[66]. I am convinced that credence must be given to the story that Philometor's son was murdered during the period of his mother's marriage to Ptolemy VIII[67], without postulating a short-lived reign of the prince over Cyrene.

Is it possible to determine the date of the marriage? Ptolemy VIII's return to Egypt and his accession to the throne between 22 June and 6/7 July 145 BC provides the *terminus post quem*. If we further make the assumption that the conception of Ptolemy Memphites may be placed after the marriage, December 144 BC must be considered as *terminus ante quem* (*i.e.*, 9 months before the

[59] For a discussion of the date, see Lanciers (2020a) 45-47.
[60] Otto-Bengtson (1938) 59 n. 1; Volkmann (1959) 1730.
[61] Huß (2002) 41-42.
[62] Bennett (2001-2013) s.v. Ptolemy n. 5; Bielman Sánchez-Lenzo (2015) 188 with n. 55; Bielman (2017) 95-96; cf. Nadig (2007) 9, 177.
[63] Diod. XXXIV-XXXV 14; Val. Max. IX 2 ext. 5; Liv. Perioch. LIX.
[64] Grzybek (2017) 105-107; on p. 106 and 111 he suggests the date 144/143 BC for the murder (cf. p. 107 n. 226: after 28 September 145 BC = the beginning of year 26). He dissociates the date of the wedding (p. 110: "gewiss noch im Spätsommer, spätestens zu Herbstbeginn 145") and the murder, because he accepts that the prince became ruler of Cyrene after the start of year 26: see below p. xxx.
[65] Heinen (1997) 453-454.
[66] Grzybek (2017) 107 n. 226, supplements the beginning of P.Oxy. XIX 2222 fr. A (TM 63166) as follows: [Πτολεμαῖος Πτολεμαίου υἱὸς ἐβασίλευσε ἔτηι α σὺν Κλεο-] | [πάτραι] Φιλομήτορι, ἔτηι β μ[όνος ἐν Κυρήνηι …]; he concludes that the son of Ptolemy VI first ruled Egypt together with his mother and then became sole ruler in Cyrene (after 28 September 145 BC). Needless to say, there is no convincing ground for this restoration.
[67] The reliability of Justin as a historical source was defended by Heinen (1997) 451-453, who points out that Trogus Pompeius may have used the work of Poseidonios of Apameia: see Malitz (1983) 244 with n. 32; Richter (1987) 191-192.

attestation of the prince as eponymous priest). Usually the fact that a royal couple is married is deduced from the occurrence of a common cult title[68]. P.Phrur.Diosk. 18 (TM 44733) of 14 November 145 BC (year 26, 18 Phaophi) is now the earliest text in which Ptolemy VIII and his sister bear the title Theoi Euergetai (l. 4, 18), while in P.Cair. dem. II 30605 l. 2 (TM 2774), a document of 20 September 145 BC, the last couple mentioned in the title of the Alexander-priest are still the Theoi Philometores. One may therefore conclude that the marriage and – if we accept the story of Justin XXXVIII 8.3-4 – also the death of the young prince took place between 20 September and 14 November 145 BC[69]. And even if the connection between the two events were less direct than Justin suggests, it is in any case unlikely that Ptolemy VIII would have left Philometor's son alive after the birth of his own son Memphites in July-August 143 BC, who was clearly immediately regarded as successor to the throne.

To check the validity of this statement, we should examine whether there is evidence that the son of Philometor lived after 145 BC (or 143 BC). I. Thèbes à Syène 303 (TM 6329, Sehel), 315 (TM 88945, Philae) and 316 (TM 88946, Philae) are dedications to or in the name of Ptolemy VIII, his "sister" Cleopatra II and the "children"[70]. The element "sister" makes it clear that these inscriptions were erected at a time when Ptolemy VIII was married to his "sister" Cleopatra II and not yet to his "wife" Cleopatra III, *i.e.* in the years 145-141/0 BC. There is, however, no convincing reason to believe that the son of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II was one of these children[71].

Bennett, who uses P.Köln VIII 350 as proof that the son of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II was still alive in 143 BC, recognises the prince in a relief in the temple of Edfu, where the child accompanying the royal couple is called "the living *ka* of the king … the eldest royal son, beloved of king Ptolemy may he live forever, beloved of Ptah"[72]. It is, however, much more likely that the prince in this scene on the western outer wall of the naos and the corresponding relief on the eastern outer wall is Ptolemy Memphites or Ptolemy IX Soter II[73].

More complicated is the dating and interpretation of the attempted coup of Galaistes, which is known from two isolated fragments of Diodorus. Diodorus (XXXIII 20) relates how Galaistes, the son of the former Athamanian king Amynandros, became the commander of the Egyptian army during the 7th Syrian War. After Philometor's death, he was accused of treason and Ptolemy VIII deprived him of his gift estate (*dôrea*). Galaistes left for Greece, where he welcomed other exiles from Egypt. Diodorus continues: φήσας δὲ ἐν παρακαταθήκῃ τὸν βασιλέα Πτολεμαῖον τὸν Φιλομήτορα δεδωκέναι παιδίον αὐτῷ τρέφειν ἐκ τῆς Κλεοπάτρας ἐπὶ βασιλείᾳ, καὶ τούτῳ διάδημα περιθείς, καὶ συναγωνιστὰς ἔχων

[68] There are, however, exceptions to this rule. Cleopatra I was apparently not immediately deified after her marriage to Ptolemy V: Lanciers (2014) 381-383.

[69] For a detailed discussion, see Bielman Sánchez-Lenzo (2015) 192-195. The year 145 BC is now usually considered the year of marriage: Mooren (1988) 435-436; Minas (2000) 145; P.Horak I, 150 (McGing); Grzybek (2017) 110.

[70] In the inscription Mitford (1961) 26 no. 69 l. 6, the reference to "children" is restored.

[71] For an overview of possible explanations for the use of the plural, see Bielman Sánchez-Lenzo (2015) 201-203. Carrez-Maratray (2002) 65 with n. 21, and Bielman Sánchez-Lenzo (2015) 202 with n. 61, consider the possibility that Philometor's son is one of the children, but this is based on the prince's alleged appearance in P. Köln VIII 350 and Huß' untenable theory that the prince would not have murdered until around 130 BC. Bielman Sánchez-Lenzo (2015) 316, suggest that the son of the Theoi Philometores mentioned in I.Philae 12a (TM 53478), may have been the youngest son of the couple, but – as they themselves acknowledge - this is based on the rather dubious reconstruction of the inscription by Carrez-Maratray (2006).

[72] Bennett (2001-2013) s.v. Ptolemy n. 5.

[73] For discussions of the reliefs, see Cauville – Devauchelle (1984) 51-52 (Ptolemy Memphites in both reliefs); Minas-Nerpel (2014) 150-155 (probably Ptolemy IX Soter II in both reliefs); Bielman Sánchez-Lenzo (2015) 230-236 (Ptolemy Memphites in both scenes); Grzybek (2017) 112-123 (Ptolemy Memphites and Ptolemy IX Soter II).

πολλοὺς φυγάδας, παρεσκευάζετο κατάγειν ἐπὶ τὴν πατρῴαν βασιλείαν τὸν παῖδα[74]. Another fragment, XXXIII 22, refers to the general Hierax who, when Ptolemy VIII's finances were low and the soldiers were inclined to defect to Galaistes, paid them from his own funds.

The veracity of at least part of this story, namely the fact that Galaistes and other courtiers fell into disfavour and were forced into exile, is confirmed by other sources. P.Köln V 223 ll. 3-5 (TM 3184) refers to the gift estate of Galaistes (written here Galestes) and its possible confiscation in year 25 of Ptolemy VIII (cf. l. 8)[75]. Apparently there was also a purge of the college of eponymous priests at the beginning of Euergetes' 26th year, with confidants of Ptolemy VI being replaced with supporters of his brother[76]. Perhaps the replacement of Aristarchus of Samothrace as librarian of the Alexandrian library was also related to the return of Ptolemy VIII to Egypt[77]. Based *inter alia* on P.Köln V 223, Heinen suggested that the episodes narrated by Diodorus may have taken place shortly after the accession to the throne of Ptolemy VIII in the early summer 145 BC[78]. If this assumption is correct, it is quite possible that the son mentioned by Diodorus is indeed the youngest son of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II.

To bring clarity to this matter, we should try to date both fragments of Diodorus, which come from the anthologies compiled in the 10th century for Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus. It has been established that in each of these anthologies the excerpts appear in proper chronological sequence[79]. In the *Excerpta de insidiis* the fragment regarding the insurrection of Galaistes (Fr. 41; De Boor [1905] 205) is found before the story of the murder of the Lusitanian leader Viriathus, which was instigated by Q. Servilius Caepio, Roman consul in 140 and proconsul in 139 BC (Fr. 42, De Boor [1905] 205-206). The year 140/139 BC is therefore the likely *terminus ad quem* for the start of Galaistes' attempted coup[80]. The *terminus post quem* is provided by Diod. XXXIII 4a (Fr. 39, De Boor [1905] 204-205), where the secession of Diodotos Tryphon against the Seleucid king Demetrios II Nikator is related, an event from the years 145-144 BC[81]. The story of Galaistes' revolt can thus only be broadly dated between 145-144 and 140-139 BC. In the *Excerpta de virtutibus e vitiis*, however, the funeral of Viriathus (Fr. 321; Büttner-Wobst [1906] 301) precedes the story of Hierax, who prevented the defection of Ptolemy VIII's troops to Galaistes (Fr. 322. Büttner-Wobst [1906] 301). Unless one assumes that the revolt of Galaistes stretched over several years[82] or that Diodorus in XXXIII 22 referred retroactively to earlier

[74] "Claiming that King Ptolemy Philometor had entrusted to him a son by Cleopatra to be reared as heir to the kingdom, he placed a diadem on the boy's head, and with a number of exiles as partisans of the cause made ready to restore him to his father's kingdom" (translation F.R. Walton, Loeb edition).

[75] For the interpretation of this document, see Criscuolo (1986), who concludes that the confiscation probably happened in the first weeks of Euergetes' reign. That P.Köln V 223 itself can be dated to year 26 of Ptolemy VIII is, however, uncertain: see Lanciers (2020b) 114-115.

[76] The *athlophoros* of year 36 = year 25 did not become *kanephoros* in year 26 and the priestess of Arsinoe III was also replaced: Duttenhöfer (1996) 307-309.

[77] He probably died in Cyprus in 144 BC, but it is not certain that he was in exile there: Schironi (2018) 3-6. Several ancient authors mention the violence of Ptolemy VIII against the Alexandrian population: see Huß (2001) 603 with n. 45.

[78] Heinen (1997) 455; he is followed by Bennett (2001-2013) s.v. Ptolemy Memphites n. 9. Before Heinen, Malitz (1983) 247 and 248, also dated Galaistes' attempted putsch before Euergetes' accession to the throne – placed by him in 144 BC – but neither Heinen nor Malitz provide an in-depth discussion of the chronological sequence of Diodorus' fragments.

[79] Astin (1959) 227 n. 12; Mattingly (1986) 492 n. 9.

[80] Since Diodorus used sources organised according to different calendar systems, synchronisation errors are possible. Astin (1959) 224, therefore concludes regarding the death of Viriathus: "… the earliest year under which Diodorus might have given his account is 141/0, with 140/39 more likely and 139/8 also possible". Astin's preferred date of 140/39 BC is accepted by Mattingly (1986) 492 with n. 11.

[81] Grainger (2010) 351-352; Chrubasik (2016) 135-137.

[82] While it is of course dangerous to use an *argumentum ex silentio*, it is nevertheless unlikely that a revolt against Ptolemy VIII that would have lasted between 145/4 and 140/39 BC would have left no traces in other sources. Astin (1959) 224, accepts a close chronological connection between the two fragments: "Clearly Diodorus must

deeds of Hierax[83], the attempted coup of the Athamanian must rather be placed in the years 140/39 BC, which is the traditional view[84].

While Heinen's proposal to place Galaistes' revolt in the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy VIII is thus rather unlikely, other suggestions to recognise the real son of Ptolemy VI in Diodorus' story – and not a fake throne pretender brought forward by Galaistes – also fail to convince. These theories are based on the erroneous assumption that the prince was an eponymous priest in 143 BC and thus must have been alive in that year. For this reason, Chauveau dates the Galaistes affair and the murder of Philometor's son at the time of the marriage of Ptolemy VIII and his niece Cleopatra III around 141/0 BC[85]. Bielman Sánchez and Lenzo, who accept the view of Huß that the prince was murdered during the civil war between Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II, propose a significantly later date for Galaistes' coup, in the years 135-132 BC[86], but this seems to be excluded by the position of the relevant passages of Diodorus' work in the *Excerpta*.

In my view, we do not have any indication that Philometor's youngest son was alive after 145 BC. We should therefor not dismiss Justin's story that he was murdered at the time of the marriage of his mother with her brother Ptolemy VIII.

Conclusion

The publication of P.Trier II 15 and the combined information of P.Köln VIII 350 and P.Tebt.frag. 14,082 confirm the reliability of Justin's account of the events after Ptolemy VIII's return to Egypt in 145 BC. The observation that the king issued a *prostagma* as early as 15 July 145 BC, only a few weeks after his return to Egypt, proves that the change of power did indeed take place *sine certamine*. The identification of the prince who was an eponymous priest in 143 BC as Ptolemy Memphites and not as the son of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II, removes a possible obstacle to dating the latter boy's murder to the time of his mother's marriage to Ptolemy VIII, as narrated by Justin. This, of course, this does not necessarily mean that every element in Justin's dramatic description of the events is true.

In the 27th year of Ptolemy VIII, the incumbent eponymous priest was replaced by Ptolemy Memphites, the newborn son of Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II. The birth of the heir to the throne took place in July-August 143 BC and the solemn coronation of Ptolemy VIII in Memphis was organised in the same period, since according to Diodorus both events were closely connected.

In my opinion, the traditionally proposed date of 140/39 BC for Galaistes' coup attempt should be maintained. This implies that the boy who was presented by Galaistes as a son of Ptolemy VI and the rightful heir to the throne was not the real son of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II, who had been murdered some years earlier.

The table below gives an overview of the events I discussed and the proposed dating:

Date	Event

have narrated the commencement of the revolt under one year and its failure under a subsequent year, probably the next".

[83] Mattingly (1986) 492, mentions the fact that Poseidonios, who must have been the source of Diodorus, "tended to reserve blocks of material until some critical point and then deploy them at length", but Diodorus XXXIII 22 clearly gives the impression that Hierax is introduced here for the first time.

[84] Otto-Bengtson (1938) 38; Volkmann (1959) col. 1728; P.Köln V, 205 (W. Schäfer); Huß (2001) 607; Nadig (2007) 11, 51, 168; Werner (2019) 32-33. Armoni-Maresch (2016) 322-324, also accept this date and connect P.Lips. II 124 ll. 37-47, where – according to their reading and interpretation - additional taxes for the *katoikoi hippeis* in year 31 (140-39 BC) are mentioned, with the suppression of Galaistes' revolt; however, this connection is rejected by Käppel (2021) 77-78.

[85] Chauveau (1990) 164-165 and (2002) 259; his dating is accepted by Hölbl (2001) 196, and Veïsse (2004) 48, 76, 123. Huß (2002) 42, also accepts that the throne pretender in Diodorus is the son of Philometor, but he does not propose a date for the Galaistes episode.

[86] Bielman Sánchez–Lenzo (2015) 187-189.

Probably June 145 BC	Death of Ptolemy VI after the battle of Oinoparas
22 June - 6/7 July 145 BC	Return of Ptolemy VIII to Egypt and recognition as king
15 July 145 BC	*Prostagma* of Ptolemy VIII
20 September - 14 November 145 BC	Marriage of Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II & murder of the son of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II
Early July – 28 August 143 BC	Birth of Ptolemy Memphites
July – September 143 BC	Egyptian coronation of Ptolemy VIII in Memphis
140/39 BC	Attempted coup of Galaistes

My reconstruction of the events shows that Ptolemy VIII in 145 BC did not want to take any risk of losing his regained kingship again. As long as Philometor's son was alive, the possibility existed that his mother's supporters would continue to put him forward as the rightful heir to the throne[87]. The king could only trust an heir who was of his own flesh and blood. Therefore, Philometor's son was murdered and Euergetes' own son, Ptolemy Memphites, was immediately granted an eponymous priesthood as a first step to a possible later co-regency and eventual kingship. Although the assassination of her son with Ptolemy VI was undoubtedly a heavy blow for Cleopatra II, she may have retained the hope for some time that the kingship would eventually fall to her son Ptolemy Memphites[88]. However, this situation changed when the king fathered two more children by his niece and second wife Cleopatra III. That Ptolemy VIII gradually began to prefer his younger children, the later Ptolemy IX and X, to his son by Cleopatra II, which is illustrated by the fact that both also received the honour of an eponymous priesthood, was in my opinion one of the reasons for the outbreak of the civil war between Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II in 132 BC, a conflict during which Ptolemy Memphites was also assassinated by his father[89].

Eddy Lanciers, Research Fellow KU Leuven, Research Unit Ancient History
eddy.lanciers@kuleuven.be

Bibliography

Ager (2005) = S. L. Ager, Familiarity Breeds: Incest and the Ptolemaic Dynasty, JHS 125 (2005), 1-34.
- (2006) = S. L. Ager, The Power of Excess: Royal Incest and the Ptolemaic Dynasty, Anthropologica 48 (2006), 165-186.
Armoni-Maresch (2016) = Ch. Armoni – K. Maresch, Zur Besteuerung der Katöken Ägyptens zur Mitte des 2. Jh. v.Chr.: P.Lips. II 124, ZPE 200 (2016), 321-328.
Astin (1959) = A.E. Astin, Diodorus and the Date of the Embassy to the East of Scipio Aemilianus, CPh 54 (1959) 221-227.
Bennett (2001-2013) = C. Bennett, s.v. Ptolemy VI (https:/www.trismegistos.org/calendar/bennett/

[87] In the same sense already Ager (2005) 6, and (2006) 169.
[88] Since they date the assassination of the son of Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II many years after the birth of Ptolemy Memphites, Bielman Sánchez-Lenzo (2015) 190, have a different view on the "compromise" Cleopatra II reached with Ptolemy VIII in the first years of their joint reign: "Il est certain qu'elle consenti à ce compromis parce qu'il avait pour objectif – à moyen ou à plus long terme – la préservation des droits sur le trône d'Egypte du fils qu'elle avait eu avec Ptolémée VI. Elle est probablement parvenue à garder en vie pendant plusieurs années ce fils, tout en mettant au monde un autre fils conçu avec Ptolémée VIII".
[89] See Lanciers (2020) 23-29.

ptolemies/Ptolemy_vi_fr.htm; s.v. Ptolemy (https:/www.trismegistos.org/calendar/bennett/Ptolemies/nios_ii_fr.htm); s.v. Ptolemy Memphites (https:/www.trismegistos.org/calendar/bennet/ptolemies/memphites_fr.htm).
- (2002) = C. Bennett, The Chronology of Berenice III, ZPE 139 (2002), 143-148.
- (2011) = C. Bennett, Alexandria and the Moon. An Investigation into the Lunar Macedonian Calendar of Ptolemaic Egypt (Studia Hellenistica 52), Leuven-Paris-Walpole, MA 2011.
Bielman Sánchez-Lenzo = A. Bielman Sánchez – G. Lenzo, Inventer le pouvoir féminin : Cléopâtre I et Cléopâtre II, reines d'Egypte au II^{e} s. av. J.-C. (Echo 12), Bern 2015.
Bielman (2017) = A. Bielman, Stéréotypes et réalités du pouvoir politique féminin : la guerre civile en Égypte entre 132 et 124 av. J.-C., EuGeStA 7 (2017), 84-114.
Büttner-Wobst (1906) = Th. Büttner-Wobst, Excerpta historica iussu Imp. Constantini Porphyrogeniti confecta. II.1. Excerpta de virtutibus e vitiis, Pars I, Berlin 1906.
Carrez-Maratray (2002) = J.-Y. Carrez-Maratray, L'éphitète Philometor et la réconciliation lagide de 124-116, RdE 53 (2002), 61-74.
- (2006) = J.-Y. Carrez-Maratray, *I. Philae* I 10 et 12 : encore la déesse Philométor, CE 81 (2006), 245-251.
Cauville-Devauchelle (1984) S. Cauville – D. Devauchelle, Le temple d'Edfou : Étapes de la construction, nouvelles données historiques, RdE 35 (1984), 31-55.
Chauveau (1990) = M. Chauveau, Un été 145, BIFAO 90 (1990), 135-168.
- (1991) = M. Chauveau, Un été 145. Post-scriptum, BIFAO 91 (1991), 129-134.
- (2000) = M. Chauveau, Encore Ptolémée « VII » et le dieu Néos Philopatôr !, RdE 51 (2000), 257-261.
Chrubasik (2016) = B. Chrubasik, Kings and Usurpers in the Seleukid Empire. The Men who would be King, Oxford 2016.
Clarysse-Van der Veken (1983) = W. Clarysse – G. Van der Veken, The Eponymous Priests of Ptolemaic Egypt (P. L. Bat. 24), Leiden 1983.
Coulon (2011) = L. Coulon, Les inscriptions des catacombes osiriennes d'Oxyrhynchos. Témoignages du culte d'Osiris sous les règnes de Ptolémée VI et Ptolémée VIII, in A. Jördens-J. F. Quack (eds), Ägypten zwischem innerem Zwist und äußerem Druck. Die Zeit Ptolemaios' VI. bis VIII. Internationales Symposion Heidelberg 16.-19.9.2007, Wiesbaden 2011, 77-91.
- (2018) = L. Coulon, Les inscriptions associées aux niches de l'Osireion, in M. Mascort (ed.), Oxyrhynchos IV. L'Osireion d'Oxirrinc, I (Nova Studia Aegyptiaca, 10), Barcelona 2018, 171-196.
Criscuolo (1986) = L. Criscuolo, L'archivo di Philô (P.Köln V,222-225) e la confisca dei beni di Galestes, l'Atamano (Diod. XXXIII,20), ZPE 64 (1986), 83-86.
Cuenod (2020) = A. Cuenod, « En mariage comme en affaire, nul ne doit s'engager à la légère ». Remarques sur les alliances matrimoniales et les stratégies dynastiques de Ptolémée VIII Évergète II à Ptolémée X Alexandre, in G. Gorre - S. Wackenier (eds), Quand la fortune du royaume ne dépend pas de la vertu du prince: un renforcement de la monarchie lagide de Ptolémée VI à Ptolémée X (169-88 av. J.-C.)? (Studia Hellenistica, 59), Leuven–Paris–Bristol, CT 2020, 55-70.
Cuenod-Olivier (2020) = A. Cuenod – J. Olivier, D'un Ptolémée à l'autre. Ceindre le diadème à Alexandrie (163-80 av. J.-C), in Th. Faucher (ed.), Money Rules! The Monetary Economy of Egypt, from Persians until the Beginning of Islam (BdE 176), Cairo 2020, 203-229.
De Boor (1905) = C. De Boor, Excerpta historica iussu Imp. Constantini Porphyrogeniti confecta. III. Excerpta de insidiis, Berlin 1905.
Duttenhöfer (1996) = R. Duttenhöfer, Ein ptolemäischer Eselkauf mit neuer eponymer Priestertitulatur, CE 71 (1996), 297-309.
Eldamaty (2011) = M. M. Eldamaty, Die ptolemäische Königin als weiblicher Horus, in A. Jördens-J. F. Quack (eds), Ägypten zwischem innerem Zwist und äußerem Druck. Die Zeit Ptolemaios' VI. bis VIII. Internationales Symposion Heidelberg 16.-19.9.2007, Wiesbaden 2011, 24-57.

Grainger (2010) = J. D. Grainger, The Syrian Wars (Mnemosyne. Supplements 320), Leiden-Boston 2010.
Grzybek (2017) = E. Grzybek, Thronanspruch und Thronbehauptung. Studien zur Regierungszeit Ptolemaios' VIII., Wiesbaden 2017.
Heinen (1997) = H. Heinen, Der Sohn des 6. Ptolemäers im Sommer 145. Zur Frage nach Ptolemaios VII. Neos Philopator und zur Zählung der Ptolemäerkönige, in Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses Berlin, 13.-19.8.1995, Band I (APF. Beiheft 3), Stuttgart-Leipzig 1997, 449-460.
Hölbl (2001) = G. Hölbl, A History of the Ptolemaic Empire, London-New York 2001.
Huß (2001) = W. Huß, Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit 332-30 v.Chr., Munich 2001.
- (2002) = W. Huß, Noch ein Mord im Haus des Ptolemaios?, ZPE 140 (2002), 40-42.
Kaplony-Heckel (2006) = U. Kaplony-Heckel, Neun neue Leineweber-Quittungen – Anhang: Promemoria DO Medinet Habu 1758, in G. Moers et. al. (eds), *jn.t dr.w*. Festschrift für Friedrich Junge, II, Göttingen 2006, 383-400 (= Land und Leute am Nil nach demotischen Inschriften, Papyri und Ostraka. Gesammelte Schriften, II, Wiesbaden 2009, 1340-1357).
Käppel (2021) = E. C. Käppel, Die Prostagmata der Ptolemäer (Papyrologica Coloniensia, XLV), Paderborn 2021.
Lanciers (1988) = E. Lanciers, Die Alleinherrschaft des Ptolemaios VIII. im Jahre 164/163 v.Chr. und der Name Euergetes, in B.G. Mandilaras (ed.), Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens 25-31 May 1986, II, Athens 1988, 405-433.
- (1995) = E. Lanciers, Some Observations on the Events in Egypt in 145 B.C., Simblos 1 (1995), 33-39.
- (2014) = E. Lanciers, The Development of the Greek Dynastic Cult under Ptolemy V, APF 60 (2014), 373-383.
- (2019) = E. Lanciers, Cleopatra III's Marriage with Ptolemy VIII and the Start of her Queenship: Notes on Some Greek and Demotic Sources, ZPE 210 (2019), 194-200.
- (2020a) = E. Lanciers, The Civil War between Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II (132-124): Possible Causes and Key Events, in G. Gorre - S. Wackenier (eds), Quand la fortune du royaume ne dépend pas de la vertu du prince: un renforcement de la monarchie lagide de Ptolémée VI à Ptolémée X (169-88 av. J.-C.)? (Studia Hellenistica, 59), Leuven–Paris–Bristol, CT 2020, 21-54.
- (2020b) = E. Lanciers, The Evolution of the Court Titles of the Ptolemaic *Dioiketes* in the Second Century, AncSoc 50 (2020) 99-128.
Lampela (1998) = A. Lampela, Rome and the Ptolemies of Egypt. The Development of their Political Relations (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, 111), Helsinki 1998.
Lippert (2008) = S. Lippert, Like Phoenix from the Mummies: Demotic Documents from Oxyrhyncha in Cartonnages from Tebtunis, in S. Lippert - M. Schentuleit (eds), Graeco-Roman Fayum – Texts and Archaeology. Proceedings of the Third International Fayum Symposion, Freudenstadt, May 29-June 1, 2007, Wiesbaden 2008, 165-171.
Malitz (1983) = J. Malitz, Die Historien des Poseidonios (Zetemata 79), Munich 1983.
Mattingly (1986) = H. B. Mattingly, Scipio Aemilianus' Eastern Embassy, CQ 36 (1986), 491-495.
Mavrojannis (2016) = Th. Mavrojannis, The Mausoleum of Ptolemy Eupator and the « Tombs of the Kings » at Nea Paphos in the Light of the Portraiture of the Ptolemaic Strategoi of Cyprus from Voni-Kythrea, Ostraka. Rivista di Antichità, 25 (2016), 119-161.
Minas (2000) = M. Minas, Die hieroglyphischen Ahnenreihen der ptolemäischen Könige. Ein Vergleich mit den Titeln der eponymen Priester in den demotischen und griechischen Papyri (Aegyptiaca Treverensia, 9), Mainz am Rhein 2000.
Minas-Nerpel (2014) = M. Minas-Nerpel, Koregentschaft und Thronfolge: Legitimation ptolemäischer Machtstrukturen in den ägyptischen Tempeln der Ptolemäerzeit, in F. Hoffmann – K. S. Schmidt (eds), Orient und Okzident in hellenistischer Zeit. Beiträge zur Tagung "Orient und Okzident –

Antagonismus oder Konstrukt. Machtstrukturen, Ideologien und Kulturtransfer in hellenistischer Zeit, Vaterstetten 2014, 143-166.
Mitford (1938) = T. B. Mitford, Contributions to the Epigraphy of Cyprus. Some Pre-Roman Inscriptions from Kouklia, Mnemosyne 6 (1938), 103-120.
- (1961) = T. B. Mitford, The Hellenistic Inscriptions of Old Paphos, ABSA 56 (1961), 1-41.
Mooren (1988) = L. Mooren, The Wives and Children of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II, in B. G. Mandilaras (ed.), Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens 25-31 May 1986, II, Athens 1988, 435-444.
Mørkholm (1975) = O. Mørkholm, Ptolemaic Coins and Chronology: The Dated Silver Coinage of Alexandria, ANSMN 20 (1975), 7-24.
Murnane (1977) = W. J. Murnane, Ancient Egyptian Coregencies (SAOC 40), Chicago 1977.
Nadig (2007) = P. Nadig, Zwischen König und Karikatur. Das Bild Ptolemaios' VIII. im Spannungsfeld der Überlieferung (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 97), Munich 2007.
Ogden (1999) = D. Ogden, Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death. The Hellenistic Dynasties, London 1999.
Otto (1934) = W. Otto, Zur Geschichte der Zeit des 6. Ptolemäers. Ein Beitrag zur Politik und zum Staatsrecht des Hellenismus (ABAW. Philosophisch-historische Abteilung. NF. Heft 11), Munich 1934 (= Hildesheim 1976).
Otto-Bengtson (1938) = W. Otto – H. Bengtson, Zur Geschichte des Niederganges des Ptolemäerreiches. Ein Beitrag zur Regierungszeit des 8. und des 9. Ptolemäers (ABAW. Philosophisch-historische Abteilung. NF. Heft 17), Munich 1938 (= Hildesheim 1978).
Pfeiffer (2018) = S. Pfeiffer, Review of Erhard Grzybek: Thronanspruch und Thronbehauptung. Studien zur Regierungszeit Ptolemaios" VIII., Sehepunkte 18.7/8 (2018) = http://www.sehepunkte.de/2018/07/31822.html
Rathbone (1986) = D. W. Rathbone, The Dates of the Recognition in Egypt of the Emperors from Caracalla to Diocletianus, *ZPE* 62 (1986), 101-131.
Richter (1987) = H.-D. Richter, Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Historiographie. Die Vorlagen des Pompeius Trogus für die Darstellung der nachalexandrischen hellenistischen Geschichte (Iust. 13-40), Frankfurt am Main 1987.
Samuel (1962) = A. E. Samuel, Ptolemaic Chronology (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 43), Munich 1962.
- (1965) = A. E. Samuel, Year 27 = 30 and 88 B.C., CE 40 (1965) 376-400.
Schironi (2018) = F. Schironi, The Best of the Grammarians. Aristarchus of Samothrace on the *Iliad*, Ann Arbor 2018.
Sewell-Lasater (2020) = T. L. Sewell-Lasater, Becoming Kleopatra: Ptolemaic Royal Marriage, Incest, and the Path to Female Rule, Diss. Houston 2020.
Stadler (2012) = M. A. Stadler, Die Krönung der Ptolemäer zu Pharaonen, WJA, 36 (2012), 59-95.
Stern (2013) = M. Stern, Einblicke in die ptolemäische Verwaltungspraxis. Nochmals BGU VI 1242 und BGU VI 1311, APF 59 (2013), 62-94.
Thompson (2012) = D. J. Thompson, Memphis under the Ptolemies, Princeton-Oxford 2012[2].
Van 't Dack (1962) = E. Van 't Dack, Postes et télécommunications ptolémaïques, CE 37 (1962), 338-341 (= Ptolemaica Selecta. Études sur l'armée et l'administration lagides [Studia Hellenistica 29], Leuven 1988, 96-102).
Veïsse (2004) = A.-E. Veïsse, Les « révoltes égyptiennes ». Recherches sur les troubles intérieurs en Égypte du règne de Ptolémée III à la conquête romaine (Studia Hellenistica, 41), Leuven-Paris-Dudley, MA 2004.
Volkmann (1959) = H. Volkmann, s.v. Ptolemaios VIII. Euergetes II., in Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, XXIII. 2, Munich 1959, col. 1721-1736.

Werner (2019) = C. Werner, Stellenbesetzung und Besoldung in der Militärverwaltung der Ptolemäerzeit (P.Trier II 15) (APF. Beiheft 38), Berlin-Boston 2019.
Whitehorne (1994) = J. Whitehorne, Cleopatras, London-New York 1994.