

FAMILY MATTERS:
REMARKS ON THE REPRESENTATION OF FAMILY TIES
IN THE DYNASTIC PROPAGANDA OF THE PTOLEMIES

By

AGNIESZKA FULIŃSKA

When considering the Macedonian rule in Egypt, we must bear in mind the situation in that country, which differed from other provinces conquered by Alexander and afterwards ruled by his generals. In Egypt Alexander was greeted as the one who liberated the country from unholy Persian rule (HÖLBL 2001: 77), and, according to our sources, the local priesthood accepted him as the son of Ammon (Plut. *Alex.* 27), which in political terms translated to naming him the pharaoh, legitimate ruler of Egypt. Divine legitimacy was the most important trait of the king, whose primary role was to guarantee the maintenance and constant renewal of cosmic harmony which in turn was reflected in the social order (KOENEN 1993: 39), and ethnicity was of very little consequence for the Egyptians, who had no problems with accepting foreign dynasties, as long as they complied to the ages-long traditions of the state. Therefore, in order to establish his legitimacy in Egypt, Ptolemy's first move was to show his close ties with Alexander – which he did, both by establishing the official cult of the *ktistes* after kidnapping the funerary procession and bringing the body to Egypt¹, and also by means of what was supposed to become one of the dynasty's most powerful tool of propaganda: his coins. Satrapal issues of Ptolemy Soter show portraits of Alexander in elephant scalp on the obverse, and the first clearly propagandistic royal issue shows deified Alexander in a quadriga of elephants on the reverse, while Ptolemy's own portrait appears on the obverse (MØRKHOLM 1991: 63 f.). Only slightly later Alexander almost completely disappears from the coinage to be replaced by various members of the dynasty, among whom the most prominent places would be held by Ptolemy I for standard silver issues and his daughter Arsinoe II for large gold and silver denominations.

¹ The most exhaustive recent discussion of ancient sources concerning the burial in Alexandria from the archaeological point of view, together with further bibliography, is given by ADRIANI 2000: 5–22.

The history of the Ptolemies is also a long list of complicated family ties, including a number of incestuous unions, which provoked a very wide range of reactions from the highest praise to deepest contempt. The way in which the official propaganda made use of family bonds within the dynasty shows to what extent the public image of the rulers was influenced not only by the Greek or Macedonian traditions, but also by the requirements of the local mentality. The blending of Greek and Egyptian elements in Ptolemaic Egypt has recently become a growing interest for scholars of various fields; this paper aims at outlining some aspects of the use of family ties in the royal propaganda (as reflected first of all on royal coins and in official art, supported by textual evidence), and making preliminary assessments of how these two traditions shaped certain notions presented in art.

FATHERS AND SONS: CHILDREN OF THE GODS

It is disputable to what extent Ptolemy I exploited his possible ties with the Argead dynasty. Our main Roman source for such claims is Curtius Rufus, who in his *Historia Alexandri* (IX 8, 33) speaks about the controversies concerning his parentage and rumours that he may have been illegitimate son of Philip: “Sanguine coniunctus erat, et quidam Philippo genitum esse credebant: certe pelice eius ortum constabat”; likewise Pausanias (I 6, 2): Πτολεμαῖον Μακεδόνες Φιλίππου παῖδα εἶναι τοῦ Ἀμύντου, λόγῳ δὲ Λάγου νομίζουσι: τὴν γὰρ οἱ μητέρα ἔχουσαν ἐν γαστρὶ δοθῆναι γυναῖκα ὑπὸ Φιλίππου Λάγῳ. These statements notwithstanding, we have no proof that such rumours were contemporary; besides, we also have an exactly opposite story in Justin (XIII 4, 10), who says: “Prima Ptolemaeo Aegyptus et Africae Arabiaeque pars sorte euenit, quem ex gregario milite Alexander uirtutis causa prouexerat”, portraying Ptolemy as a common soldier (therefore most likely of humble, or at least non-aristocratic origins), raised in rank due to his virtues². By all means the official patronym of the king was Λάγου with no pretensions to the descent from Philip. It does not imply, however, that Ptolemy did not perceive himself as (half-) brother of the *ktistes*: much as we have Ἀλέξανδρος Φιλίππου for the Greeks, in Egypt he is in the first place the son of the god Ammon (or Zeus-Ammon in Alexandria). The latter descent is much easier to claim, and even if it was not the idea of Soter himself, we can easily trace it in only slightly later testimonies, those from the reign of his son, Ptolemy II Philadelphus.

² The discrepancy between these accounts makes an interesting separate case for the study of reception of Alexander's companions and Hellenistic kings; a thorough discussion of the extant sources, together with arguments against Ptolemy's use of the Argead connections, is given by COLLINS 1997.

Theocritus, the court poet of Philadelphus, included the following passage in his *Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Theocr. 17, 13–27):

ἐκ πατέρων οἷος μὲν ἦν τελέσαι μέγα ἔργον
 Λαγείδας Πτολεμαῖος, ὅτε φρεσὶν ἐγκατάθοιτο
 βουλάν, ἂν οὐκ ἄλλος ἀνὴρ οἷός τε νοῆσαι.
 τῆνον καὶ μακάρεσσι πατὴρ ὁμότιμον ἔθηκεν
 ἀθανάτοις, καὶ οἱ χρύσεος θρόνος ἐν Διὸς οἴκῳ
 δέδμηται· παρὰ δ' αὐτὸν Ἀλέξανδρος φίλα εἰδῶς
 ἐδριάει, Πέρσαισι βαρὺς θεὸς αἰολομίτρας.
 ἀντία δ' Ἡρακλῆος ἔδρα κενταυροφόνοιο
 ἴδρυται στερεοῖο τετυγμένα ἐξ ἀδάμαντος·
 ἔνθα σὺν ἄλλοισιν θαλίας ἔχει Οὐρανίδησι,
 χαίρων υἰωνῶν περιώσιον υἰωνοῖσιν,
 ὅττι σφέων Κρονίδης μελέων ἐξείλετο γῆρας,
 ἀθάνατοι δὲ καλεῦνται εἰοὶ νέποδες γεγαῶτες.
 ἄμφω γὰρ πρόγονός σφιν ὁ καρτερός Ἡρακλείδας,
 ἀμόφτετοι δ' ἀριθμεῦνται ἐς ἔσχατον Ἡρακλῆα.

From his ancestors what a man for bringing to completion a mighty deed was Ptolemy, son of Lagos, whenever he laid down in his heart a plan, the like of which no other man could have conceived. Him the father made equal in honor even to the blessed immortals, and a golden throne is built for him in the house of Zeus; beside him, kindly disposed, sits Alexander, the god of the dancing diadem, who brought destruction to the Persians. Facing them is established the seat of centaur-slaying Heracles, fashioned from solid adamant; there he joins in feasting with the heavenly ones and rejoices exceedingly in the grandsons of his grandsons, for the son of Kronos has removed old age from their limbs, and his very own descendants are called immortal. Both have as ancestor the mighty son of Heracles, and both trace their family back in the end to Heracles.

(trans. by R. HUNTER)

The text presents “double parentage” for Ptolemy Soter: he is called *Lageidas* in accordance with his patronym, but the whole passage is in fact devoted to his divine ancestry, which through Heracles – the mythical ancestor of the Argeads – leads directly to Zeus. Theocritus does not elaborate on how exactly Ptolemy should be related to the Temenid dynasty and therefore to Heracles and Zeus, but we may assume that it must be on the mother’s side rather than father’s (cf. the Adulis inscription of Ptolemy Euergetes, *OGIS* 54, line 4: τὰ μὲν ἀπὸ πατρὸς Ἡρακλέους τοῦ Διός, and also the Satyros list of the ancestry of Arsinoe, Soter’s mother; Theoph. *Ad Autol.* II 7), which, however, leaves us with the mysterious *patēr* in the text, who does not seem to be identical with Lagos, and may be either a metonymy for a more distant ancestor, or an indication at divine “siblinghood” with Alexander as the pharaoh – son of Ammon/Zeus. If we add to it the telltale symbol chosen by Ptolemy to represent his dynasty: an eagle on a thunderbolt, the programme appears more obvious.

Moreover, there are traces of a legend about Ptolemy’s childhood, possibly fabricated in the Hellenistic times:

ὁ δὲ Φίλιππος Ἀρσινόῃ ὁμιλήσας, εἶτα ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ κατέλιπεν ἔγκαρπον, καὶ ὄγε τὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα ἀγεται.

(*Suda* s.v. ἔγκαρπον, ε 74)

Philippos had a liaison with Arsinoe, but then left her fruit-containing by him, and he took Olympias as his wife³.

ὁς Ἀρσινόην ἔγημε τὴν Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Σωτῆρος μητέρα. τοῦτον δὲ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον οὐδέν οἱ προσήκοντα ἐξέθηκεν ἄρα ὁ Λάγος ἐπ' ἀσπίδος χαλκῆς. διαρρεῖ δὲ λόγος ἐκ Μακεδονίας, ὅς λέγει ἀετὸν ἐπιφοιτῶντα καὶ τὰς πτέρυγας ὑποτείνοντα καὶ ἑαυτὸν αἰωροῦντα ἀποστέγειν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ἄκρατον ἀκτίνα, καὶ ὅτε ὕοι, τὸν πολὺν ὑέτόν: τοὺς γε μὴν ἀγελαίους φοβεῖν ὄρνιθας, διασπᾶν δὲ ὄρνυγας καὶ τὸ αἶμα αὐτῶ παρέχειν τροφήν ὡς γάλα.

(*Suda* s.v. Λάγος, λ 25)

It was he who married Arsinoe, the mother of Ptolemaios the Saviour. This Ptolemaios, not related to him at all, Lagos in fact exposed upon a bronze shield. And a story is current out of Macedonia that says an eagle used to visit [him] and, stretching down its wings while raising itself, protected him both from the direct ray of the sun and, whenever it rained, from heavy rain. It would terrify the ordinary birds, tear apart quails, and offer their blood to him as food, like milk.

This legend points at several archetypal elements of a myth: we have an exposed child, whose legitimate royal parentage is challenged, as in the case of many heroes, starting with Gilgamesh, but the boy survives thanks to divine intervention. In the case in question the intervening deity was certainly Zeus, since the protector of the baby was the sacred bird of the king of Olympus. Such claims would make Ptolemy a hypothetical brother of Alexander, both as son of Philip and as son of Zeus: the latter of far more importance for the Egyptian frame of mind, since it makes him a legitimate heir to the throne. Moreover, in Egyptian theological concepts of royalty the pharaoh by the power of his office became the son and living representative of Ammon, and it is known from Egyptian documents that Ptolemy Soter was considered legitimate pharaoh, after undergoing all necessary ceremonies and obtaining the Horus and throne names, since 304 BC (ŁUKASZEWICZ 2006: 42).

The choice of the eagle for the dynastic symbol does not constitute a break with the Macedonian tradition, since there is monetary evidence for the use of the very same image, an eagle on a thunderbolt, by Alexander on his bronzes (BELLINGER 1979: 27–29), also the Zeus from the most common silver types of Alexander is Zeus Aetophoros. The legend of being shielded by a bird's wings (as seen in *Suda* λ 25), possibly linked to the choice of “coat of arms”, may also be “translated” into meanings pertaining to Egyptian imagery: one of the

³ Translations of the *Suda* are taken from the *Suda* OnLine project (<http://www.stoa.org/sol/>), status as of July 2011.

most popular representations of Horus as the royal protector was that of a falcon shielding the king with its wings; also the protective goddesses Isis and Hathor were commonly presented as women spreading their winged arms around or above the figure of the pharaoh. Therefore a legendary matter concerning the birth of the founder of the dynasty may be intelligible both for the Greek and Egyptian audience, in both cases within their particular frames of mind.

This claim at divinity was furthered by Ptolemy II Philadelphus, who established official cult of both his parents, organized games and processions to commemorate their death, and built a temple in which he erected chryselephantine statues of Soter and Berenice I (Theocr. 17, 121–125: *μοῦνος δὲ προτέρων τε καὶ ὦν ἔτι θερμὰ κονία | στειβομένα καθύπερθε ποδῶν ἐκμάσσειται ἴχνη, | ματρὶ φίλα καὶ πατρὶ θυώδεας εἴσατο ναούς· | ἐν δ' αὐτοῦς χρυσῶ περικαλλέας ἢ δ' ἐλέφαντι | ἴδρυται πάντεσσι ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἄρωγούς.*). The queen's cult is also mentioned in Theocr. 15, 100 ff., when the celebration of the Adonia, led by her daughter Arsinoe II, is described. Of particular interest is the hint at chryselephantine, since it is generally agreed that this particular technique was reserved in Greece for statues of gods (LAPATIN 2001: 5 and 120 f. on the Ptolemaic chryselephantine statuary; for the discussion on to what extent the use of the technique *implied* divinity see CARNEY 2007: 35, n. 32); it was, however, allegedly Philip II who erected such statues of living persons in the Philippeum in Olympia for the first time (Paus. V 17, 4)⁴, which makes the case even more interesting.

Ptolemy II not only commemorated his parents by public celebrations and apotheosis, but also issued a series of coins, which clearly stated his dynastic programme. On one side of these coins jugate busts of Soter and Berenice were placed, and on the other – likewise composed busts of Philadelphus and his late second wife and full sister Arsinoe II. After a very short issue bearing the legend ΘΕΩΝ ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ on the Philadelphoi side (SVOR. 934) a pattern was established, and continued until the last occurrence of this type in the coinage of Ptolemy V Epiphanes: on the obverse⁵ were presented the busts of the current ruler and his deceased and deified wife with the legend ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ, while on the reverse remained the busts of their parents with the legend ΘΕΩΝ (SVOR. 603 and passim; cf. MØRKHOLM 1991: 103 f.).

Modern historians (BURSTEIN 1982: 211 f.; CARNEY 1987: 429) argue that Philadelphus' incestuous marriage, which will be discussed later in this paper,

⁴ This notion has recently been challenged on archaeological grounds (see CARNEY 2007: 60, n. 101); however, the presence of such statues of kings in Alexandria might add to the discussion in favour of Pausanias' tradition.

⁵ The attribution of the obverse and reverse is arbitrary in this case, and based on the Hellenistic pattern for royal issues: the ruler's head on the obverse, a protective divinity on the reverse; normally, legends appear on reverses only.

aimed first and foremost at strengthening his own (and his children's) position, since Ptolemy Soter left a number of progeny by at least three women: the hetæra Thais, Antipater's daughter and the official royal wife Eurydice, and finally Berenice whose only son was chosen to co-rule and succeed the king (for a full list see OGDEN 1999: 68). OGDEN (1999: 75) goes as far as suggesting that the "dynastic" issue was intended to show that Berenice's children were the only legitimate heirs to Ptolemy Soter but much as this notion may have had a part in the royal propaganda, to make it its main element seems too far-fetched. First, we hardly hear about serious fights for power or troubles with succession, especially in the light of Argead history, the not-so-far in time succession after Alexander, and also what the Lagid dynasty would face a few generations ahead; then, the scholar himself admits that Eurydice's sons were dead short after the marriage of the Philadelphi, therefore at least ten years prior to the minting of the issue. In 261/260 the competition with Philadelphus' half-brother would be history, and the arguments about the symbolic rivalry with Ceraunus over Arsinoe II, who at the time of her marriage to her full brother was formally their half-brother's widow, seem weak: Ceraunus, despite all his ambition and alleged cruelty (Justin XXIII 2), never contended for his father's kingdom, concentrating his efforts on the rule in Macedon, therefore hardly constituted a serious political enemy for Ptolemy II. The meaning of the "dynastic" issue seems to go much further than sibling squabbles.

This series of coins, consisting mostly of large denominations in gold, together with all other celebrations in the names of his parents, allowed Philadelphus to stress the continuity of the royal rule, and also emphasize the divine descent of himself and his sister-wife as children of the gods, and therefore also relatives of the main Macedonian divinity in Alexandria: the city's founder Alexander, son of Ammon. Both these notions were crucial for the Egyptian religious views of monarchy, but the dynastic continuity obviously formed an important part of Macedonian mentality, too, judging by the status of the Argeads in the kingdom, and the empire's dissolution after the extinction of the family: the death of Alexander IV prompted the emancipation of the satrapies and the adoption of royal titles by their rulers. Nonetheless, the idea of continuity was different in both traditions; the Egyptians expected an unbroken line of pharaohs to guarantee the cosmic order of Maat, and their actual descent from one another was considered of less consequence, while for the Macedonians it was the clan ruler position of the strongest of the Argeads that constituted dynastic family power. It is worth noting that until the time of Alexander the Argead rulers had not used the title of *basileus* (CARNEY 1991), possibly because of their strive to achieve the status of Hellenes who were hostile towards the monarchic ideas, but the beginning of Hellenism, right after the deaths of the last Argeads sees an emergence of such titles, which may support the hypothesis about them being an adaptation or translation of oriental royal nomenclature.

Far more controversial for the Greeks must have been the deification of the members of the family, if we consider the unwelcome reception of Alexander's claims at divinity; on the other hand there is strong evidence for ancestors' cult in Macedonia, and Curtius (IX 6, 26 and X 5, 29) twice mentions Alexander's plans of apotheosis of both his parents: "mihi maximus laborum atque operum meorum erit fructus, si Olympias mater immortalitati consecratur, quandoque excesserit uita", "gloriae laudisque ut iusto maior cupido, ita ut iuueni et in tantis sane remittenda rebus; iam pietas erga parentes, quorum Olympiada immortalitati consecrare decreverat, Philippum ultus erat" (cf. HAMMOND 2000: 150–152; WORTHINGTON 2008: 200 f.). Apparently there was less reluctance towards posthumous deifications than for lifetime acts of this kind, hence probably the cautious stance of Philadelphus in proclaiming his own divine status: Athenaeus (V 197c–203b) in his account of the *pompē* in honour of Ptolemy Soter and Berenice I does not mention the apotheosis of the current ruler. However, from one generation later the Ptolemies would describe themselves as gods ever since the beginning of their reigns.

SIBLINGS AND SPOUSES: *HIEROS GAMOS*

The Ptolemies did go further in exploring the Egyptian royal tradition and incorporating it into their dynastic practice, and accordingly to Egyptian habits the family ties played a major role here. What is worth emphasizing, these habits were in most cases alien, and even abominable to the Greeks, which shows how important the legitimization of rule was to the Macedonian kings. In Egypt, a major role in the image of the dynasty was ascribed to royal women – which was one of the elements that would be unthinkable for the Greeks and the Macedonians; we remember the famous statement of Alexander about his mother's ambitions, noted by Plutarch (*Alex.* 68; likewise Diod. XIX 11, 9): "The Macedonians would not suffer the rule of a woman". In Egyptian tradition, however, the royal mother or wife could play a number of important roles: from being the living representation of various goddesses (which includes titles such as the royal consort, the protectress of the king and his symbolic sister, the living goddess – all these alien to the Hellenic tradition) to the very mundane and political role of a regent during her son's childhood or husband's absence, and even co-ruler.

The major shift in the imagination and image of the dynasty comes with Ptolemy Philadelphus, son of Ptolemy Soter and his second wife, Berenice, and more precisely with his second marriage to his full sister, Arsinoe, known as Arsinoe II Philadelphus, who after a turbulent life as wife first to Lysimachus of Thrace and then to her half-brother Ptolemy Ceraunus, for a very short time ruler of Macedonia, fled back to Alexandria, where she deposed her brother's first wife

(and at the same time her own first husband's, Lysimachus' daughter, also named Arsinoe) and married him around the year 278/276. We know very little about this marriage, apart from such facts as that it did not produce offspring, and that Arsinoe II adopted the children from her brother's first marriage who formally were also her step-grandchildren. OGDEN (1999: 74) quotes a demotic inscription which suggests that Arsinoe I, who was sent away from Alexandria to Koptos, never lost the title of the "chief royal wife", which also may shed some light on the character of the sibling marriage. We also know that Ptolemy II had several mistresses, some of whom were awarded divine honours (which was not unseen earlier, as we learn from the case of Harpalus; see CARNEY 2000: 30–32), so we might tentatively assume that the union was purely formal. There is a passage in Theocritus 17 about "his noble partner, than whom no better wife embraces her young husband in the halls, loving with all her heart her brother and her husband" (17, 128–130, trans. by R. HUNTER), which may belong to the domain of rhetorics, being a standard *topos* of the encomium. It does, however, command attention in the context which will become clearer in a short time: according to Plutarch (*De Is. et Os.* 12 = *Mor.* 356A) Osiris and Isis were a model of extraordinary divine affection, united already in their mother's womb (Ἴσιον δὲ καὶ Ὀσιριν ἐρῶντας ἀλλήλων καὶ πρὶν ἢ γενέσθαι κατὰ γαστρὸς ὑπὸ σκότῳ συνεῖναι). Moreover, both the predecessors and successors of the Philadelphoi served as models of ideal love: Soter and Berenice I (Theocritus) and Ptolemy III Euergetes and Berenice II (Callimachus).

Of the greatest consequence in this context is the passage of the *Encomium* that follows (131–134):

ὦδε καὶ ἀθανάτων ἱερὸς γάμος ἐξετέλεσθη
οὓς τέκετο κρείουσα Ῥέα βασιλῆας Ὀλύμπου·
ἔν δὲ λέχος στόρνυσιν ἰαυεῖν Ζηνὶ καὶ Ἥρῃ
χεῖρας φοιβήσασα μύροις ἔτι παρθένος Ἴρις.

In this manner too was accomplished the sacred marriage of the immortals whom Queen Rhea bore as kings of Olympus: it is one bed that Iris, to this day a virgin, prepares for Zeus and Hera, when she has cleansed her hands with perfumes.

(trans. by R. HUNTER)

What needs to be stressed here, is that however the marriage of the Olympian gods was considered a *hieros gamos*, it never served as model for the royal marriages among the Greeks; the idea of divine incest – brother–sister marriage within the royalty – is, however, present both in Persian⁶ and Egyptian cul-

⁶ SPOONER (1966: 55 f.) suggests that the case of the Achaemenids royal incest could have been adopted from local traditions of the conquered lands and therefore "may be seen in the same light as the Ptolemaic incestuous unions in Egypt, as designed to help reconcile an alien dynasty by adopting customs which the people would expect from an indigenous one". It was allegedly Cambyses who performed this kind of union for the first time in the history of the dynasty (Hdt. III 31), but

ture, in the latter being in fact one of the religious foundations of the pharaonic rule⁷. The historical sources give us what may seem a respectively short list of incestuous marriages among Middle-Eastern royalty, especially when compared to popular notions on the subject⁸; nonetheless, what really matters here is not the actual practice of incest, but the conviction of the contemporaries that it was a custom among Persians and Egyptians. It is therefore worth noting that for the ancient writers both the Egyptians and Persians were exemplary of incest practice⁹; Diodorus (I 27) emphasized the divine origin of Egyptian royal incest: νομοθετῆσαι δέ φασι τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους παρὰ τὸ κοινὸν ἔθος τῶν ἀνθρώπων γαμεῖν ἀδελφὰς διὰ τὸ γεγονὸς ἐν τούτοις τῆς Ἰσιδος ἐπίτευγμα [“The Egyptians also made a law, they say, contrary to the general custom of mankind, permitting men to marry their sisters, this being due to the success attained by Isis in this respect”, trans. by C.H. Oldfather], while Pausanias (I 7, 1) commented on the marriage of the Philadelphi: οὗτος ὁ Πτολεμαῖος Ἀρσινόης ἀδελφῆς ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐρασθεὶς ἔγημεν αὐτήν, Μακεδόσιν οὐδαμῶς ποιῶν νομιζόμενα, Αἰγυπτίοις μὲντοι ὧν ἦρχε [“This Ptolemy fell in love with Arsinoe, his full sister, and married her, violating herein Macedonian custom, but following that of his Egyptian subjects”, trans. by W.H.S. Jones].

The royal couple in Egypt represented in the first place the divine couple of Osiris and Isis, whose re-union symbolised the return of harmony after the reign of chaos, and even if the full sibling marriages were not compulsory for the kings and scarcer than it may seem, they were most certainly never considered an act of abomination, unlike among the Hellenic peoples. According to the socio-anthropological analyses (see i.a. ADAMSON 1982; SHAW 1992; AGER 2005) the Greeks, e.g. the Athenians, accepted half-sibling marriages, even if not enthusiastically, while the Macedonians certainly accepted unions between close relatives, as for instance the marriage of Alexander's full sister Cleopatra to their maternal uncle shows, but apparently incest had no divine sanction here, unlike in other cultures, including Egypt and possibly Persia (cf. SCHEIDEL 2002; AGER

this notion has been challenged recently in the view of other sources (cf. DILLERY 2005: 395, also for refutation of possible Egyptian influence on Persian customs). In any case the tradition had been established in Persia long before Alexander and his Successors.

⁷ For a sociological analysis of possible explanations of the origins of this custom see MIDDLTON 1962: 608–610; from the point of view of Ptolemaic propaganda, however, the mythological/religious context, accepted by the ancient writers, is more important than any modern anthropological notion.

⁸ For a full list of such unions see ADAMSON 1982: 90 f.; in Egypt there are 14 attested full sibling marriages over the period of ca. two thousand years, with a definite peak of their popularity dating to the 18th and 19th Dynasties, in Achaemenid Persia three such marriages are attested over the period of two hundred years. The number may not be high, but it is not negligible, either, and together with other incestuous marriages (half-siblings, parent/child, aunt, uncle/nephew, niece) does constitute a case.

⁹ For the remarks on the Persians see Ael. *NA* VI 39; Dio Chrys. 10, 29 f.; Sext. Emp. *Pyrr*: III 23.

2006; FRANSEN 2009: 24 and 89). As far as full sibling marriage is concerned, however, “the Greeks clearly had a notion that it was abhorrent to the gods” (AGER 2005: 3).

That also the Greeks of Alexandria did not exactly accept what they apparently perceived as the royal antics, is best shown by the sad fate of the poet Sotades, who was reputedly condemned to death for the open criticism of the marriage (Plut. *De lib. ed.* = *Mor* 11a and Ath. XIV 620f–621a quote the line that allegedly earned him the sentence: εἰς οὐχ ὀσίην τρυμαλιῆν τὸ κέντρον ὠθεῖς). It is worth noting that the earlier marriage of Arsinoe to her half-brother, Ptolemy Ceraunus, did not seem to provoke critical comments from the ancient authors, which would corroborate the hypothesis that it was the full-sibling union which crossed the boundaries of what was acceptable for the Greek mind.

Whatever the motives behind this incestuous union, it was certainly perfectly exploited by Philadelphus, in particular after the death of his wife/sister ca. 270/268 (see CADELL 1998). Around the year 261/260 Philadelphus launched a full scale propaganda, in which he included both his deceased parents and his sister-wife, who from now on until almost the end of the dynasty would be the focal point in the ruler cult – again an element quite alien to the Greeks, who very rarely included women in their ancestral or heroic cults. We should, however, bear in mind the aforementioned hints at Alexander’s intention to deify both his parents, as well as the presence of women’s statues in the Philippeum, and generally higher status of aristocratic women in Macedonia, as archaeologically attested by burials (cf. for instance the tomb of “Eurydice” in Vergina; DROUGOU, SAATSATOGLOU-PALIADELI 2005: 183–186)¹⁰. The extent of the cult of Arsinoe Philadelphus, however, exceeded anything that had been seen anywhere both earlier in the Greek world and later in the Hellenistic kingdoms, and its most important aspect is that she became the protective goddess of the dynasty, identified with Isis-Aphrodite (cf. for instance testimonies in Posidippus 116 and 119), while one of her cult titles remained Thea Philadelphus, attested on numerous private votive tablets (BURSTEIN 1982: 202). What is even more interesting, is the fact that from now on, whether the spouse was the sister of the king or not, she would use the title of the “royal sister and wife”, as can be seen for instance in the inscriptions mentioning Berenice II Euergetis, wife of Ptolemy III (*OGIS* 61: βασιλίσσα Βερενίκη ἡ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου ἀδελφὴ καὶ γυνή; see BINGEN 2007: 32), one of the few queens whose family ties with the dynasty were not so very close, as she was only the king’s distant cousin. Moreover, MODRZEJEWSKI (1955: 433) observes that in earlier Egyptian poetry the word “sister” could have the meaning of “beloved”, which clearly points at the ambiguity

¹⁰ Also recent, as yet unpublished archaeological finds from the royal necropolis in Vergina show the long established high position of Macedonian aristocratic women; for an overview of current research in the field see KOTTARIDI 2011.

of the term; FRASER (1972: 217) seems to adopt an over-cautious, let alone moralistic stance when he explains the title Philadelphus in terms of purely “fraternal love” and symbolic union, but whatever the actual character of the marriage as such, it certainly evoked the divine/royal incest. Such attitude in scholarship may be derived from Theocritus’ encomiastic mode, and therefore disregard the local traditions that stood behind what was acutely pointed out by BURTON (1995: 3): “The Ptolemaic family’s enterprising manipulations of Greek cultural norms, as exemplified by Arsinoe’s strikingly successful dynastic career in Egypt, would have presented many challenges to artistic imagination and tact”.

To fully understand the reasons for such incestuous unions and their meaning in the legitimization of the rule, we must look further than just the political role of the king. The most important, most primordial function of the pharaoh was the constant preservation of the harmony of the universe (the Maat), whose embodiment – as the incarnation of the goddess, the personified Maat – was the queen, also in iconography (the feathers of Maat constitute frequently a part of the queens’ headdresses, also in Ptolemaic times): “The royal women are compositionally interchangeable with the goddess Maat. Their role as companion of the king echoes that of the relationship between Ra and his daughter, between the creator and the principle of cosmic order” (TROY 1986: 64). AGER (2005: 21) argues that the myth of Isis and Osiris (or Zeus and Hera) is only the surface image – very useful in the visual or textual propaganda – of the true archetypal and sacred dimension of the unity of the universe:

Royal incest should be seen in the light of this powerfully creative incest of the cultural imagination. Royalty is liminal state, at the boundaries of the society, and perhaps at the borders between human and divine. By committing incest, by stepping beyond those bounds, royalty evokes that creative power. [...] By indulging in an act representative of chaos, royalty may deliberately provoke and flirt with disaster, only to overcome it and restore the order necessary for the continuance of society.

We have seen this idea converted into poetic language in Theocritus, who may have flirted with the Egyptian myth of Osiris and Isis, disguising it in the Greek costume of Zeus and Hera (at the same time preserving its deeper meaning for the Hellenized Egyptian reader), but how did it translate into the language of arts? Representation of this concept posed no problem at all for Egyptian art: the pharaoh and his wife had been portrayed in divine attire and with divine attributes as early as the Old Kingdom, and Ptolemaic Egyptian style art does not differ significantly from these representations (see STANWICK 2002: 43–47). It was far more difficult to grasp this idea by the means of Greek art, however, and much as we may see Greek style sculptural portraits of the Ptolemies with divine attributes, the most interesting case is presented on the coins.

As has been mentioned before, around the year 261/260 Ptolemy Philadelphus launched two very important issues consisting of large denominations in gold and

silver. At this point it should be stressed that the “dynastic” series, apart from being a direct statement of divine ancestry – not through Ammon or Alexander, but the king’s own deified parents – the series’ iconography shows the importance of the queen’s presence by her husband’s side, a concept unknown in the Greek world and never before represented on coins¹¹. This model would be imitated later in the Seleucid kingdom (Cleopatra Thea and her husbands) and Rome, and, interestingly enough, also on coins that show deities: Zeus and Dione in Epirus, Sarapis and Isis on coins of Ptolemy III, the Dioscuri.

Unlike the jugate heads type, the second series was dedicated entirely to the deceased queen; it shows the portrait of Arsinoe on the obverse, and a *dikeras* – the double cornucopia, a new attribute, developed especially for the cult of the queen (Ath. XI 497b–c) – together with the legend ΑΡΣΙΝΟΗΣ ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΟΥ on the reverse. This type would be minted as long as until the time of Ptolemy XII Auletes in the name of a number of subsequent queens: Berenice II, Arsinoe III, Cleopatra I, Cleopatra II and Cleopatra III, Cleopatra Selene (wife of Ptolemy IX Soter II), and finally Cleopatra Tryphaena (SVOR. 1061 and 1062; 1120 and 1163–1165; 1241, 1242 and 1374; 1498; 1499 and 1500; 1726; 1841 resp.).

Cleopatra VII was the only queen never to mint this issue, but it is hard to decide whether this was intended as breaking with the tradition of Arsinoe II being at the centre of the dynastic cult, and to establish Cleopatra as the most important living goddess (Nea Isis), or whether it was simply due to the fact that Cleopatra VII did not mint gold coins at all, and after Ptolemy III’s short continuation of the silver decadrachms these issues were solely gold octadrachms (with one exception of gold tetradrachm for Cleopatra III). The only allusion or connection to Arsinoe’s cult on the last Cleopatra’s coins is the *dikeras* present on the Paphos bronze issue showing the ruling queen in the guise of Isis/Aphrodite with Horus/Eros/Caesarion (SVOR. 1874).

Thus, the cult of Arsinoe was established as the central point for the royal women, and all queens that followed partook in her divinity, becoming on the mythical, sacred level the sisters of their husbands, whether, like Arsinoe III or the later Cleopatras, they were real siblings, or, like Berenice II and Cleopatra I, only more or less distant cousins. For Cleopatra I, daughter of Antiochus III, therefore a very distant relative of the Ptolemies, and her husband Ptolemy V, the titulature goes as follows in one of the demotic texts: “Pharaoh Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy and Arsinoe, the father loving gods, with his sister, his wife Queen Cleopatra, the manifest gods” (PESTMAN 1967: 42). Even Cleopatra Berenice, who in her lifetime was wife of her uncle, Ptolemy X Alexander I, and her first

¹¹ The most important of extremely rare early examples of jugate representation dates to the time of satrapal campaign of Balacros and Perdicas against Laranda, ca. 324/323 BC, and shows two male heads (SNG France 2311).

cousin, Ptolemy XI Alexander II, as well as co-ruler of her own father Ptolemy IX Soter II (HÖLBL 2001: 212), was always referred to as “wife and sister”.

The statues of the “divine siblings” (*Theoi Adelphoi*) were placed in temples all over Egypt, becoming the *Synnaoi Theoi* for both local deities and Alexander, a notion quite popular in the pharaonic times (NOCK 1930: 4–16). Such practice is again known from the pharaonic times, and most likely served first of all the unification of Alexandrian cults with the Egyptian tradition (it is worth noting that the cult of city founders is largely unknown in Egypt, unlike in Greece, so this aspect of Alexander’s heroization or divinization was alien to the Egyptian mind). After the Philadelphoi the other royal couples would join the gods in their temples, forming a long line of divine rulers. The artistic epitome of the latter are several Egyptian style monuments, for instance the Edfu relief from the temple of Horus, on which Ptolemy IV makes offerings to Horus and his deified ancestors, back to Ptolemy Soter and Berenice I (see QUAEGBEUR 1978: 247 f.).

An interesting case of a complicated family situation which influenced the royal titlature can be observed at the beginning of the decline of the dynasty, in the time of Cleopatra II and Cleopatra III, mother and daughter, who for several years were formally two wives of Ptolemy VIII, brother of the former and maternal uncle of the latter. Since Cleopatra II’s first husband (and father of Cleopatra III) was the much beloved in Alexandria Ptolemy VI, while their younger brother was generally hated by the people, there was a lifelong rivalry between the siblings, as well as mother and daughter, which resulted in the division of titles: Cleopatra II retained the title of “queen-sister”, ἡ ἀδελφή, while Cleopatra III was called on inscriptions and papyri “queen-wife”, ἡ γυνή (HÖLBL 2001: 195 f.). Even though the latter title seems to bestow actual political power, the former, being more important from the religious point of view, reflects Cleopatra II’s actual position: for much of the time of the difficult co-rule of the Philometores trio she apparently held the upper hand, ruling for 57 years.

MOTHERS AND SONS: RULING QUEENS

As has been mentioned before, apart from introducing the cult of his sister/wife, Ptolemy II also established the cult of his (and his wife’s) own parents, first of all by organising a huge ceremony, the Ptolemaea in the memory of Soter and Berenice I, which would later become a cyclic event in Alexandria (MACURDY 1932: 43; HÖLBL 2001: 94). The Dionysiac *pompē* or procession which formed a major part of the celebrations, included gilded statues of Alexander and of the king’s parents. In the aforementioned account of this event preserved in Athenaeus (V 197c–203b) there are mentions of temples dedicated to these deities; also the discussed earlier “dynastic” issue shows Soter and Berenice as protective gods of the ruling couple. It is not certain whether the Ptolemaia were

organized for the first time in 282, following the death of Ptolemy Soter, or later, in 279, when Berenice died; with the latter event, and subsequent deification of the late queen, another celebration was for certain connected – the Adonia organized by her daughter, Arsinoe, and described in Theocritus 15 (*The Adoniazusai*). Whatever the exact chronology of these festivals, both these occasions celebrated the parents of the ruling couple. This aspect of dynastic continuity was probably more important for the Macedonians, for whom the idea of kingship had been very much connected with the continuity of the Argead house¹², than for the Egyptians, who had been accustomed to constant shifts of power within the pharaonic families; as long as the rule continued and received divine sanction, the actual parentage was less important, since the king's association was in the first place with the gods.

The continuing tradition of the title Philometor points at the role of the mothers as regents during the childhood of the heirs, at legitimate descent in case of ruling or co-ruling queens, while together with Philopator it hints at the divine qualities of the previous generations, rather than at true affection, especially that the dynasty's history in the 2nd century was not a paragon of perfect family relationship. In one case, that of Ptolemy VI, for whom his mother Cleopatra I was regent for several years, the title Philometor was almost certainly given by the queen, since in the early texts only very simple titulature appeared, while the title Philometor was added only after Ptolemy V's death, when Cleopatra I rose to eminence as the actual ruler, as attested by the telltale demotic formula (PESTMAN 1967: 46): “the pharaohs Cleopatra the mother, the manifest goddess, and Ptolemy son of Ptolemy, the manifest god” (son of Ptolemy being the translation of the patronym)¹³.

The divine parentage seems to have received more attention than the biological ancestry; the Hathoric/Isiac aspect of the queens makes a case for complex incest. The inscriptions accompanying the Edfu relief describe Berenice I as the “god's mother”, which makes a counterpoint to Hathor's and Isis' epithet of “the king's divine mother”. Even though it is usually Isis who is evoked in the Ptolemaic inscriptions, the goddess seems to share many aspects with Hathor, who ever since early pharaonic times was perceived as an archetype of the female, as well as the royal spouse and mother, who combined two endogamic relationships, being at the same time the mother, daughter and companion to Ra,

¹² Whatever the actual practice of succession (see a recent discussion by MITCHELL 2007 for various arguments and bibliography), Curtius (X 6, 10–13) probably conveys genuine feelings for the dynastic continuity which became particularly important in the Hellenistic age.

¹³ AS WHITEHORNE (2001: 86) rightly observes, the order which puts Cleopatra's name in the first place, before that of her son's, is prevalent in demotic texts, while the Greek inscriptions and papyri seem to prefer the son–mother order, not excluding, however, the other version. It may reflect the delicate matter of a woman's position in both traditions: easily acceptable in the role of regent or even ruling queen for the Egyptians, hardly tolerable in this position by the Macedonians.

and the spouse and mother to Ra-Horus (TROY 1986: 53 f.). Thus she became the personification of all aspects of the feminine and helped to form the archetype of *hieros gamos*. By the Hellenistic times both Hathor and Isis were syncretised with Aphrodite, therefore the identification of the queens with the goddess was in a way triple, and both in its religious meaning and in iconography it retained the traits of the three. Arsinoe II was depicted in Egyptian style temple and votive reliefs with a number of variations of composite crowns, in their iconography and meaning alluding to many deities and their aspects (DILS 1998; NILSSON 2010); some of the combinations are believed to have been designed specifically for the queen's divine cult. For instance a relief from Tanis (British Museum, inv. No. EA 1056) combines the attributes of many divinities: the vulture cap (featuring the symbol at Nekhbet the protectress, worn by Isis in her royal aspect), the red crown of Lower Egypt, the full Isis crown (the ostrich feathers symbolizing Maat, the solar disc, the cow's horns), and ram horns.

Among the first generations of the Ptolemies there is one instance when a separate cult is confirmed in the sources for a prematurely deceased child: the daughter of Ptolemy III and Berenice II, also named Berenice, who died in her childhood, was announced a goddess on her own, protectress of her parents (KOENEN 1993: 28) – almost as a female counterpart of Horus/Harpocrates who was the traditional protective deity of the pharaohs. The association of the queens-mothers with Isis, however, gave additional legitimacy to their sons, stressing their position as incarnations of Horus. The character of Arsinoe's deification and her role as a dynastic deity also added to the sacred legitimacy of the Ptolemies: since she was named "daughter of Ammon" (SMITH 1988: 40), she became the symbolic sister of Alexander, thus constituting the link not only with the Egyptian god but also with the divine founder and patron of the dynasty. All her "progeny" was therefore related to Alexander through Ammon, and this link may have formed a counterpart of the alleged descent of Ptolemy Soter from Zeus. Since Zeus and Ammon were one both in the Hellenistic religious frame of mind, and in the legends of Alexander (the "Pseudo-Callisthenes" romance tradition) which by all probability originated from the Alexandrian court and intellectual circles (STONEMAN 1991: 10 f.), the Zeus/Ammon related "siblingship" of Arsinoe Philadelphus and Ptolemy Soter reflected the complex relationships between Egyptian deities.

In the later period of the Ptolemaic rule in Egypt a shift in the perception and exploitation of the mother-son relationship within the royal house can be observed. Much as the queens of the dynasty used to play a major role in the political affairs of the state, it is with the dominating figure of Antioch III's daughter, Cleopatra I Syra, that we begin to see the passing of power from the hands of men into the hands of women. Cleopatra I expanded her influence and position beyond that of the king's divine consort (OGDEN 1999: 86), but it would be her granddaughter, Cleopatra III, who – probably in some kind of opposition to her unpopular husband but also in collaboration with him against her enormously

popular mother – managed to assume for the first time a lifetime title of “living Isis” (as *Isis megalē mēter theōn*), and, moreover, the formal title of the “royal calf” for her son, who according to a temple legend was supposed to be born on the day when the sacred bull Apis died (WHITEHORNE 2001: 124 f.). It was also Cleopatra III who chose for her sons the dynastic names of *Alexandros* and *Soter* – clearly referring to the divine ancestors of the dynasty. She was therefore the first Ptolemaic ruler who appreciated the power of the image of the goddess as mother – a mother to Horus the pharaoh – and not only wife and sister (cf. WHITEHORNE 2001: 96 f.), and fully exploited it in her propaganda.

Unfortunately, no certain portraits of the early Cleopatras are preserved, so it is almost impossible to say to what extent these associations were translated into art. Nonetheless, the few images in round sculpture and glyptic with the characteristic “corkscrew” hairstyle (e.g. Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. No. Ma 3546; Nicosia, Cyprus Museum, inv. No. J 745), as well as the eminence of the image of a similar Isis/Demeter representation on the 2nd century bronzes, may be indicative of the growing importance of the goddess as associated with the royal women.

The last Ptolemaic queen, Cleopatra VII, who after two quite unfortunate (and probably ill-fated from the beginning) formal marriages with her brothers – sole female rule was not widely accepted by both Greeks and Egyptians – eventually made her son Ptolemy XV Caesarion formal co-ruler, and officially exerted power in his name, in the long tradition of royal mothers acting as regents. She was the only queen to portray herself on her coins with her son; the earlier issue of Ptolemy VI (British Museum, inv. No. 1978-10-21-1) bears the portraits of the young king and his mother on the obverse and reverse respectively. The already mentioned Paphos issue of Cleopatra VII (SVOR. 1874) is the only monetary example of the exploitation of both the relationship between a ruling mother and her minor son, and its associations with the goddess Isis/Aphrodite represented as a mother suckling her child. The little bronze of the last and greatest queen of the Ptolemaic dynasty sums up the three centuries long history of binding the family relationships of the kings, queens and their progeny with the ancient traditions of the direct link between royalty and divinity in Egypt.

On a stele from the Louvre (E 27113) Cleopatra VII was also portrayed either as a pharaoh worshipping the suckling Isis, or as the goddess being worshipped by her brother or son as pharaoh (the image does not allow for certainty as far as identification of the persons present goes), and the stele combines the purely Egyptian style of representation with a Greek inscription – a fine and telltale example of the ultimate merging of all the elements: the Greek and the Egyptian, the royal and the divine, the masculine and the feminine.

REFERENCES

- SNG France: *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, France 3, Cabinet des Médailles*, Paris 1994.
- SVOR.: I.N. SVORONOS, *Ta nomismata tou kratous tōn Ptolemaiōn*, vol. 1–4, Athinai 1904–1908.
- ADAMSON 1982: P.B. ADAMSON, *Consanguinous Marriages in the Ancient World*, Folklore XCIII 1982, pp. 85–92.
- ADRIANI 2000: A. ADRIANI, *La tomba di Alessandro. Realtà, ipotesi e fantasia*, Roma 2000.
- AGER 2005: S.L. AGER, *Familiarity Breeds: Incest and the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, JHS CXXV 2005, pp. 1–34.
- 2006: *The Power of Excess: Royal Incest and the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, Anthropologica XLVIII 2006, pp. 165–186.
- BELLINGER 1979: A.R. BELLINGER, *Essays on the Coinage of Alexander the Great*, New York 1979.
- BINGEN 1982: J. BINGEN, *Hellenistic Egypt. Monarchy, Society, Economy, Culture*, Edinburgh 1982.
- BURSTEIN 1982: S.M. BINGEN, *Arsinoe II Philadelphus: A Revisionist View*, in: W.L. ADAMS, E.N. BORZA (eds.), *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage*, Washington 1982, pp. 197–212.
- BURTON 1995: J.B. BURTON, *Theocritus's Urban Mimes. Mobility, Gender, and Patronage*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1995.
- CADELL 1998: H. CADELL, *À quelle date Arsinoé II Philadelphie est-elle décédée?*, in: H. MELAERTS (ed.), *Le culte du souverain dans l'Égypte Ptolémaïque au IIIe siècle avant notre ère. Actes du colloque international, Bruxelles 10 mai 1995*, Leuven 1998, pp. 1–4.
- CARNEY 1987: E. CARNEY, *The Reappearance of Royal Sibling Marriage in Ptolemaic Egypt*, PP CCXXXVII 1987, pp. 420–439.
- 1991: 'What's in a Name?' *The Emergence of a Title for Royal Women in the Hellenistic Period*, in: S.B. POMEROY (ed.), *Women's History and Ancient History*, Chapel Hill 1991.
- 2000: *The Initiation of Cult for Royal Macedonian Women*, CPH XCV 2000, pp. 21–43.
- 2007: *Philippeum, Women and Dynastic Image*, in: HECKEL, TRITILE, WHEATLEY 2007, pp. 27–60.
- COLLINS 1997: N.L. COLLINS, *The various fathers of Ptolemy I*, Mnemosyne L 1997, pp. 436–476.
- DILLERY 2005: J. DILLERY, *Cambyses and the Egyptian Chaosbeschreibung Tradition*, CQ LV 2005, pp. 387–406.
- DILS 1998: P. DILS, *La couronne d'Arsinoé II Philadelphie*, in: W. CLARYSSE, A. SCHOORS, H. WILLEMS (eds.), *Egyptian Religion: The Last Thousand Years: Studies Dedicated to the Memory of Jan Quaegebeur*, vol. 2, Leuven 1998, pp. 1299–1330.
- DROUGOU, SAATSATOGLOU-PALIADELI 2005: S. DROUGOU, Ch. SAATSATOGLOU-PALIADELI, *Vergina. The Land and its History*, Athens 2005.
- FRANDSEN 2009: P.J. FRANDSEN, *Incestuous and Close-kin Marriage in Ancient Egypt and Persia: An Examination of the Evidence*, Copenhagen 2009.
- FRASER 1972: P.M. FRASER, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, vol. 1, Oxford 1972.
- HAMMOND 2000: N.G.L. HAMMOND, *The Continuity of Macedonian Institutions and the Macedonian Kingdoms of the Hellenistic Era*, Historia XLIX 2000, pp. 141–160.
- HECKEL, TRITILE, WHEATLEY 2007: W. HECKEL, L. TRITILE, P. WHEATLEY (eds.), *Alexander's Empire. Formulation to Decay*, Claremont 2007.
- HÖLBL 2001: G. HÖLBL, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, trans. by T. SAAVEDRA, London–New York 2001.
- KOENEN 1993: L. KOENEN, *The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure*, in: A. BULLOCH, E.S. GRUEN, A.A. LONG, A. STEWART (eds.), *Images and Ideologies. Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley 1993, pp. 26–115.
- KOTTARIDI 2011: A. KOTTARIDI, *Queens, princesses and high priestesses: the role of women at the Macedonian court*, in: *Heraclēs to Alexander the Great. Treasures from the Royal Capital of Macedon, a Hellenic Kingdom in the Age of Democracy (Exhibition catalogue, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, 7 April–29 August 2011)*, pp. 93–126.

- LAPATIN 2001: K.D.S. LAPATIN, *Chryselephantine Statuary in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Oxford 2001.
- ŁUKASZEWICZ 2006: A. ŁUKASZEWICZ, *Egipt Greków i Rzymian*, Warszawa 2006.
- MACURDY 1934: G.H. MACURDY, *Hellenistic Queens. A Study in Woman Power in Macedonia, Seleucid Syria, and Ptolemaic Egypt*, Baltimore 1934.
- MIDDLETON 1962: R. MACURDY, *Brother–Sister and Father–Daughter Marriage in Ancient Egypt*, *American Sociological Review* XXVII 1962, pp. 603–611.
- MITCHELL 2007: L. MITCHELL, *Born to Rule? Succession in the Argead Royal House*, in: HECKEL, TRITLE, WHEATLEY 2007, pp. 61–74.
- MODRZEJEWSKI 1955: J. MODRZEJEWSKI, *Małżeństwo między bratem a siostrą w grecko-rzymskim Egipcie*, *Meander* X 1955, pp. 431–437.
- MØRKHOLM 1991: O. MØRKHOLM 1991, *Early Hellenistic Coinage. From the Accession of Alexander to the Peace of Apamea (336–188 B.C.)*, ed. by P. GRIERSON, U. WESTERMARK, Cambridge 1991.
- NILSSON 2010: M. NILSSON, *The Crown of Arsinoë II. The Creation and Development of an Imagery of Authority*, Gothenburg 2010.
- NOCK 1930: A.D. NOCK, *Synnaos theos*, *HSCPh* XLI 1930, pp. 1–62.
- OGDEN 1999: D. OGDEN, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death. The Hellenistic Dynasties*, London–Swansea 1999.
- PESTMAN 1967: P.W. PESTMAN, *Chronologie égyptienne d'après les textes démotiques (332 av. J.-C.–453 ap. J.-C.)*, Leiden 1967 (*Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava*, vol. 15).
- QUAEGEBEUR 1978: J. QUAEGEBEUR, *Reines ptolémaïques et traditions égyptiennes*, in: H. MAEHLER, V.M. STROCKA (eds.), *Das Ptolemäische Ägypten. Akten des internationalen Symposions 27.–29. September 1976 in Berlin*, Mainz 1978, pp. 245–262.
- SCHUIDEL 2002: W. SCHUIDEL, *Brother–Sister and Parent–Child Marriage in Premodern Societies*, in: K. AOKI, T. AKAZAWA (eds.), *Human Mate Choice and Prehistoric Marital Networks: International Symposium 16, November 20–24, 2000*, Kyoto 2002, pp. 33–47.
- SHAW 1992: B.D. SHAW, *Explaining Incest: Brother–Sister Marriage in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, *Man (New Series)* XXVII 1992, pp. 267–299.
- SMITH 1988: R.R.R. SMITH, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, Oxford 1988.
- SPOONER 1966: B. SPOONER, *Iranian Kinship and Marriage*, *Iran* IV 1966, pp. 51–59.
- STANWICK 2002: P.E. STANWICK, *Portraits of the Ptolemies: Greek Kings as Egyptian Pharaohs*, Austin 2002.
- STONEMAN 1991: R. STONEMAN, *The Greek Alexander Romance*, London 1991.
- TROY 1986: L. TROY, *Patterns of Queenship in Ancient Egyptian Myth and History*, Uppsala 1986.
- WHITEHORNE 2001: J. WHITEHORNE, *Cleopatra*, London–New York 2001.
- WORTHINGTON 2008: I. WORTHINGTON, *Philip II of Macedonia*, New Haven–London 2008.