The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Steack's *Dynasty of the Ptolemies* M. L. Strack: *Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer*. Pp. X.+294. Berlin. 1897.

B. P. Grenfell

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 01 / February 1899, pp 54 - 56

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00042402, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00042402

How to cite this article:

B. P. Grenfell (1899). The Classical Review, 13, pp 54-56 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00042402

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

poetical composition derived its name *συμφῶδια*,¹ was actually its author.' The extract here given as a specimen is solid stuff, so far as it goes. We do indeed miss the obvious comparison with Theocr. *Id.* ii.; and the possibility that the Fragment is after

¹ 'Cp. Strab. 648. On the other hand Dieterich *Pulcinella*, p. 30 derives the word from *Διδόντος* [*sic*] *Δόσιος*.' [This sounds nonsense: Prof. Christ means that the word *Αυσιδῶς*, which in Strabo *loc. cit.* is linked with *Μαργδοῖ* and closely follows *τὴν Συμφῶδιαν*, is according to Dieterich connected with *Διδόντος* *Δόσιος*, not as Strabo implies with *Δόσις*.]

all rhythmical prose (Grenfell, Diels, Blass, Weil) rather than poetry (Crusius, Rohde, Wilamowitz) should have been recorded. Still, everything cannot be said. The second edition contained six sheets more than the first; the third contains ten sheets more than the second, and runs up to 946 pp., exclusive of the eighteen plates of authors' busts and statues given at the end. The book as it stands is certainly the widest and fullest one-volume history of Greek Literature in existence.

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

STRACK'S DYNASTY OF THE PTOLEMIES.

M. L. STRACK: *Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer*. Pp. x. + 294. Berlin. 1897.

THERE are few periods of ancient history for which at once the literary sources are so scanty, the materials afforded by archaeology so considerable and so miscellaneous, as that of the Ptolemies. The author of this book has performed a most valuable service in putting together the widely-scattered evidence bearing on the chief problems connected with the Ptolemaic dynasty, and in attempting a critical estimate of the very divergent views which have been held on most points. While some few of the difficulties admit of a definite solution, it is not our author's fault that in a great number of questions our sources of information are still insufficient for him to obtain a very convincing answer.

The book is divided into four chapters, of which the first deals with the order and relationship of the various sovereigns and of those associated with them. In the third century B.C., in which the baleful custom of intermarriage between brother and sister and the recognition of the rights of queens to sovereignty had not yet produced a cloud of complications, there are but few difficulties. The chief problem is the personality of the mysterious son of Philadelphus, who appears with his father in the protocols of papyri dated between the nineteenth and twenty-seventh years of the second Ptolemy. Strack, following Wiedemann, identifies him doubtfully with Euergetes, but confesses his inability to account for his disappearance from the dates in the year 27. Another explanation has recently been advocated by Prott (*Rhein. Mus.* liii. 460), that the *viós* in

question was an obscure son of Philadelphus mentioned by Athenaeus and Trogus, a theory which is as impossible to prove or disprove as the other. The only fact that is tolerably certain is that the *viós* was not a son of Arsinoe II., since it is now known that she did not live till the twenty-seventh year, and according to the scholiast on Theocritus she died *ἄτεκνος*. Hence Krall's explanation that the *viós* was a son of Arsinoe II. and died in infancy is a degree worse than the other two. In the second century B.C. we are met by a more serious difficulty, the position of Eupator and Philopator Neos in the order of kings. Which of these was the son of Philometor, murdered by Euergetes II. in 146, and who was the other? As regards Eupator the question would seem to be settled, as Strack observes, by a Cypriote inscription which calls him the son of the gods Philometores. Philopator Neos is supposed, on the strength of a coin with a double date (year 50 = 1) to have been regent in Cyprus about 120 B.C. This, however, is far from certain.

The dates in papyri of the second Euergetes' reign cause some difficulty owing to their varying statements concerning the king's wives. He is represented as reigning sometimes with Cleopatra II. 'the sister,' sometimes with Cleopatra III. 'the wife,' sometimes with both. By making a chronological list of all the authorities, and rejecting a few that were inconvenient, Strack reaches the general conclusion (p. 49) that there were at least twelve changes between B.C. 145 and 116. From the thirtieth to the thirty-fourth years only Cleopatra II. is assigned to the king. But in a recently discovered papyrus of the

thirty-second year (Grenfell and Hunt, *Greek Papyri* ii., No. 15) he is stated to have been reigning with both Cleopatras; so that two more changes would have to be postulated. Future discoveries will probably extend the number of variations further. But is this the way to construct history? Strack takes the Egyptian scribes much too seriously. Their dates can generally be trusted for what they actually say, but extreme caution is necessary in arguing from what they omit. It would be just as reasonable to argue from the alternate omission and insertion of Philopator Neos in the lists of deified Ptolemies found in papyri of Soter II.'s reign, that his name was being constantly struck out and re-admitted. As Mahaffy has remarked, it is much more probable that during the greater part of his reign Euergetes II. was really reigning with both Cleopatras, and the omission of one or the other in the dates is largely accidental. A good illustration of the weakness of the *argumentum a silentio* occurs in connection with the titles of Ptolemy Alexander. Strack (p. 135) infers from the omission of the title Soter in Leyden Papyrus O, dated in the twenty-sixth year of that king, that although he had the title during the early part of his reign, he renounced it in B.C. 101, when he murdered his mother. But in an unpublished papyrus, also dated in the twenty-sixth year of Ptolemy Alexander, in the possession of Lord Amherst of Hackney, the reigning sovereigns are called *θεοὶ φιλομήτορες σωτῆρες*, showing that the omission of the title *σωτήρ* in Leyden pap. O is almost certainly accidental.

The second chapter deals with the laws of succession to the throne. Here we are met at the outset by the doubt whether any definite or consistent law of succession existed. Wide generalities are perhaps possible, but are not very enlightening; and when we come to questions of detail, which are, of course, what we want to know, so many reservations are necessary that it is very difficult to apply rules at all. Undeterred, however, by these obstacles, Strack arrives at the following conclusions (p. 75). (1) The throne descends in the male line, *perhaps* on the principle of division of the kingdom between sons, without any special privileges for the eldest. (2) From the time of Cleopatra II. onwards, when the equal rights of queens to sovereignty were admitted, the throne devolves upon the surviving queen, who is required, however, to share it with a male member of the family. (3) Daughters have no claims to

the throne in the lifetime of legitimate male descendants. (4) Illegitimate children have no rights to the throne. Under the term *illegitimate* are included children not born in the purple.

On this it may be observed that the second point, if not inconsistent with, at any rate profoundly modifies the first, and that much the most important point is the last, that children born before their father's accession were illegitimate, an ingenious theory suggested by Mahaffy. The question is, unfortunately, very difficult, because it is in the first century B.C. that we hear most of these illegitimate princes and princesses, and for that period the literary sources are more than usually worthless, and contemporary records are still very rare. If we knew who Ptolemy Apion was, who was Ptolemy Auletes' mother, what became of the two children born to Lathyrus after he became king, or even what Strabo meant when he asserted that of the three daughters born to Auletes after he came to the throne, only the eldest was *γνήσια*, then we might be in a position to decide what was meant by the common charge of illegitimacy. With regard to the passage in Strabo, indeed, Mahaffy adopts the heroic remedy of inserting *οὐ* in the critical place. But it is not very encouraging for the theory that where by a happy chance it became open to verification, it has signally broken down. Soter I. assumed the kingly title in 305 B.C., and since there was never any doubt about Philadelphus' legitimacy, it was necessary for Strack, in the interests of the theory, to place Philadelphus' birth not earlier than 305-4, a date which, in the absence of direct evidence, was tenable, though for various reasons not very satisfactory. But since the publication of Strack's book the new fragment of the Parian Chronicle has been discovered, which places Philadelphus' birth in 309-8 B.C., a date which is likely to hold the field for some time.

In his third chapter Strack discusses the individual names of the Ptolemies. The most interesting problem arises in connection with the second Ptolemy. Did he have the title Philadelphus during his lifetime, or was it transferred to him afterwards from the great Arsinoe? Strack decides for the first alternative, but his arguments on *a priori* grounds have not weakened my adherence to the other view, advocated by Wilcken, to which the evidence at present seems to point. The continued absence of any mention of Ptolemy II. with the title *φίλαδελφος* until the second century B.C., the

use of ἡ φιλάδελφος in the Revenue Papyrus in reference to Arsinoë, and still more the fact that although Arsinoë was deified as θεὰ φιλάδελφος, Ptolemy II. and Arsinoë together are not θεοὶ φιλάδελφοι, but θεοὶ ἀδελφοί, seem to me to outweigh Strack's objection, that if the second Ptolemy was not deified as θεὸς φιλάδελφος in his lifetime, it is not easy to see under what title he was deified. The question of Philadelphus' title is of some importance because it is bound up with the larger question of the origin of these titles in general; and it follows from my disagreement with Strack about the name Philadelphus, that I think he has considerably underestimated the connection between these titles and the religious cults.

On the general question of the chronology of the period, which forms chapter iv., Strack pins his faith to the canon of Ptolemy, the geographer. There follows a very useful chronological table with elaborate notes giving the authorities for the dates. Last, but not least, comes a most welcome collection of Ptolemaic inscriptions bearing on points discussed in the book. I only wish that Strack would go a step further and give us a full collection of Ptolemaic inscriptions, a task which is much required and which no one is more competent than himself to undertake. In inscription 95 (p. 251) occurs the mutilated passage...καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι... ΙΣ Ν...ΥΑΙΑΣ τοῦ Χνόμω Νεβιήθ καὶ θεῶν... The first doubtful word is presumably ἱερεῖς and the last must be φιλίας, cf. *Berlin. Griech. Urkund.* i. 17, *al.* ἱερεῖσι πενταφυλίας Σοκνοπαίου θεοῦ μεγάλου, from which it may be safely conjectured that the intervening word in the inscription is a number, perhaps H.

One of the great difficulties confronting anyone who writes about the Ptolemies is that many of the most important papyri are written in demotic, and that the decipherment and translation of them are far too often in doubt. Strack rightly makes full use of the contributions from scholars

like Brugsch and Krall, and in discussing those of Revillout he often shows great judgment in separating the wheat from the chaff. But he is somewhat apt to mislead the unwary by arguing from uncorroborated versions of Revillout's demotic texts as if they could be depended upon almost as much as a Greek text. How much caution is necessary in dealing with Revillout's readings and inferences from demotic papyri, where he generally cannot be controlled, may be gauged by an examination of his readings of and inferences from Greek papyri, where he generally can. I quote a rather amusing example which occurs in Strack's book (p. 144), and to which Strack hardly brings his customary acuteness; but there are numbers of hardly less egregious blunders throughout Revillout's *Mélanges sur la métrologie, l'économie politique*, etc. A letter of a soldier in the Louvre collection, written in the fifteenth year of an unnamed king, concludes according to Revillout thus—καὶ εαυτων δ επιμελομενοι γλουτ/ αγνοητε, and he positively infers from this that γλοντός ('rump') was a nickname of Euergetes II. This is too much for even Strack to believe, though he fails to detect where the error lies. Of course, the sentence should be read καὶ εαυτων δ επιμελομενοι ιν γγαινητε, one of the commonest formulae in ending a second century B.C. letter.

I have had occasion in this review to point out several alterations, which even in the short period since the publication of Strack's book are necessitated by fresh discoveries. That this process will continue far is certain; how far, it would be idle to speculate. But as a storehouse of information up to 1897 about the problems connected with the Ptolemaic dynasty and as a comprehensive and generally judicious survey of the various explanations which have been suggested, the book will be of the greatest service to every student of the Ptolemaic period.

B. P. GRENFELL.

KENYON'S GREEK PAPYRI, VOL. II.

Greek Papyri in the British Museum. Catalogue with texts, Vol. ii. Edited by F. G. KENYON, with 123 Facsimiles, 1898.

THE rapidly-swelling papyrus literature has lately received a notable addition in Mr.

Kenyon's second instalment of the Catalogue of Greek Papyri in the British Museum. The new volume covers the acquisitions made by the Museum between 1891 and 1895—some 400 documents in all. Of this number 262 texts are here printed in full, and careful