Mairi Gkikaki

Some Thoughts on Individuality
in the Representations
of the Ptolemaic Queens

Nel contributo si analizza lo sviluppo dei ritratti delle regine tolemaiche con particolare attenzione rivolta ai tipi di raffigurazioni. In genere gli studi finora apparsi distinguono tra ritratti di tipo egizio e quelli di tipo greco. A partire dalla seconda metà del III secolo a.C. è tuttavia possibile identificare sculture in stile egizio con resa naturalistica dei tratti del volto dal gusto chiaramente greco. Tale elemento ha una funzione individualizzante ed è ben osservabile su una statua di Berenice II Evergete (267/6-221 a.C.), oggi al Museo Egizio di Torino, così come su una scultura in basalto raffigurante Arsinoe III Filopatore (246/5-204 a.C.) conservata a Copenaghen. Quest'ultima reca inoltre un'acconciatura greca. L'individualità della regina non viene così affidata soltanto ad elementi iconografici quali la cornucopia, il diadema o il velo, ma viene accompagnata dalla resa individualizzata del volto.

Un caso particolare è quello della regina identificata come Iside. Questo tipo è osservabile a livello scultoreo a partire dalla fine del II secolo a.C. quando la dea viene raffigurata col medesimo abito in uso nel suo culto da parte delle regine tolemaiche almeno fin dall'epoca di Tolomeo IV Filopatore (222-205 a.C.), mentre la regina assume nelle sue rappresentazioni la caratteristica acconciatura della dea.

The search for representations of the individual in antiquity leads us inevitably to human beings and the features that lend them their own peculiar character, unique appearance, behavioural patterns, and, therefore, their unmistakable individuality.

According to Aristotle, a key feature for humans and for all living beings is development (*Physics* III,201a,10). By «development» Aristotle meant a gradual advancement through progressive stages, a process within which the fuller unfolding is realized, bringing the

innate purposes of every being in fulfilment[1]. The Ptolemaic queens and their iconography from the 3rd to 2nd century B.C. offer a superb case study. Viewed as a group in space and time, these queens form a clearly defined assembly. Their development was twofold: they developed not only as parts of the group of their kind, but also individually during their lifetimes, as well as posthumously.

Although ancient historiographers have dedicated nothing more than a few lines to the lives of the Ptolemaic queens, this is hardly the case for modern scholars who have demonstrated a keen interest in their obscure personalities and met the challenge of reconstructing a rather complicated puzzle. The study of the portraits of the Ptolemaic queens has likewise proved a very rewarding one. The term «portrait» could be, at first sight, considered excessive since these works demonstrate little resemblance to true physical appearance. Thorough analysis of the available representations on coins and in stone, however, proves that the portraits were endowed with considerable amounts of individuality. The wide diversity in the attributes employed, especially for the Egyptian-style representations of the queens, gave prominence to these individual qualities. This is all the more evident in the case of the queens of the later 2nd century B.C. who had actually ruled as co-regents, and this period coincides with the adaptation of the Isis-imagery for the female members of the royal family.

Former Classification of Ptolemaic Portraits and Construction of Iconography

In relation to Ptolemaic art, various attempts have been made to categorize its monuments, and naturally the representations of queens according to the varying degrees of influence exercised by the Greek and Egyptian sides, respectively. As a result, scholars in the 20th century had conveniently divided the Ptolemaic statuary into stylistic categories that are of use for all Archaeology and Art History students[2]. Indirectly, a central question of both these attempts was to determine which one of the two styles – the Greek or the Egyptian – had the greatest share of influence. The model envisaged was thus highly competitive and paid little respect to artistic inspiration in a multi-cultural, cosmopolitan environment[3].

On at least three specific occasions, we have concrete historical information on the construction of iconography in a given place and time: firstly, upon the posthumous deification of Arsinoe II. The double cornucopia was designated as her own constitutional badge by her brother-husband, Ptolemy II, whereas a special crown was invented for the Egyptian-style representations[4]. Secondly, the crown that was designed and ordered by decree for the young Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy III Euergetes upon her premature death and subsequent deification is yet another case of an individual element styled for a queen[5]. Thirdly, and most importantly, the introduction of the particular Isis dress and Isis hairstyle for queens that occurred by the late 3rd century B.C.

Deification Pattern

It must be admitted that actual historical evidence concerning the deification of the Ptolemaic queens is meagre, whereas the amount of relevant archaeological information is extraordinary large. Some thoughts made by Peter Marshall Fraser should be noted since deification was closely related to the development of iconography. According to the scheme established by Fraser, the process of deification followed a threefold scheme with chronological significance[6]. The first stage consisted of the assumption of cult names, whether these were names that alluded to loyalty in royal family such as the «Theoi Philadelphoi», or names that derived of the cults of Greek and Egyptian divinities. Evidence for the latter case can be found in an Alexandrian loan contract papyrus of 252/1 B.C. where the names of various streets in the city of Alexandria are given. The names could derive from shrines on these streets since they all refer to Arsinoe under various qualities. These qualities of Arsinoe are connected to Hera, Athena, Demeter, Nike, and Isis[7].

The second phase of identification consists of cases where both the goddess and the queen are mentioned. The queen is then venerated as «synnaos» and «symbomos» (temple sharing and altar-sharing goddess). This is, for example, the case on the Ptolemaic *oinochoai*[8]. On them, the queen offers libations on an altar that is inscribed with her own name, along with the names of Agathe Tyche and Isis.

The third and ultimate stage of assimilation is complete identification, with the effect that even the name of the queen is suppressed. By the time of the third Cleopatra, the phenomenon had reached its mature phase: Cleopatra III identified herself with Isis and an eponymous priesthood of her as «Isis, the Great Mother of the Gods» was established, which lasted from about 131 to 104 B.C.[9].

Arsinoe II Philadelphos

Arsinoe II Philadelphos was not the first queen to receive divine honours. When Berenice I – the mother of Ptolemy II – passed away in 279 B.C., she received divine honours and was also worshipped individually in the temple called the Berenikeion[10]. The existence of this temple implies that images of her were also constructed; but the images preserved on the double portrait of Ptolemy I and Berenice I on the gold mnaeia produced since 261 B.C. and on the plaster cast of a cameo are the only ones preserved today[11].

Far more evidence is available for the images of Arsinoe II Philadelphos (316-270 B.C.). At the time she was commemorated on works of art that were either purely pharaonic or purely Greek. A mixture of the two styles is not observed. Divine features and attributes were added in both cases. The statue in the Vatican has a back pillar, a typical feature of Egyptian sculpture. The tripartite wig with the double *uraeus* and *menit* are inspired by the iconography of the queens of the New Kingdom. Her image as a whole is purely pharaonic[12].

Fig. 1
AU Mnaieon, 29 mm, 27.81 g. Arsinoe II Philadelphos
(Ptolemy II Philadelphos before 246 B.C.).
Berlin Coin cabinet obj. no. 18217867
(https://ikmk.smb.museum/object?id=18217867,
last accessed: 23/10/2020).

Fig. 2
AU Mnaeion, 29 mm, 27.72 g. Berenice II Euergetes
(Ptolemy III Euergetes 246-222 B.C.).
Berlin Coin cabinet obj. no. 18203065
(https://ikmk.smb.museum/object?id=18203065,
last accessed: 23/10/2020).

The same purity is preserved on the Greek-style representations of the same queen. Most prominent among them are the coin portraits on the gold mnaeia (fig. 1) and the decadrachms, which were struck posthumously in her name and with her own personal types[13]. The veiled head and the melon coiffure inevitably remind the viewer of her young portrait, as preserved on silver and bronze issues of the city of Ephesos, dated to Arsinoe's lifetime and more particularly between 300 and 281/0 B.C. while she was wife of Lysimachos and Queen of Thrace[14]. The diadem worn on her hair on the posthumous coin portraits was, according to ancient testimony, actually given to Arsinoe by virtue of her being wife of the king[15]. The *stephane* was appropriate for a Goddess and it was connected with Hera and Aphrodite[16]. The ram's horn that is curved around her ear is reminiscent of Amun, with whom the pharaohs identified themselves. The sceptre that rests at her shoulder is also of pharaonic inspiration and betrays her association to Isis[17]. On the reverse, the double cornucopia constitutes Arsinoe's badge, as Athenaeus clearly reveals. The cornucopia is known from representations of Tyche and Hera since Classical times, but the inscription on the Ptolemaic oinochoai links Arsinoe with Good Fortune (Agathe Tyche)[18]. This coin portrait may bear a resemblance to Greek-style representations on stone. Indeed, portrait heads such as the one of the Antoniades Collection were once veiled and bore a diadem and also a *stephane*[19]. The bronze statuette in the British Museum is a figure related to these portraits, and thus provides us with information on the imagery[20].

Berenice II Euergetes

The second half of the 3rd century B.C. is the time of Berenice II Euergetes (267/6-221 B.C.) and Arsinoe III Philopator (246/5-204 B.C.), and is distinguished by the marked division between Greek- and Egyptian-style representations. The two main styles of portraits inaugurated by Arsinoe Philadelphos are therefore followed by the queens of the later part of the 3rd century B.C. The Egyptian style representations cannot be securely identified with any

sculpture in the round, since inscriptions and attributes are lacking. Nevertheless, the increasing degree of amalgamation expressed in the naturalistic execution of face features and hair, which clearly have Greek origins, is new.

Enough information survives so as to show that their glorification was styled on the pattern of Arsinoe Philadelphos. Interestingly, both queens of the later 3rd century were revered during their lifetimes in the broader frame of the dynastic cult and at the sides of their king husbands. Substantial evidence exists for the assimilation of Berenice II and Arsinoe III to goddesses (Isis in particular, and Berenice alone to Demeter), an aspect that stems from her dynastic name, Benefactress[21]. Furthermore, Berenice II was the first queen to appear behind her husband on Egyptian temple reliefs that depicted the assumption of royal power[22]. She had also exercised royal power, firstly as sole ruler of Cyrene, and secondly during her husband's absence in the so-called «Laodicean War». She was also the first queen to mint coins in her lifetime-her own peculiar types.[23] Her coin portraits (fig. 2) are deprived of the deification symbols of her predecessor.

A statue in Turin (fig. 3) is dated on stylistic grounds to the time of Berenice II and could be a portrait of her[24]. The figure wears a tripartite wig and vulture headdress, which is decorated with what appears to be a triple *uraeus*. The crown is missing. At first sight the figure has all the typical features of the Egyptian sculpture, but the face is rounded and fleshy, the lips are slightly downturned, and the eyes are defined by a curved upper line and a straight bottom line instead of the typical almond-shaped eyes of Egyptian sculpture. The nose appears to have been short and quite broad. An important point is that the upper part of the face shows signs of reworking; these are detectable in the hollowed-out surface below the eyes. At some point, therefore, the piece was intended to be a portrait, and it was modified by the ad-

Fig. 3
Statue, perhaps a Portrait of Berenice II Euergetes. Turin Museo Egizio 1385 (H 101.7 cm).

Fig. 4
AU Octodrachme, 27 mm, 27.75 g. Arsinoe III Philopator
(Ptolemy V Epiphanes 204-203 B.C.).
Berlin Coin Cabinet obj. no. 18203066
(https://ikmk.smb.museum/object?id=18203066,
last accessed: 23/10/2020)

Fig. 5
AU Octodrachme, 28 mm, 27,84 g.
Kleopatra I (180-176 B.C.).
British Museum 1978, 1021.1.
© The Trustees of the British Museum.

dition of individual features. Provided that the dating is right, this is one of the earliest testimonies for an attempt to embellish a statue of the traditional Egyptian style with physiognomic traits.

The basalt head that is kept in Copenhagen takes us one step further[25]. It is unfortunately of unknown provenance, and because it is the only surviving part of the statue we do not know how the figure was draped. A Greek hairstyle is combined here with a hard stone material. Furthermore, the rather naturalistically modelled individual features are modulated in the geometrical language of Egyptian art. The majority of the scholars agree in identifying it with Arsinoe III Philopator due to its closeness to the marble portrait of the same queen in Boston[26].

These two portraits constitute a milestone in the long process of the reciprocal influence of the Egyptian and Greek styles: the procedure of amalgamation has reached a culmination and has almost exhausted its limits. In the subsequent phase new forms of representation will be explored.

Coin portraits of Arsinoe III are also known, but they are dated posthumously to the reign of Ptolemy V[27]. The queen is represented as unveiled, permitting an unobscured view of her diadem and *stephane* (fig. 4). The latter, along with the sceptre, are certainly inspired by Arsinoe II. The cornucopia on the reverse is distinguishable from that of her predecessors in that its curve is turned leftwards. It also has a different, more elaborate form, and the fruit is arranged in a different way[28].

By the late 3rd century B.C., the earliest representation of a Ptolemaic queen with the central fold and the knot between the breasts, which will become the typical Isis dress, had been formed. The Stela of Tanis, dated to the reign of Ptolemy IV Philopator (222-205 B.C.), is one of the earliest examples of a queen wearing the typical Isis costume that would become so popular for queens and Isis alike in the next century[29]. The Isis dress sprang out of Egyptian tradition, and predecessors are to be found in private portraits of the Egyptian style. None

of the early representations of the Isis dress have an association with the goddess. It has also been observed that the queens are depicted with the Isis dress on Egyptian temple reliefs concerning ancestral worship, or the assumption of power, or the counting of regal years[30].

By the first half of the second century B.C. corkscrew locks had been added and a new type of portrait is established. Particularly in the case of the corkscrew locks, relevant scholarship has suggested an Egyptian or Greek origin. Evidently, forerunners had existed in Egypt, but «it was their Ptolemaic adaptation that eventually pervaded the Hellenistic world»[31].

The reasons for inaugurating Isis iconography are not exactly known. Certainly, such a ceremonial knotted dress would have existed and would have been worn by the queens on appropriate occasions. Another reason would be to distinguish the queens from the representations of the goddess on the Egyptian temple reliefs, who follows the traditional Egyptian costume. It is also of importance that no statue of a queen wearing the Isis dress has been found in Egyptian temples, but all come from Alexandria and its surroundings. During the latter part of the 2nd century B.C., when the Isis dress was introduced for Isis, the association was evident: the statues of the queen presented from this point elevated her to the status of a goddess[32].

Cleopatra I

The queen's appearance was therefore changed and developed, so as to accommodate the new styles of representation. The fact is that by the time of the Cleopatra I the forms of deification, and most significantly the role of the queen in the share of power had radically changed. After the death of her husband (180 B.C.), Cleopatra became regent to her son, who was only six years old[33]. On official documents of the time, Cleopatra I is named first, followed by the name her son[34]. On the unique gold octodrachm, Cleopatra I takes the prominent obverse. Her son's portrait on the reverse is of smaller proportions (fig. 5). The family resemblance between the two establishes Cleopatra's role as wife and mother – a necessary intermediate role for the succession of the legitimate heir to the throne[35]. The representation follows a type that was inaugurated by Arsinoe II: it shows the queen veiled, wearing a *stephane* on her hair, and resting the sceptre on her shoulder. Just like Berenice II before her, she ruled and had the right to struck coins with her own name and types within her lifetime.

On the bronze issues of the time, which certainly circulated more widely, it seems possibly that an ambivalence was desirable: the female head on the obverse with the corkscrew locks and the corn wreath can be naturally considered a representation of Isis[36]. On at least one issue, however, the legend around the head reads «ΚΛΕΟΠΑΤΡΑΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΗΣ», thus making the theory that the queen could be depicted in the guise of Isis-Demeter seem quite possible[37]. The fact that Cleopatra I could be rendered with corkscrew locks is exemplified by the Ptolemaic *oinochoe* in Oxford[38].

The few stone portraits that have been associated with Cleopatra I are all dated on stylistic grounds. They sport a corkscrew coiffure and demonstrate youthful features just like those in her portrait on the gold issue. The queen had indeed barely reached the age of 28 at the time of her death. The head in Brooklyn Museum (fig. 6) has youthful qualities and is softly rendered, it sports a diadem with a triple *uraeus* over the forehead[39].

For the statuette in New York (fig. 7), an identification either as Cleopatra I or Cleopatra II has been suggested[40]. Along with the head preserved in Brooklyn, these are two of the few examples of triple *uraeus*. The single *uraeus* was an attribute of kings and gods since the Old Kingdom. From the Middle Kingdom onwards, the *uraeus* was also peculiar to the queens so that the hieroglyph for «queen» is a *uraeus*. All of the known cases of the triple *uraeus* are dated to Ptolemaic times and all are representations of queens. Not one case of a Ptolemaic king with a triple *uraeus* is known. According to one theory, the triple *uraeus* could be a symbol for the queen, like the king's mother symbolized Isis. The symbolism was certainly of particularly importance since it exemplified the dynasty's obsession with dynastic loyalty[41].

Fig. 6
Portrait of Cleopatra I (?).
Limestone, H. 13.7 cm.
Brooklyn Museum,
Charles Edwin Wilbour Fund, 71.12.
Creative Commons-BY.
(Photo: Brooklyn Museum,
71.12_front_PS1.jpg).

During the latter part of the 2nd century B.C., the image of Arsinoe was also adapted to the newly introduced style. The statue in New York (fig. 8) sports a corkscrew coiffure and a dress with the typical Isis knot; but the figure stands out among her contemporaries, since the queen holds a double cornucopia. Individuality is therefore secured through the use of this distinct attribute: Arsinoe's personal badge[42].

Cleopatra II (185-116 B.C.), daughter of Cleopatra I, was consort to her brother, Ptolemy VI Philometor, from 175 B.C. After his death (145 B.C.), she went on to marry her brother, Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II. The three of them ruled jointly between 170 and 164/3 B.C. On temple reliefs Cleopatra II is depicted with the normal iconography for the queen behind her brothers[43].

Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II, by marrying in turn in 142/140 B.C. his own niece and the daughter of Cleopatra II, Cleopatra III (161-101 B.C.), inaugurated a triadic form of monarchy that lasted until 116 B.C. Both wives bore the title of queen, with the addition of sister and wife respectively. In 130 B.C., in the midst of civil war, Cleopatra II proclaimed her independence as «Cleopatra Philometor Soteira»[44]. Cleopatra III, in or-

der to compete, established a new priesthood for herself as «Sacred Foal of Isis, Great Mother of the Gods»[45].

Sculptures that are usually connected with «the time of the Cleopatras» bear without exception the Isis garment and the corkscrew locks[46]. Kyrieleis notes that it is no coincidence that, of the Ptolemaic queens after Cleopatra I, until Cleopatra I no monuments exist in the Greek style until Cleopatra II[47].

Both Cleopatra II and Cleopatra III reached old age. Some of the statues with a back pillar and Isis-style dress, which have been dated on stylistic ground to the later part of the 2nd century B.C., demonstrate massive proportions and heavy drapery that veils the body shapes. They could therefore be depictions of either of the two Cleopatras. Such a figure is the statue in Brooklyn made of basalt[48]. The queen holds the cornucopia with her left arm. On her

Fig. 8
Portrait of Arsinoe II Philadelphos
(second century B.C.).
New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art.
Limestone with traces of gilding and paint,
H. 38.1 cm. Rogers Fund, 1920.
Acc. n.: 20.2.21 © 2014.
Image copyright The Metropolitan
Museum of Art/Art Resource/Scala, Florence.

Fig. 7
Portrait of Cleopatra I or II (?).
Limestone, H. 62.2 cm.
New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art,
Gift of Joseph W. Drexel, 1889.
Acc. n. 89.2.660 © 2014.
Image copyright The Metropolitan
Museum of Art/Art resource/Scala, Florence.

shoulders rest thick corkscrew locks (fig. 9). Moreover, portraits such as the head in Louvre and the one in Vienna (fig. 10) demonstrate a grimy, harsh expression, and heavy facial features[49]. It would not be unreasonable to believe that features of old age were considered as a mark of authority in this case. The portrait in Vienna, in particular, is rather unflattering on the whole. She wears a tubular diadem or circlet, a feature that suggests a priestly function and reminds us of the cult titles of Cleopatra III and the accumulation of priesthoods[50].

Cleopatra III could be considered as the most plausible candidate, since her share of power and importance are abundantly attested. Among other representations of her, the reliefs of the Temple Deir el-Medineh are worth mentioning. In these reliefs, Cleopatra III is (against all traditions) depicted before Ptolemaios IX. Her titles are similar to the ones of Berenice II and name her explicitly as co-regent[51].

Fig. 9
Portrait of Cleopatra II or III (?).
Basalt, H 97.8.
Brooklyn Museum,
Charles Edwin Wilbour Fund, 74.220.
Creative Commons-BY.
(Photo: Brooklyn Museum,
74.220_front_PS9.jpg).

Fig. 10
Portrait of Cleopatra II or III (?).
Basalt, H. 32.5 cm.
Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum,
AS I 406.

Fig. 11
AR Tetradrachm, 27 mm, 14.84 g.
Cleopatra Thea (126/5 B.C.).
American Numismatic Society 0000.999.46369.

Fig. 12
AR Tetradrachm, 30 mm, 16.39 g.
Cleopatra Thea and Antiochus VIII (125-121 B.C.).
Berlin Coin Cabinet obj. no. 18200209
(https://ikmk.smb.museum/object?id=18200209,
last accessed: 24/10/2020).

At about the same time in the Seleucid Kingdom, Cleopatra Thea (164-121 B.C.), daughter of Ptolemy VI of Egypt and of Cleopatra II, was for a short time (126/125 B.C.) sole ruler, and from 125 to 121 B.C. she shared her throne with her son, Antiochus VIII[52]. Her assumption of power was accompanied by a series of tetradrachms that bear the legend: of Queen Cleopatra the Goddess Benefactress (fig. 11). Quite appropriately, the queen adapted a two-tiered corkscrew hairstyle and her facial features are heavy and matronly. For the reverse, the double cornucopia of Arsinoe II was closely copied[53]. Cleopatra clearly asserts her power and ambitions since her depiction is now more than ever individualized in comparison with the early and

rather idealized coin portraits of Cleopatra Thea at the side of Alexander I Balas at the time of their marriage[54]. Both portrait styles were undeniably inspired by Ptolemaic dynastic traditions: the cornucopia was already present on the marriage-issue, and a *stephane* was added to the diadem on the later issues. For the double portraits of Cleopatra Thea and Antiochus VIII, the family similarity must be noted (fig. 12). What is most notable is that Cleopatra is

Fig. 13
Portrait of Cleopatra III (?).
Limestone, H. 24.7 cm.
Baltimore, The Walters Art Museum 22.407,
acquired by Henry Walters, 1928.

Fig. 14
AR Tetradrachme, 25 mm, 14,15 g.
Cleopatra VII and Marc Antony.
Berlin, Coin Cabinet obj. no. 18217908
(https://ikmk.smb.museum/object?id=18217908,
last accessed: 24/10/2020).

Fig. 15
AE, 30 mm, 19.88 g.
Cleopatra VI.
American Numismatic Society 1951.116.420.

prominently depicted before her son, whose face lies in background. She is not the attribute of the man beside her anymore, but instead has the leading role. No portraits of Cleopatra Thea in the round are preserved.

The two-tiered coiffure, with the shorter locks over the ears of her later coin portraits, is nevertheless to be found on contemporary sculptures of the later part of the 2nd century B.C. One example is the limestone head in Alexandria (21992), which sports a diadem and a single *uraeus*. The hairstyle is a hybrid, since new and older elements are combined. The corkscrew locks at the sides are combined with pleats of hair drawn back and curled up the back pillar. On top of her head there is a crown in the form of a circle of *uraei,* which once would have supported the crown[55]. The other example of this two-tiered coiffure can be found on a head in Baltimore (fig. 13)[56]. In both cases, the unusual coiffure can be interpreted as a physiognomic feature. The possibility of a portrait of Cleopatra II, or rather Cleopatra III, in her young years seems plausible. Further support for this possibility is lent by the similar portrait on the Lycomedes gem[57].

The Iconography of Cleopatra VII Philopator: back to tradition

New tendencies are observed in relation to the 1st century B.C. Obviously, the troubles and upheavals of the times brought about a reinstatement of the traditional Egyptian style in sculpture. The queens' statues bear intensively more Egyptian attributes, and art in general is orientated towards models of the early Ptolemaic times. For the Isis-type statues a more youthful appearance is adapted[58]. The old distinction between Greek and Egyptian-style statues appears again. For the latter, a new style is observed: the statues now have broad shoulders, rounded breasts, a slim waist, and a protruding belly. A typical example is the statue in the Vatican[59].

Cleopatra VII, who was the most prominent female person of the Ptolemaic Dynasty for the 1st century B.C., originally ruled jointly with her father, Ptolemy XII Auletes, and later with her brothers, Ptolemy XIII and Ptolemy XIV, whom she married, but eventually she became sole ruler. She later elevated her son with Julius Caesar, Caesarion, to co-regent[60].

Fig. 16
AE 80 drachm, 28 mm, 18.01 g.
Cleopatra VII.
American Numismatic Society 1941.131.1158.

She appears on temple walls, and most magnificent among them is the imposing depiction of her and Caesarion in the Hathor temple in Dendara. There, the queen is associated with Isis and Hathor, and her son with Harsomtus and Harpocrates[61]. The cult titles of Cleopatra VII are far more restrained and simple than those attested for her predecessors. According to Plutarch, Cleopatra herself appeared in public with the sacred costume of Isis and was called «Nea Isis» (*Ant*. 54, 9). On coins with the effigies of Antony and Cleopatra she is called «Thea Neotera»[62]. These coins are remarkable for the fact that Cleopatra's image on the obverse is influenced by the harsh expression of Marc Antony on the reverse (fig. 14)[63].

On the reliefs in Dendara she is depicted wearing a composite crown, very similar to that of Arsinoe[64]. Portraits of Cleopatra in the Egyptian style cannot be identified with any certainty, but the securely identified Greek-style portraits are quite revealing. Cleopatra wanted to be associated with Arsinoe II Philadelphos and the glorious times of the Ptolemaic Dynasty. On bronze drachms she had the double cornucopia placed on the reverse (fig. 15)[65]. On the Greek style portraits, on coin issues struck in Alexandria (fig. 16), Cleopatra sports the melon coiffure of Arsinoe II, which is crowned by a wide diadem, and prefers to have her head unveiled, just like Berenice II on the issues of her sole regency in Cyrene[66]. Her individual features are evident in the curving nose. The Ptolemaic eagle of the reverse is, for the first time, combined with a female ruler.

Concluding remarks

To sum up, the portraits of the Ptolemaic queens form a well-defined assembly that chronologically extends from the 3rd to the 1st century B.C., and its epicentre lies in Alexandria. Artistic means and style were employed so as to depict the queens and to exemplify their roles in the share of power. For the queens of the 3rd century B.C., portraits were created in the Greek as well as in the Egyptian style. A mixture of the two styles is not observed. Nevertheless, their images were already individualized by this early stage: each queen had her own personal cornucopia-badge, her attributes (veil, sceptre, *stephane*, diadem) were variously

combined, and physiognomic features begin to make their appearance, as for example on the statue in Turin. A new era was inaugurated with the introduction of the Isis dress and coiffure for the representations of the queens. The prestige and the power of the Cleopatras of the 2nd century B.C. is evident through their complete identification with Isis and – and what is most remarkable – the rendering of mature features of aging. In the cases of the portrait coins of Cleopatra I and Cleopatra Thea, the resemblance of Ptolemy VI Philometor and Antiochus VIII to their mothers exemplifies the extent to which the queen could assert herself as an individual. Cleopatra VII restrained herself from the overwhelming accumulation of cult titles, unlike her immediate predecessors. It is possible that depictions of her in the guise of Isis never existed, and their absence is no coincidence. On the other hand, she knew very well how to use her image in order to inspire faith for the glorious times, or to offer support to her mate. The variety, constant change and developments in the representations of the Ptolemaic queens, which we observed in our analysis, is a feature of their individuality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALBERSMEIER 2002a = S. ALBERSMEIER, *Untersuchungen zu den Frauenstatuen des Ptolemäischen Ägypten*, Mainz am Rhein 2002.

ALBERSMEIER 2002b = S. ALBERSMEIER, *Untersuchungen zum Verhältnis der königlichen und privaten Frauenstatuen der Ptolemäerzeit*, in *La rôle et le statut de la femme en Égypte hellénistique, romaine et byzantine* H. Melaerts – L. Mooren (eds.), Leuven 2002, 1-19.

ASHTON 2001 = S.-A. ASHTON, *Ptolemaic Royal Sculpture from Egypt. The interaction between Greek and Egyptian traditions*, BAR International Series 923, Oxford 2001.

BIANCHI 1988 = R.A. BIANCHI (ed.), *Cleopatra's Egypt. The Age of the Ptolemies,* exhibition catalogue, The Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn 1988.

BOTHMER 1996 = B.V. BOTHMER, *Hellenistic Elements in Egyptian Sculpture of the Ptolemaic Period*, in *Alexandria and Alexandrianism*, proceeding of the Symposium, Malibu, Ca., 22-25 April 1993, Malibu, Ca. 1996, 215-230.

CHESIRE 1982 = W. CHESIRE, *Zur Deutung eines Szepters der Arsinoe II. Philadelphos*, «ZPE» 48, 1982, 105-111.

CHESIRE 2009 = W.A. CHESIRE, *The Bronzes of Ptolemy II Philadelphus*, Ägypten und Altes Testament 77, Wiesbaden 2009.

DAVESNE 1991 = A. DAVESNE, Les monnaies ptolémaiques d'Ephèse, In: Erol Atalay Memorial (Izmir 1991), 21-31.

DELIVORRIAS 1993 = A. DELIVORRIAS, *Der statuarische Typus der sog. Hera Borghese*, in *Polykletforschungen*, Beck – P. C. Bol (eds.), Berlin 1993, 221-252.

DURALI 1988 = T. DURALI, *Aristotle's Thoughts Concerning the Problem of the Living Beings and their Evolution*, in *Individu et Société. L'influence d'Aristote dans le Monde Méditarrranéen*, proceeding of the conference, Istanbul, Palais de France, 5-9 January 1986, T. Zarcone (ed.), Istanbul 1998, 5-30.

FLEISCHER 1996 = R. FLEISCHER, *Kleopatra Philantonios*, «IstMitt» 46, 1996, 237-340.

HAZZARD 2000 = R.A. HAZZARD, *Imagination of a Monarchy. Studies in Ptolemaic Propaganda*, Toronto 2000.

HEAD 1880 = B.V. HEAD, *History of the Coinage of Ephesus*, «NumChron» 1880, 1880, 125-154.

HÖLBL 2001 = G. HÖLBL, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, London 2001.

KYRIELEIS 1975 = H. KYRIELEIS, *Bildnisse der Ptolemäer,* AF 2, 1975.

KYRIELEIS 1987 = H. KYRIELEIS, Review of E. La Rocca, *L'età d'oro di Cleopatra. Indagine sulla Tazza Farnese*, Documenti e ricerce d'arte Alessandrina 5, 1984, «Gnomon» 59, 1987, 532-539.

LA ROCCA 1984 = E. LA ROCCA, *L'Età d'Oro di Cleopatra. Indagine sulla Tazza Farnese*, Documenti e ricerce d'arte Alessandrina 5, Roma 1984.

LAWRENCE 1925 = A.W. LAWRENCE, *Greek Sculpture in Ptolemaic Egypt*, «JEA» 11 1925, 179-190.

LE RIDER – CALLATAY 2006 = G. LE RIDER – F. DE CALLATAY, *Les Séleucides et les Ptolémées. L'héritage monétaire et financier d'Alexandre le Grand*, 2006.

MEYER 1992/1993 = M. MEYER, *Mutter, Ehefrau und Herrscherin. Darstellungen der Königin auf Seleukidischen Münzen*, «Hephaistos» 11/12, 1992/93, 107-132.

MINAS 1998 = M. MINAS, *Die ΚΑΝΗΦΟΡΟΣ. Aspekte des Ptolemäischen Dynastiekults*, in *Le culte du souverain dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque au IIIe siècle avant notre ère*, Studia Hellenistica 34, H. Melaerts (ed.), Leuven, 43-60.

MINAS 2000 = M. MINAS, *Die hieroglyphischen Ahnenreihen der ptolemäischen Könige. Ein Vergleich mit dem Titeln der eponymen Priester in den demotischen und griechischen Papyri*, Aegyptiaka Treverensia 9, Mainz 2000.

MINAS 2005 = M. MINAS, *Macht und Ohnmacht. Die Repräsentation ptolemäischer Königinnen in ägyptischen Tempeln*, «ArchPF» 51, 2005, 126-154.

MØRKHOLM 1979 = O. MØRKHOLM, *The Portrait Coinage of Ptolemy V. The Main Series*, in *Greek Numismatics and Archaeology. Essays in Honor of Margaret Thompson*, O. Mørkholm – N. M. Waggoner (eds.), Wetteren 1979, 203-214.

MÜLLER 2009 = S. MÜLLER, *Das Hellenistische Königspaar in der medialen Repräsentation. Ptolemy II und Arsinoe II*, Berlin 2009.

NILSSON 2012 = M. NILSSON, *The crown of Arsinoe II. The creation of an image authority*, Oxford 2012.

NOSHY 1937 = I. NOSHY, *The Arts of Ptolemaic Egypt. A Study of Greek and Egyptian Influences in Ptolemaic Architecture and Sculpture*, London 1937.

PINCOCK 2010 = R. PINCOCK, *A Possibly Unique Isis Head Bronze Coin of Cleopatra I*, «NumChron» 170 (2010) 53-62.

QUAEGEBEUR 1988 = J. QUAEGEBEUR, *Cleopatra VII and the Cults of the Ptolemaic Queens, in Cleopatra's Egypt. The Age of the Ptolemies,* exhibition catalogue, The Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn 1988.

RITTER 1965 = H.-W. RITTER, *Diadem und Königsherrschaft. Untersuchungen zu Zeremonien und Rechtsgrundlagen des Herrschaftsantrittes bei den Persern, bei Alexander dem Großen und im Hellenismus*, Vestigia 7, Munich 1965.

RUMSCHEID 2006 = F. RUMSCHEID, *Die figürlichen Terrakotten von Priene. Fundkontexte, Ikonographie und Funktion in Wohnhäuser und Heiligtümern im Licht antiker Parallelbefunde*, Wiesbaden 2006.

SCCC II = A. HOUGHTON – C. LORBER – O. HOOVER, *Seleucid Coins. A Comprehensive Catalogue*, II. *Seleucus IV through Antiochus XIII*, New York 2008).

Schwentzel 2000 = C.G. Schwentzel, *Les cornes d'abondance ptolémaïques dans la numismatique*, «CahPEg» 21, 2000, 99-103.

Smith 1988 = R.R.R. Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, Oxford 1988.

Stanwick 2002 = P.E. Stanwick, *Greek Kings as Egyptian Pharaohs*, Austin 2002.

Svoronos 1904 = J.N. Svoronos, *Τα νομίσματα του κράτους των Πτολεμαίων*, Athens 1904.

Thompson 1963 = D.B. Thompson, *Troy*, III. *The Terracotta Figurines of the Hellenistic Period*, Princeton 1963.

Thompson 1973 = D.B. Thompson, *Ptolemaic Oinochoai and Portraits in Faience. Aspects of the Ruler-Cult*, Oxford 1973.

NOTES

The author wishes to thank Dr. Andrea Bignasca and Dr. Antonio Corso. A first draft of this paper was presented in the Norwegian Institute at Athens Workshop 'TO ATOMO. Representations of the Individual in Antiquity' in May 2012.

1 Durali 1988, 20-22.

2 Lawrence 1925, 179-190; Noshy 1937, 83-142, proposed the distinction between «unmixed sculpture» and «sculpture with mixed elements»; Smith 1988, 87 pleaded for the categories «purely pharaonic», «with pharaonic regalia but with a face treated with varying degrees of naturalistic Greek style», «with pharaonic regalia but with the addition of an external and obviously Greek element» and «with no pharaonic regalia but with hair and portrait features in a more or less purely naturalistic Greek style».

3 See the review of division of categories in Ashton 2001, 5-7.

4 Concerning the double cornucopia: Ath. 2, 497 B.C. «(Δίφιλος· τῶν Ῥοδιακὸν ἢ τῶν ῥυτῶν. καὶ πάλιν· ῥυτὸν χωροῦντα δύο χόας, ὃν οὐδ' ἂν ἐλέφας ἐκπίῃ. ἐγὼ τοῦ το πέπωκα πολλάκις. ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ πρότερον κέρας. δοκεῖ σκευοποιηθῆναι ὑπὸ πρώτου τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου φόρημα γενέσθαι τῶν Ἀρσινόης εἰκόνων)». The Egyptian crown: Quaegebeur 1988, 47, fig. 18 and more recently Nilsson 2012, *passim*.

5 OGIS 1,56 lines 46-76; Hazzard 2000, 40; Albersmeier 2002a, 56 Anm. 345 with references.

6 The whole deification scheme is envisaged by Fraser 1972, 236-246. Vgl. *ThesCRA* II 176 3diii.

7 PLond 2243: *ThesCRA II*, 182 Papyri no. 293.

8 *ThesCRA* II 184-185, no. 325.

9 Minas 2000, 155-160.

10 Fraser 1972, 228, 230; Hölbl 2001, 194.

11 Le Rider – Callatay 2006, 51-52, fig. 41; Kyrieleis 1975, 6, pl. 6,3.

12 Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Egizio 22681 (H 2.70 m): Ashton 2001, 100-101, no. 35; Quaegebeur 1988, 48, fig. 19; Albersmeier 2002a, 371-373, cat. no. 136, pl. 22a; Stanwick 2002, 98-99, A4 figs. 4-5.

13 Le Rider – Callatay 2006, 51-52, figs. 38-39.

14 Head 1880, 127-129, pls. 7, 5-7; BMC Ionia 55-56, nos. 71-74, pls. 10, 5-7; Svoronos 1904, 133-134, nos. 875-889, pls. 26, 11-16; SNG von Aulock Ionia 1840; SNG Copenhagen Ionia 258-259; Davesne 1991, 21-22, figs. 1-2.

15 According to Justin 24, 3, 2-3 the diadem was given to her by half brother, Ptolemaios Keraunos, after their marriage: Ritter 1965, 114-124; Müller 2009, 76-81.

16 Thompson 1963, 49-50; Rumscheid 2006, 178-182.

17 Chesire 1982, *passim*.

18 Schwentzel 2000, 99-100, with references. Hera with cornucopia on the relief in Aegina, Archaeological Museum: Delivorrias 1993, 234, figs. 1-3.

19 Alexandria, Museum 3262 (H 24 cm): Kyrieleis 1975, 178-179, J3 Taf. 72, 1-3.

20 London, British Museum 38443: Chesire 2009, 89-105 colour plate B figs. 21a-d.

21 Berenice II: Minas 1998, 47-48; Albersmeier 2002a, 196-197. Arsinoe III Philopator: Fraser 1972, 179, 199 - indirect evidence through a dedicatory inscription; Minas 2000, 125 (cult inaugurated by Ptolemy V. Epiphanes).

22 Minas 2005, 134-135, fig. 5.

23 Svoronos 1904, 142, 151, nos. 983-984, 1113-1116, pl. 35, 1, 11, 12, 14-20 (Attic weight standard); 145, 14, 150-153, nos. 962-963, 972-973, 978-982, 986-99, pl. 29, 1-11, 17, 16; 35, 2-5, 13 (Ptolemaic weight standard); Hölbl 2001, 46-49.

24 Turin Museo Egizio 1385 (H 101.7 cm): Ashton 2001, 100-101, no. 38; Albersmeier 2002a, 186-188, no. 135, pl. 27 c-d (overseen as no. 134, pl. 24 c-d).

25 Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek 329 (IN 586) (24.3 cm):

KYRIELEIS 1975, 183, L8, pl. 98, 3-4; BIANCHI 1988, 177-179, no. 71; ASHTON 2001, 104-105, no. 43; ALBERSMEIER 2002a, no. 81, pl. 30 a-b.

26 Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 01.8207 (35 cm): KYRIELEIS 1975, 181-182, no. L1; BIANCHI 1988, 177-179, no. 70.

27 Phoinike: SVORONOS 1904, 1269, 1272, pl. 42, 1. 4. Alexandria: SVORONOS 1904, no. 1159, pl. 39, 1-3. MØRKHOLM 1979, 208.

28 SCHWENTZEL 2000, 101-102, fig. 3.

29 London, British Museum 1054: Cleopatra's Egypt 1988, 105, no. 15. On the stela of Tanis, Arsinoe III stands behind Ptolemy IV. The royal pair adores the Triad of the ithyphallic Min, at centre, the child-god Horsiese, and the titular Goddess of Lower Egypt, Wadget.

30 Recently: ALBERSMEIER 2002b, 91-94.

31 BOTHMER 1996, 225.

32 ALBERSMEIER 2000b, 425-426.

33 HÖLBL 2001, 143.

34 MINAS 2000, 133-134.

35 AU 27.84 g, 27 mm, London, British Museum 1978, 1021.1: PINCOCK 2010, 61, fig. 6.

36 SVORONOS 1904, τλγ´-τλε´, no. 1232-1238, 1240, pls. 40, 7-15.18; SNG Copenhagen, The Ptolemies 246-248, 253-258 (various denominations). The legend of the reverse reads: Πτολεμαίου Βασιλέως and the issues are dated prior to 180 B.C. The scholarship tends to identify the female head with Isis: SVORONOS 1904, IV 280; KYRIELEIS 1975, 114; LA ROCCA 1984, 23-25. But BMC The Ptolemies 89: Head of «Cleopatra as Isis».

37 AE 19.3 g, 30 mm: PINCOCK 2010, 54, fig. 2.

38 THOMPSON 1973, 163, 93, 166, no. 123, Taf. 43.

39 Brooklyn, N. Y., The Brooklyn Museum of Art 71.12 (H 13.7 cm): ASHTON 2001, 116-117, no. 64; AL-BERSMEIER 2002a, 202-203, 301-302, cat. no. 38, pl. 30c-d. New York, Metropolitan Museum 89.2.660.

40 New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 89.2.660 (61.8 cm): KYRIELEIS 1975, 183, M1, pl. 101, 1. (queen of the 2nd-1st century B.C.); ASHTON 2002, 116-117, no. 65 (Cleopatra VII); ALBERSMEIER 2002a, 349-350, cat. no. 105, pl. 31a; STANWICK 2002, 125, E14, fig. 173.

41 ALBERSMEIER 2002a, 50-51. An altogether different opinion is expressed by ASHTON 2002, 43. who thought the triple *uraeus* was the personal badge of Cleopatra VII.

42 New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 20.2.21 (38.1 cm): ASHTON 2001, 108-109, no. 54; ALBERSMEIER 2002a, 350-352, no. 106, pl. 3a. 33a-b.

43 MINAS 2005, 136-138.

44 MINAS 2000, 145-153.

45 FRASER 1972, 221, n. 249; HÖLBL 2001, 195-201, 205, 207-210, 172-183, 285-286; ALBERSMEIER 2002a, 207v208; MINAS 2000, 155v160.

46 Recently: ALBERSMEIER 2002a, 91-94.

47 KYRIELEIS 1987, 536.

48 Brooklyn, N.Y., The Metropolitan Museum of Art 74.220 (96.5 cm): ASHTON 2001, 112-113, no. 60; AL-BERSMEIER 2002a, 302-303, no. 39, pl. 36c-d.

49 Louvre Ma 3546 (H 37 cm): KYRIELEIS 1972, 120-121, no. M12, pl. 104; Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, AS I 406 (H 32.5 cm): AL-BERSMEIER 2002a, 377-378, no. 142, pl. 34,4, 35, 1-2.

50 MINAS 2000, 155-160.

51 MINAS 2000, Dok. 57, 29-31; MI-NAS 2005, 142-143.

52 HÖLBL 2001, 192-193, 200-201.

53 Sole ruler: MEYER 1992/1993, 117-119, fig. 13a-c; SCCC II 2258; co-regency with Antiochus VIII: MEYER 1992/1993, 119-123, figg. 14-19; SCCCII 2259-2277.

54 MEYER 1992/1993, 114, fig. 8; SCCC II 1841.

55 Alexandria, Museum 21992 (H 80 cm): KYRIELEIS 1975, 119, 185-186, M10, pl. 103,4 (a Cleopatra); ASHTON 2002, 104-15, cat. no. 45 (dates to the early reign of Ptolemy IV); ALBERSMEIER 2002a, 287, cat. no. 13, pl. 32a-b.

56 Baltimore, The Walters Art Museum 22.407 (H 24.7 cm): ALBERSMEIER 2002a, 210-211, no. 33, pl. 34a-c.

57 Museum of Fine Arts 27.711: KYRIELEIS 1975, 117, 120, pl. 100,2.

58 Just like the statue in Alexandria, Museum 31448: ALBERSMEIER 2002a, 291, no. 21, pl. 42a-b.

59 Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Egizio 22800 (H 1.43 m): ALBERSMEIER 2002a, 232-233, 374, no. 138, pl. 46c-d.

60 HÖLBL 2001, 230, 238-239.

61 QUAEGEBEUR 1988, 51-52; MINAS 2005, 150-151.

62 Cf. Plut. *Ant.* 60,3.

63 SVORONOS 1904, 316-317, nos. 1897-1898, pl. 63, 22-26; FLEISCHER 1996, 238-240, pl. 41, 3-6.

64 MINAS 2005, 150.

65 SCHWENTZEL 2000, 102-103, fig. 4.

66 SVORONOS 1904, 306, no. 1853, pl. 62, 7; 314. nos. 1883-1885, pl. 63, 10, 13.