

Cypriot Bronze Coins of Cleopatra with Caesarion; Two Eagles on Ptolemaic Coins as Representations of Co-Regency

Richard Pincock

(Plates 1, 2)

Various catalogs and reviews of Ptolemaic coins have overlooked certain coins of Cleopatra VII that relate to her co-regent Caesarion (son of Caesar), or they misattributed them to her father (Ptolemy XII), her uncle (Ptolemy, King of Cyprus), or her brother (Ptolemy XIV) and sister (Arsinoe IV).¹ They are the four types of bronze coins shown on plate 1 nos. 1-4 and described in table 1 together with published attributions beginning in 1883.

In 1904 Svoronos attributed the four types to Cleopatra/Caesarion.² This article presents a review of Svoronos' attributions as well as additional arguments and comments that strongly support three of them. Then some characteristics and relationships of individual examples are reported, followed by a review of certain errors in Svoronos' catalog that have contributed to the later neglect of his clear and reasonable attributions to Cleopatra. In order to put the coins into historical context, a summary will outline the relationships and chronology of the persons named in the various attributions listed in column three of table 1. Finally, as the coins predominantly have two-eagle reverses, a general review of two-eagle Ptolemaic coinage is presented. Contrary to long held views, the occurrences of two-eagle coinage are highly correlated with times of co-regencies.

Attributions to Cleopatra/Caesarion by Svoronos

In his monumental compilation of Ptolemaic coins published in 1904 and 1908, Svoronos attributed the four types of coins listed in table 1 to Cleopatra and regarded them as representing her co-regency with Caesarion.³ However, column 3 of the table shows fifteen attributions of these coins given to individuals other than Cleopatra/Caesarion. From a sequential review of the coins as given below, only six of the twenty-three listings in the table correctly attribute coins to Cleopatra/Caesarion (see those in column 3 marked with *).

Table 1. Various Attributions of Four Types of Late Ptolemaic Bronze Coins*

Coin Type ⁱ	Attributed by	Attributed to ⁱⁱ	
Type 1 (Sv.1875, pl. LXII, 27) Rv. One eagle, facing left; under eagle's right wing, palm; in field right,  monogram See plate 1 n. 1	<i>BMC Ptolemies</i> , p. 120, 52, 53	Ptolemy, King of Cyprus	1
	Svoronos 1875	Cleopatra/Caesarion*	2
	Cox, ⁴ p. 16, 124	Cleopatra/Ptolemy XIII, XIV, or Caesarion	3
	Nicolaou ⁵ 419-424	Ptolemy, King of Cyprus	4
	<i>RPC I</i> , 3903 ⁶	Cleopatra/Caesarion*	5
Type 2 (Sv.1876-7, pl. LXII,28-9) Rv. Two eagles, facing left See plate 1 n. 2	Svoronos 1876-7	Cleopatra/Caesarion	6
	<i>RPC I</i> , 3902, recording (erroneously, see n. 15 below) the monogram  in the field	Cleopatra/Caesarion	7
Type 3 (Sv.1842, pl. LXI, 27-8) Rv. Two eagles, facing left; in field, left, Isis crown  , with monogram  below (as with type-1 but rotated 90° clockwise) See plate 1 n. 3	<i>BMC Ptolemies</i> , p. 121, 1-2	Ptolemy XIV/Arsinoe IV	8
	Svoronos 1842	Cleopatra/Caesarion*	9
	Cox, p. 16, 123	Cleopatra/Ptolemy XIII, XIV, or Caesarion	10
	Nicolaou 463-8	Cleopatra/Caesarion*	11
	<i>SNG Copenhagen</i> 682-3	Late 2 nd -early 1st cent BC	12
	Sear ⁷ 7950	Ptolemy XII	13
	Hazzard ⁸ (119; C1149)	Ptolemy XII	14
	ANS data base ⁹	Ptolemy XII	15
	(<i>RPC I</i> ---)	(unrecorded)	16
Type 4 (Sv.1843, pl. LXI, 29) Rv. Two eagles, facing left; in field, left, Isis crown  , (no monogram) See plate 1 n. 4	<i>BMC Ptolemies</i> , p. 121, 3	Ptolemy XIV/Arsinoe IV	17
	Svoronos 1843	Cleopatra/Caesarion *	18
	Cox, p.16, 122	Cleopatra/Ptolemy XIII, XIV, or Caesarion	19
	Nicolaou 425-461	Cleopatra/Caesarion*	20
	<i>SNG Copenhagen</i> 684	Late 2 nd -early 1st cent BC	21
	ANS data base	Ptolemy XII	22
	(<i>RPC I</i> ---)	(unrecorded)	23

ⁱ The obverse of each type is a head of Zeus Ammon, facing right. The reverse legend, ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ, is in practice never complete.

ⁱⁱ *According to the arguments presented in this article only the attributions shown with an asterisk, i.e. nos. 2, 5, 9, 11, 18 and 20, are correct.

As a starting point, Svoronos noted that the large bronzes (Sv. 1874, here plate 1 n. 5) of Cleopatra VII, with the reverse legend ΚΛΕΟΠΑΤΡΑΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΗΣ and Caesarion as a baby in

Cleopatra's arms on the obverse, have the monogram  which he interpreted as ΚΥΠΡΟΥ, a mintmark for Cyprus.¹⁰ The same monogram appears on types 1 and 3 in table 1 but not on any other Ptolemaic coins and it serves as a link to tie types 1, 3, and 4 coins together.

Type 1 (plate 1 n. 1). In his review of Svoronos' 1904 publication, Regling¹¹ agreed that the mintmark on Cleopatra's large bronze coin (Sv. 1874) was correctly interpreted as designating Cyprus. However, he was doubtful that the monogram on the smaller bronze type-1 coins (Sv. 1875) without the name of Cleopatra was adequate evidence for attribution to her.¹² Regling did not note that type 1 coins have a palm branch behind the eagle, a feature that also occurs on Cleopatra's tetradrachms. Note also that Regling accepted that type 3 coins with the Cyprus monogram and an Isis crown belonged to Cleopatra (see below).

Type 2 (plate 1 n. 2). Type 2 coins (Sv. 1876 and 1877) with two eagles rather than one seem to be very rare. Svoronos listed only three examples, in Paris, Berlin and Vienna. He did not mention a monogram, and the two coins which he illustrates (Paris and Berlin) do not show any obvious monogram. He stated¹³ that the dual eagles on types 2, 3, and 4 coins very probably refer to the co-regency of Cleopatra and Caesarion but the basis of his attribution of type 2 to Cleopatra is unclear. Regling stated that Sv. 1876/7 coins have no characteristic symbols or monogram and that all that can be said of them is, from their style, they are 'late Ptolemaic'.¹⁴ *RPC* I, 3902, incorrectly states that the Cyprus monogram occurs on these type 2 coins. Without the monogram there is insufficient evidence to assign type 2 coins to Cleopatra, their listing in *RPC* will be deleted¹⁵ and type 2 coins will not be considered further here.

Type 3 (plate 1 n. 3). Coins of type 3 (Sv. 1842) have an Isis crown at the left on the reverses just as appears on all of Cleopatra's Alexandrian tetradrachms. An Isis crown consists of two high vertical plumes above a solar disk flanked by the horns of Hathor, i.e., . This crown is associated with several Ptolemaic queens and its appearance on Ptolemaic coins of late fabric suggests attribution to Cleopatra VII, who emphasized her identification as Isis.¹⁶ Moreover, as Svoronos

pointed out,¹⁷ the Cyprus monogram  found on type 1 coins also occurs on type 3 coins, but it is now on the left and is rotated 90° clockwise, i.e., . The generally smaller flans of type 3 coins and the need to accommodate two eagles rather than one as well as the Isis crown, presumably prompted this space-saving rotation of the monogram, which looks like a sort of stand supporting the crown, and was described as such in early cataloguing¹⁸ before the monogram was recognized. Although Regling was reluctant to accept the Cyprus monogram alone on type 1 coins as adequate evidence for Cleopatra (see above), he accepted that coins of type 3, with the same monogram (although rotated) together with an Isis crown, belonged to Cleopatra.¹⁹

Type 4 (plate 1 n. 4). Coins of type 4 and type 3 both have two-eagle reverses together with Isis crowns that act as indicators of Cleopatra/Caesarion. However, type 4 has no monogram. Regling¹² only states that these coins belong less certainly to Cleopatra than do type 3 coins. Given the connection to type 3 coins through the Isis crown and two eagles, it seems reasonable to suppose that type 4 is just a further development of type 3 with the monogram left off (perhaps because it was not easily recognized when rotated).

In summary, Svoronos' attribution of types 1, 3 and 4 was based initially on the presence of the Cyprus monogram on type 1 coins with one eagle; the monogram is identical to that on the large bronze coin of Cleopatra/Caesarion. The attribution to Cleopatra was strengthened when he recognized the same monogram (although rotated) in association with an Isis crown on coins of type 3 with two eagles. In turn, the presence of an Isis crown with two eagles on type 4 coins completed the attribution of the three types to Cleopatra/Caesarion. With only minor reservations, Regling supported Svoronos' attributions.

Further confirmation of the attribution to Cleopatra and to Cyprus of types 1, 3, and 4 is provided by the following review of statistics and styles. Svoronos listed respectively 19, 20, 10 examples of types 1, 3 and 4. The coins are therefore not very rare, although they are not well represented in most catalogs of Ptolemaic coins: there are 2, 2, 1 in London²⁰; 0, 2, 1 in Copenhagen²¹; 0, 0, 1 in Frankfurt²²; 1, 0, 0 in Milan²³; 0, 0, 0, in Cologne²⁴; and 5, 6, 7, in New York²⁵. By contrast, from published site finds there are 6, 6, 37 from Paphos²⁶ and 5, 8, 18 from Curium²⁷. In the period 27 May 2001 to 8 March 2002, 3, 10, and 27 pieces of the three types were offered on eBay web auctions, all but one from a site in Cyprus: see plate 1 nos. 3, 4, 6, 8, 10 for examples. Although there is a wide diversity of styles among the three types, they do have certain characteristics in common:

Type 1 coins (plate 1 nos. 1, 6) are generally somewhat larger and heavier (25-26 mm, ave. 7.7 g)²⁸ than types 3 and 4 (respectively 22-25 mm, ave. 5.5g and 23-26 mm, ave. 6.6 g)²⁹ and are of especially poor style. The large bronzes of Cleopatra/Caesarion (plate 1 n. 5) are of similar crude style, are 29-30 mm in diameter and on average 16.5 g in weight. The large bronzes and type 1 coins have identical monograms. Although both ranges of weights are wide, one might suggest that type 1 bronzes were intended as a half denomination of the Cleopatra/Caesarion large bronzes.

Type 1 coins have an unusual hairstyle for Zeus consisting simply of a series of nearly concentric arcs radiating in two directions (plate 1 nos. 1, 6), a style which recurs on many examples of type 3 and on some type 4 coins. Although most examples of type 3 have the same concentric hairstyle as type 1 coins, they are of far superior style (plate 1 nos. 3, 7-9). Type 4 coins are more common and have a much wider variety of obverse styles. They often have a more conventional hairstyle with disorganized locks and straggly beard (plate 1 n. 4), but some have the concentric hairstyle found on type 1 and 3 (plate 1 nos. 10-11). The wider variations in type 4 obverse styles and the larger number of surviving specimens suggest that they were produced over a longer period than types 1 and 3 (see below).³⁰

The close association of types 1, 3, 4 is confirmed by offerings on eBay web auctions. A commercial 'Lot of 12 Late Ptolemaic Coins' sold on eBay on 1 February 2002 from a Cypriot site contained 12 coins, all with the same rough black patina: five two-eagle coins (one of type 3 and four of type 4) together with seven one-eagle coins. All of the one-eagle types have been assigned to Cyprus and dated to the late 2nd or early 1st century (*SNG Copenhagen*): one has a cap symbol (Cox, *Curium*, p. 15, 119, Ptolemy IX or X); four appear to have no symbol (perhaps Sv. 1713, Ptolemy IX) and two have an aphastron (Sv. 1813 = *SNG Copenhagen* 676). The last type has the same concentric hairstyle as type 1 coins.³¹ Two weeks later on 15 February 2002 the same commercial Cypriot site offered on eBay a coin of type 1 with the same black patina.

In summary, most type 3 coins are closely related in style to type 1, while the more common and diverse type 4 coins still show a stylistic relationship to type 1. This is consistent with the order of production, i.e., types 1, 3, 4, suggested from the monogram and Isis symbol. The evidence from the monogram and symbol that linked these coins to Cleopatra's large bronze, together with the evidence from styles that give a chronological association, amply confirm Svoronos' attributions of the three types to Cleopatra/Caesarion and to Cyprus.

As shown in table 1, the above attributions of Svoronos have not been generally recognized. If Svoronos' assignments of types 1, 3, and 4 to Cleopatra and Caesarion are correct, why have they been neglected? In his *Τά νομίσματα του κράτους των Πτολεμαίων* (published in 1904) Svoronos mistakenly assigned tetradrachms of Cleopatra with an Isis crown symbol (Sv. 1815-35) to her father, Ptolemy XII.³² This led him to assign bronzes with the same symbol, i.e. types 3 and 4, to Ptolemy XII rather than Cleopatra and to Egypt rather than Cyprus: see Svoronos' catalog descriptions (vol. II, p. 304) and his illustrations and captions (vol. III, plate LXI).³³ This error was compounded by Svoronos' initial failure to recognize that the rotated Cyprus monogram on type 3 is the same as the upright Cyprus monogram on type 1. He did recognize that the monogram on type 1 was the same as that on the well-known Cleopatra/Caesarion large bronze, and thus gave type 1 to Cleopatra and Cyprus (vol. II, p. 312, and on the corresponding plate LXII of vol. III). However, in the interval between the compilation of his catalog/plates and the completion of his discussion volume (vol. I in Greek, with German translation in vol. IV), Svoronos realized that the monogram of type 3, although rotated, was the same as that on Cleopatra's large bronze coin with Caesarion. He therefore assigned all four types of bronze coins to Cleopatra in his discussion volume⁹ but neglected to make the necessary changes to the plates or catalog descriptions. Hence anyone using only Svoronos' catalog or plates would assume that types 3 and 4, both with Isis crowns, belong to Ptolemy XII, while the correct attributions to Cleopatra, made by Svoronos in his commentary, are often overlooked.³⁴ Most of the publications dealing with these coins assign them to persons other than Cleopatra (see column 3 of table 1). Such assignments should be reviewed (and corrected) in the light of the historical period and with knowledge of the original attributions of Svoronos.

Historical Background³⁵

In 80 BC Ptolemy XII, father of Cleopatra VII, became king of Egypt while his younger brother was made 'king of Cyprus' to rule that island as an independent kingdom. This separation of powers was apparently more acceptable to the Romans who had interfered with Egyptian sovereignty for many years. From the beginning, Ptolemy XII cooperated with Rome in order to keep his throne, e.g., he bribed Crassus, Pompey, Caesar and others on many occasions.³⁶ He was successful in keeping his kingdom until 58 when Rome passed a law that converted the Cypriot kingdom into a Roman province. Ptolemy (king of Cyprus), rather than concede the loss and accept priesthood in a temple in Paphos, took poison.³⁷ The Egyptians blamed Ptolemy XII for the loss of Cyprus and, since he was also responsible for the heavy exactions taken from them to support his bribes, they forced him from Egypt. He went to Rome, bought further support, and in 55 was reinstated as king by means of a Roman military expedition sent from Palestine.³⁸

Ptolemy XII died in 51 and, under the terms of his will, his oldest child, Cleopatra VII (age 18) was to share the throne with her oldest brother, Ptolemy XIII (age 10).³⁹ This arrangement was ignored by Cleopatra, who managed to exclude her brother and his supporters from power for about a year and a half until, sometime in her third year of reign⁴⁰, she lost control of Egypt. She went to Syria to organize her return and arrived back in Egypt in 48 with an army at about the time that Caesar arrived in pursuit of Pompey after their battle at Pharsalus.⁴¹ Cleopatra made her way into the palace in Alexandria to meet Caesar and in a single night gained his support. At first Caesar attempted to reconcile Cleopatra with her brother (Ptolemy XIII) as joint rulers of Egypt,⁴² even giving over Cyprus from Roman control to the younger siblings (Ptolemy XIV and Arsinoe IV) in order to make a more attractive settlement.⁴³ However, these arrangements came to nothing since Cleopatra's opponents were convinced that Caesar's attraction to Cleopatra would soon result in her gaining complete control.⁴⁴ Cleopatra's enemies perceived Caesar's military weakness and, having declared Arsinoe 'queen' as a rival to Cleopatra and also having gained control of Ptolemy XIII, they proceeded to prosecute the war with Caesar.⁴⁵ However, Caesar controlled the Alexandrian

harbour and was able to bring in provisions and more troops.⁴⁶ By January 47 he managed to defeat the forces of Ptolemy XIII; Ptolemy XIII was killed and ‘Queen’ Arsinoe was later paraded in Rome in Caesar’s celebration of his several victories.⁴⁷

Early in 47 Caesar reestablished Cleopatra as queen of Egypt with Cleopatra’s youngest brother (Ptolemy XIV, age about 12) as co-ruler to satisfy a tradition that a male must be at least a nominal associate of a queen of Egypt.⁴⁸ Caesar also gave Cleopatra control of Cyprus⁴⁹ (after it had been in Rome’s possession for about 10 years). He tarried in Egypt, possibly making an extended visit to Upper Egypt with Cleopatra,⁵⁰ before leaving in the spring of 47 to gain further victories in the civil war. His son by Cleopatra, called Caesarion (‘little’ Caesar) or ‘Ptolemy named Caesar’ by the Alexandrians, was born in summer 47.⁵¹ After his return to Rome, Caesar invited Cleopatra to join him. She was there in 46 (with her brother Ptolemy XIV) until shortly after Caesar’s assassination in March 44 when she returned to Egypt.⁵² At about this time, to clear the way for Caesarion, she had Ptolemy XIV killed.⁵³ She then probably had three-year old Caesarion established as co-regent.⁵⁴ It was to her advantage, and later to Antony’s as well, to have Caesarion recognized both as the son of Caesar and as the future king of Egypt.

With the above background in mind, the various attributions in table 1 can now be considered. Even though Poole (in *BMC Ptolemies*) indicated that the monogram seemed to connect type 1 coins to “the early part of the reign of Cleopatra”, he simply followed a previous attribution⁵⁵ and gave them (see table 1, n.1) to the king of Cyprus. Nicolaou (table 1, n. 4) followed Poole and suggested further that the monogram on type 1 coins was the first appearance of a mintmark for Cyprus itself (rather than for individual cities on the island) and that this expressed the independence of the king of Cyprus from Egypt.⁴ However, these type 1 coins would then have been minted before 58, i.e., before the king of Cyprus killed himself and before Rome took control of the island. This would make type 1 coins an isolated single issue of that king. It would require an unlikely gap in time of at least ten years until the reappearance of the same monogram on the coin of Cleopatra showing young Caesarion (born in 47).

Cox (table 1, nos. 3, 10, 19) recognized types 1, 3, and 4 coins as Cleopatra’s but did not propose any specific co-regent. Ptolemy XIII might reasonably be eliminated because of Cleopatra’s reluctance to share power with him.⁵⁶ When the names of Cleopatra and Ptolemy XIII later do appear together on documents⁵⁷, there would have been a very short time available to produce a rather large issue of coins before Cleopatra was forced to leave Egypt. Similarly, Poole’s suggestion that Ptolemy XIV and Arsinoe IV, who had been given the opportunity to govern Cyprus, produced coins of type 3 and 4 (table 1, nos. 8, 17) seems unlikely not only because of time constraints⁵⁸ but also lack of any evidence that this couple took up control of Cyprus,⁵⁹ and because of Arsinoe’s prompt alliance as ‘queen’ with the enemies of Cleopatra and Caesar.⁶⁰ Had Poole recognized that both the rotated monogram and the Isis crown connect these coins to Cleopatra he would probably have followed his initial inclination to assign the coins to Cleopatra and Caesarion.⁶¹

It has been suggested⁶² or implied (table 1, nos. 10, 19) that types 3 and 4 might have been produced during a co-regency of Cleopatra with her youngest brother Ptolemy XIV, i.e., during the period 46-44, while they were in Rome. The political ambitions of Cleopatra for herself and for her son, together with her attachment to Caesar and her murder of Ptolemy XIV in 44, all advise against such an attribution.⁶³ The other attributions in table 1 (nos. 13, 14, 15, 22)⁶⁴ apparently stem from following Svoronos’ erroneous catalog or plates in his volumes II and III that give these coins to Ptolemy XII and to Alexandria. As stated by Svoronos in his volumes I and IV and shown in the presentation above, types 1, 3, and 4 are best attributed to Cleopatra, Caesarion and Cyprus rather than Alexandria.

Two Eagles as Representations of Co-regency

Types 2, 3 and 4 have two eagles depicted on their reverses. In early cataloguing, two eagles on several issues of Ptolemaic coins were taken to indicate shared sovereignty between two individuals.⁶⁵ Nevertheless, the standard catalog of the time (Poole's *BMC Ptolemies* in 1883) gave two-eagle coins to a king (Ptolemy III) who was without a co-regent and did not assign any two-eagle coins to some well established co-regencies (Ptolemy VI and Ptolemy VIII, Cleopatra VII and Caesarion). As shown below, later authorities all refer back, directly or indirectly, to Poole's catalog that did not support a relationship of two-eagle reverses with co-regency.

In a review carried out in 1897, Strack⁶⁶ relied on the faulty data in *BMC Ptolemies* (see below) and consequently argued against the idea that two eagles represented two-regents. He also expected that if two eagles on bronze coins showed co-regency, they should also appear simultaneously on silver coins. Regling, in 1906, while inclined to accept two eagles on coins of Ptolemy VI and Ptolemy VIII as representative of their co-regency, cited Strack and therefore objected to the idea in general.⁶⁷ In particular, he stated that Svoronos' suggestion that the two eagles on types 2, 3, and 4 represented the co-regency of Cleopatra VII with Caesarion was 'problematic'.⁶⁸ He gave two examples where double eagle coins seemed inconsistent with the co-regency idea (see below and nos. 81 and 83). Head, in 1910, stated "the interpretation of the [two-eagle] type as a symbol of divided sovereignty seems fanciful, seeing that it occurs not infrequently at other times".⁶⁹ He did not specify any such occurrences and referred only to Pooles's *BMC Ptolemies*. Thompson cited Regling and only stated that she agreed "the interpretation of the [two-eagle] type as symbolic of joint sovereignty is unconvincing".⁷⁰ Strack, Regling, Head and Thompson did not suggest any other reason for the existence of coins with two eagles,⁷¹ but their view, which has its origin in *BMC Ptolemies* (now known to contain some erroneous attributions)⁶⁵ has been widely accepted. The idea that two-eagle reverses may be symbolic of some type of shared sovereignty has rarely been supported.⁷² However, in 1937⁷³, Otto argued against Regling that a two-eagle coin does point to the rule of two kings; he believed (correctly) that Strack's data taken from Poole were faulty and that the question needed a new investigation.

What aspects of two-eagle coin types would be necessary to give evidence of co-regency?

Three criteria seem important:

A. In addition to two-eagle coins there should exist other evidence that a co-regency was in place, e.g. two associated names on papyri or stelae, double dates on coins, statements from ancient sources, etc.

B. Two-eagle coins should exist for long-lived joint regencies that are reliably established. It would be better still if all known co-regencies produced coins with two eagles.

C. It would be fatal to the whole idea if two-eagle coins were struck during any reign that is known to be without any sort of shared regency.⁷⁴

Strack believed he had evidence that was both against, and fatal to, the co-regency idea. However, for his view he relied on the incorrect assignments of Poole (*BMC Ptolemies*) where no two-eagle coins were attributed to the joint reign of Ptolemy VI and Ptolemy VIII, who had a well known co-regency (double eagle coins are now firmly attributed to them). Also, two-eagle coins were then given by Poole to Ptolemy III who had no co-regent (these coins, from hoard and other evidence, are now well attributed to Ptolemy II who had a co-regent).⁷⁵ Contrary to the conclusions of Strack (which were based on the erroneous attributions of Poole⁶⁵) and adopted, as described above, by Regling, Head, and Thompson, a review of modern information on co-regencies (see table 2 below) shows that two-eagle Ptolemaic coinage passes all of the three tests **A,B,C** given above.

	Co-Regents	Dates	For literature references to evidence of co-regency see ^a	Coins with two-eagle reverses ^b
1	Pt I and Pt II ^c	285	Hö 35; Ha 47, 60; Hu 228, 249, 254	-
2	Pt II and Pt the son	267-259 ^d	Hö 35; Ha 42, 66; Hu 311-2	Sv. 413, 422, ... ^d
3	Pt IV and Pt V ^c	209-204	Hö 133; Hu 450	-
4	Pt V and Pt VI ^c	181 ^e	Ha 125 n.121; [Hu 536 n.4] ^e	- ^e
5	Cleopatra I and Pt VI	180-176	Hö 143; Ha 125, 155; Hu 540	Sv. 1377, 1380, 1383
6	Pt VI and Antiochus IV ^f	170-169	Hö 145, 147; Hu 549, 552	Sv. 1422, 1430
7	Pt VI and Pt VIII with Cleopatra II	170-164	Hö 183; Ha 127; Hu 545	Sv. 1423-1428
8	Pt VI and Cleopatra II	163-145	Hö 184; Ha 128; Hu 569	
9	Pt VIII and Cleopatra II & (Cleopatra III)	145-132 124-116	Hö 195, 206; Ha 134-6; Hu 588, 598, 606, 624	
10	Cleopatra III and Pt IX	116-107	Hö 205; Ha 140; Hu 628	Sv. 1694-1703, 1704-1158, 1707-1710, 1712-1713
11	Cleopatra III and Pt X	107-101	Hö 207; Ha 141-142; Hu 635, 652	
12	Pt XII and Cleopatra VII ^c	52(?) - 51	Hö 230; Hu 705 n. 5	-
13	Cleopatra VII and Caesarion	47-30	Hö 239; Ha 151; Hu 727	Sv. 1842-3

^a Hö= Hölbl; Ha=Hazard, *Imagination*, Hu=Huß. Numbers are page numbers. Some minor co-regencies (short-lived and/or formalistic marriages) are not listed, e.g., Ptolemy VI with Ptolemy Eupator (in 152); Berenike III with Ptolemy IX (88-81) and with Ptolemy XI (80). Egyptian co-regencies are extensively reviewed by W. J. Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies* (Chicago, 1977); see pp. 94-104 for Ptolemaic co-regencies.

^b All types listed by Svoronos and *SNG Copenhagen* as having two-eagle reverses are given here.

^c Co-regency established only shortly before the death of a king. Two-eagle coins were not produced or are otherwise unknown.

^d Ptolemy II reigned from 282 to 246. However, two-eagle coinage was initiated only shortly after 267 when a co-regency was established. The two-eagle large bronzes of Ptolemy II were abundant (Svoronos lists 15 control marks).⁷⁶

^e Huß, *Ägypten*, p. 536, doubts Hazard's evidence for this co-regency. C. Bennet states that the case for co-regency is without foundation, see http://www.tyndale.cam.ac.uk/egypt/ptolemies/ptolemy_v.htm#Epiphanes.15

^f No regular co-regency is established: see O. Mørkholm, *Antiochus IV of Syria* (Copenhagen, 1966), pp. 81-92, and see discussion on p. 13 below.

It should be noted that some of the attributions of the coins in table 2 might have been originally made with the idea of two-eagles two-regents in mind; however, the attributions were not made on the basis of the two-eagle idea alone and much new information, referenced in column 4, has come to light since Svoronos. Modern data, both regarding co-regencies and coin attributions, fit the two-eagle two-regents hypothesis and there is no fatal exception to the correlation, i.e., there is no known two-eagle coin that is now attributed to a period other than a co-regency.⁷⁷

Table 2 shows that nine of the twelve well-attested co-regencies issued two-eagle coins (for the unusual case of n. 6, which may not have been a regular co-regency, see below). Two (nos. 1 and 12) of the three co-regencies without two-eagle coins were established only very shortly before the death of a king to facilitate the transition to a new monarch. The remaining case (n. 3) is similar and involves a child made co-regent at birth six years before the death of a king. These three cases are of short duration and/or involve a well-established king simply recognizing an eldest child as regent in preparation for an imminent and non-controversial change of authority. This sets these three co-regencies apart from the nine that produced dual-eagle coinage.

The nine co-regencies that produced two eagle coins were those that involved a transition to a new regime which was potentially more difficult or more controversial; i.e., n. 2 (the potential ascent to the throne of Ptolemy ‘the son’), n. 5 (the accession of Cleopatra I with her very young son on the early death of Ptolemy V), n. 6 (the very unusual case of Ptolemy VI and his uncle Antiochus IV, see below), nos. 7, 8, and 9 (the factions and alliances of Ptolemy VI and Ptolemy VIII involving Cleopatra II), nos. 10 and 11 (the intrigues of Cleopatra III who was, from time to time, for and against Ptolemy X and Ptolemy IX), and n.13 (the regime of Cleopatra VII with her half-Roman son Caesarion after much civil strife). Two-eagle coins occurred at times when there was an important political need to establish a co-regency; the two eagles may also express the hope for cooperative association and peaceful times.

More needs to be said about case n. 5, given in table 2, the co-regency of Cleopatra I with her young son Ptolemy VI and the associated coin Sv. 1380 (plate 1 n. 12) that has the obverse legend ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΗΣ ΚΛΕΟΠΙΑΤΡΑΣ around Zeus Ammon and on the reverse two eagles with the legend ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ.⁷⁸ Svoronos did not believe that the obverse legend meant what it says, i.e., ‘of Queen Kleopatra’. He thought that because users of these coins could too easily assume that the legend meant queen rather than co-regent, the coins were soon replaced by a series of the same type but without the name of Cleopatra.⁷⁹ However, new information has become available and “we now possess epigraphical, papyrological and numismatic evidence ... that the Queen [Cleopatra I] considered herself a sovereign ruling in her own right”.⁸⁰ We can therefore believe that Sv. 1380 means exactly what it states, i.e., there are two sovereigns, Queen Cleopatra I and King Ptolemy VI, with two eagles to symbolize the fact.⁸¹

As for the unusual case n. 6 in table 2, it has been argued that Antiochus IV of Syria, with Ptolemy VI under his control, had himself crowned king of Egypt in Memphis during his first invasion of Egypt in 169. The extremely rare coins (Sv. 1422, two examples known), with a reverse type showing two eagles and a legend ...ANTIOXOY, may support the idea of co-regency. However, it is not generally accepted that Antiochus was crowned king of Egypt. Mørkholm preferred the idea of a formal alliance involving a protectorate over the puppet Ptolemy VI by his uncle Antiochus IV during the siege against the forces of Ptolemy VIII in Alexandria.⁸² The two eagles on these coins may refer to the two kings (although only one was king of Egypt), and the use only of Antiochus’ name may simply show the dominance of Antiochus in this unusual alliance with Ptolemy VI.⁸³

Multiple royal symbolism is shown on a Ptolemaic coin with *three* eagles, one of the eagles with a royal crown. There are three eagles on the reverse of a rare large coin (see plate 2 n. 13) that Svoronos assigned to Ptolemy IX (116-107).⁸⁴ The third eagle, to the left, is about one-third the height of the others and wears a male royal crown with a single central part (similar to the so-called ‘double’ crown of Egypt) rather than two equal central parts (as is common with a queen’s crown). The crown on the third eagle is a definite symbol of regency. Such symbolism is essentially identical to the double crown of Egyptian kingship of Horus as a falcon, most famously shown on the colossal granite statue in the court of the Ptolemaic temple at Edfu.

Three periods of triple regency might relate to this coin: (A) the reign of Ptolemy VI with his siblings Cleopatra II and Ptolemy VIII (170-164); (B) the reign of Ptolemy VIII with Cleopatra II and Cleopatra III (124-116); and (C) after the death of Ptolemy VIII in 116, during the very brief reign of old Queen Cleopatra II (just before her death also in 116) with Cleopatra III and Ptolemy IX. The absence of central cavities on the three-eagle coins suggests that they are later than (A). The type of crown indicates a king, but the small size of the eagle suggests a subordinate position, whereas Ptolemy VIII in (B) was dominant. Thus a plausible time is (C), the very short period in 116 of dominance by Cleopatra II with co-regents Cleopatra III (daughter) and Ptolemy IX (grandson). This triple regency is indicated by a demotic contract of October 116 that has the royal

protocol ‘Year 2, Phaophi 9 (?) (29 October 116) of the Queen Cleopatra and the Queen Cleopatra and the King Ptolemy, their son’, which suggests that Ptolemy IX had a subordinate position.⁸⁵ The crown on the small eagle emphasizes the regal character of a third person, while the two large eagles represent the two queens (see table 2 for several other coins where the image of an eagle was used for either a king or a queen).⁸⁶

The Ptolemaic mints were conservative and disinclined to change a reverse type without an important reason. On the smaller flans of tetradrachms a single eagle was used without innovation for a very long period.⁸⁷ However, the very large size of the bronze coins of Ptolemy II easily allowed the addition of another eagle to represent co-regency (during the years 267-259⁸⁸). For the next eighty-five years or so there were no new two-eagle coins and it seems clear that the type was only produced at specific times and not just as an artistic elaboration. Then, in 180, Cleopatra I revived the type with her young son Ptolemy VI (see plate 1 n. 12) and two-eagle coinage occurred for various co-regencies (see table 2) to the time of Cleopatra VII with Caesarion.

Finally, we return to the two-eagle two-regent symbolism on Cleopatra VII’s Cypriot bronze coins. It seems generally accepted,⁸⁹ that the large Cypriot bronzes showing Caesarion as a baby are dated to 47 (i.e., after the birth date of Caesarion⁵¹ and the time of Caesar’s gift of Cyprus). Type 1 coins (probably the half denomination of the large Cleopatra/Caesarion bronze with the same monogram) also seem best dated to *c.*47. Types 3 and 4 can reasonably be assumed to come later. Caesarion was clearly established as co-regent by the year 44 when Cleopatra returned to Egypt and her brother Ptolemy XIV was done away with.⁹⁰ At that time Cleopatra had further independence to promote formal recognition of Caesarion as the son of Caesar. Year 44 therefore seems best for initiation of a two-regent two-eagle coin (type 3), with type 4 coins beginning later and perhaps continuing until near the deaths of Cleopatra and Caesarion in 30.

In Cleopatra’s time, the relatively small flans resulted in the crowding of the Isis crown, Cyprus monogram, legend and two eagles. Yet, rather than leaving off the important two-eagle symbolism, die cutters resorted to considerable contortion of the monogram (rotation and loss of clarity) to fit all the elements on the flan. In addition, the pattern in table 2 also shows that the use of two eagles, from the first examples to the last (from *c.*260 to *c.*30), is important and not capricious. It would be very uncharacteristic of the Egyptian mints to be erratic in their use of two eagles when they also had a highly structured system of control marks, initials and monograms on their coins. The dual eagles indicate something significant and this is, most reasonably, co-regency.

Cleopatra I was the first queen to use two eagles to symbolize co-regency with her son. Cleopatra VII, still more powerful than her great-great-grandmother Cleopatra I, took a further numismatic step in symbolizing her power. She reformed the bronze coinage minted in Alexandria and placed her portrait on the obverse. On the reverse she put a single eagle with her name and title ΚΛΕΟΠΑΤΡΑΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΗΣ. This created a new type of large bronze coin that was distinctly analogous to the tetradrachms first issued by the greatest of all Ptolemies, Ptolemy I. The two-eagle bronze coins of Cleopatra VII minted in Cyprus were not so innovative, but they were analogous to those of Cleopatra I in showing two eagles in recognition of Caesarion as co-regent. Cleopatra may have viewed the two eagles not just as a sign of co-regency, but as a symbol of her hope, tragically unrealized, that Caesarion would eventually have full sovereignty as king of Egypt.

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank M. Amandry, R. Ashton, J. Bingen, A. Burnett, R. Hazzard, O. Hoover, N. Janzen, C. Lorber, and J. Russell for helpful suggestions, comments on the manuscript, information, and/or aid in obtaining illustrations.

Key to the Plates

Plate 1

1. Nicolaou, *Paphos II*, plate XIV n. 421 Sv 1875.
2. Svoronos 1876, plate LXII n. 28, see ref. 15 above.
3. eBay auction, 15 February 2002, from Cyprus, Sv 1842.
4. eBay auction, 11 February 2002, from Cyprus, Sv 1843.
5. BMC Ptolemies, 122, plate XXX n. 2.
6. eBay auction, 7 September 2001, from Cyprus, Sv 1875.
7. ANS 1944.100.79360, by permission of the American Numismatic Society.
8. eBay auction, 11 January 2002, from Cyprus, Sv 1842.
9. Nicolaou, *Paphos II*, plate XV n. 463, Sv 1842.
10. eBay auction, 6 Oct 2001, from Germany, Sv 1843.
11. Nicolaou, *Paphos II*, plate XV n. 455, Sv 1843.
12. Svoronos 1380, private collection.

Plate 2

13. Svoronos 1695, Malter II, 23-24 February 1978, 253



-
1. See examples in column three of table 1. For an excellent review of coins of Cleopatra see S. Walker and P. Higgs (eds), *Cleopatra of Egypt* (London and Princeton, 2001), nos. 177-86, 214-60, 246a-b. That review does not mention the coins considered here.
 2. J. N. Svoronos, *Tá νομίσματα του κράτους των Πτολεμαίων* (Athens, 1904); German translation in vol. IV, *Die Münzen der Ptolemäer* (Athens, 1908).
 3. Svoronos, vol. I, p. υμζ, pp. υοα-υοδ (in Greek); vol. IV, col. 357-8, 378-81 (in German).
 4. D. Cox, *Coins from the excavations at Curium 1932-1952, ANS NNM* 145 (1959), pp. 16, 107.
 5. I. Nicolaou, *Paphos II. The Coins of the House of Dionysos* (Nicosia, 1990), pp. 114-15.
 6. See also *RPC* Suppl. I, p. 41. The reference in *RPC* I, 3903 to *BMC* Ptolemies 52, 53 should be to 'Ptolemy, King of Cyprus' and not to 'Ptolemy XV and Arsinoe IV'.
 7. D.R. Sear, *Greek Coins and their Values*, vol. 2 (London, 1979), p. 753.
 8. R.A. Hazzard, *Ptolemaic Coins - An Introduction for Collectors* (Toronto, 1995).
 9. American Numismatic Society database, <http://data.numismatics.org/cgi-bin/objsearch>, key words; 'Cyprus', Material 'bronze', Department 'Greek'. Then find all cases with 'Ptolemy XIII', i.e., old nomenclature, now Ptolemy XII. There are thirteen examples, six of Sv. 1842 and seven of Sv. 1843, all cataloged as Sv. 1842.
 10. Earlier attributions of this issue to Cleopatra Berenike III, daughter of Ptolemy IX, were rejected by Svoronos IV, col. 379. All authorities since have ascribed this Cypriot coin to Cleopatra VII.
 11. K. Regling in Svoronos, IV, col. 509 (reprinted from *ZfN* 25 (1906), pp. 344 ff.).
 12. Regling in Svoronos, IV, col. 509.
 13. Svoronos, IV, col. 381.
 14. Regling in Svoronos, IV, col. 509. The two examples of Sv. 1876 and 1877 illustrated in Svoronos plate LXII appear to be barbarous copies of two-eagle coins similar to those shown in his plate LXIV.
 15. M. Amandry informs me (private communication) that Paris 445 = Sv. 1876 has no monogram and that its style differs considerably from types 3 and 4. Therefore, the listing *RPC* I, 3902 = Sv. 1876 = type 2 (see table 1, n. 7) will be deleted from *RPC*. Also, based on the attributions presented here, he informs me that types 3 and 4 (see table 1, nos. 16 and 23) will join *RPC* I, 3903 (type 1) as coins of Cleopatra and Caesarion (see *RPC* Supplement II, forthcoming).
 16. G. Hölbl, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire* (London and New York, 2001), pp. 290-93; see also Walker and Higgs, *Cleopatra*, p. 176, n. 174; p. 321, n. 339. The Isis crown symbol was added (between September 55 and 54) to the new style (second reign) tetradrachms of Ptolemy XII (Sv. 1836-40) in his 27th year (55/54). This may reflect a further association of Cleopatra with her father after he had his elder daughter (by a different mother) Berenike IV killed early in 55 (before 15 April). It is also possible that Cleopatra was made co-regent before production of these tetradrachms. The name and image of Ptolemy XII with Cleopatra (wearing, as usual, an Isis crown) appears in the crypts of the temple of Dendera in reconstruction begun on 16 July 54 and finished before Ptolemy XII's death. On the basis of these reliefs, Quaegebeur has proved that Cleopatra was co-regent with Ptolemy XII from an undetermined date until Ptolemy XII's death in 51. If, as seems likely, plans for the decoration of the crypts were complete before the construction began, Cleopatra's co-regency with her father began before July 54 and in time to put the Isis symbol on Ptolemy XII's second reign coins; see. J. Quaegebeur, 'Cléopâtre VII et le temple de Dendara', *Göttinger Miszellen* 120 (1991), p. 66; E. Winter, 'A reconsideration of the newly discovered building inscription on the temple of Denderah', *Göttinger Miszellen* 108 (1989), p. 81-82; also see Hölbl, 'History', p. 278.
 17. Svoronos, IV, col. 357-58, 378-79.
 18. *BMC* Ptolemies, p. 121. Sear 7950 describes the rotated monogram as ΔΡ.

-
19. Regling in Svoronos, IV, col. 509. On the basis of Regling's view of type 1 coins, T. Schrapel, *Das Reich der Kleopatra* (Trier, 1996), p. 118, doubts that type 1 (and 2) coins belong to Cleopatra. He also expresses doubt that types 3 and 4 are Cypriot. However, he does not mention that the monogram on types 1 and 3 are the same as that on Cleopatra's Cypriot large bronze with Caesarion.
20. *BMC Ptolemies*, pp. 120-1.
21. *SNG Copenhagen*, Pl. XXII.
22. H.-C. Noeske, *Die Münzen der Ptolemäer* (Frankfurt, 2000), pp. 176-7.
23. R. Martini, *SNG Italia. Milano, Civiche Raccolte Numismatiche*, 13: *Aegyptus, I. Ptolemaei* (Milan, 1989), n. 526.
24. W. Weiser, *Katalog Ptolemäischer Bronzemünzen der Sammlung des Institutes für Altertumskunde der Universität zu Köln*, *Papyrologica Coloniensia* 23 (Opladen, 1995), pp. 112-3.
25. ANS database; see n. 8 above. On type 1 coins (Sv. 1875) this database incorrectly gives the reverse legend as ΚΛΕΟΠΑΤΡΑΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΗΣ rather than ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ.
26. Nicolaou, *Paphos II*, pp. 53-8.
27. Cox, *Curium*, p. 16.
28. Weights and sizes for Sv. 1874 and 1875 (type 1) taken from *RPC I*, 3901 and 3903.
29. Weights and sizes for types 3 and 4 taken from Sv. 1842 and 1843.
30. C. Lorber has pointed out to me (private communication) that the 'type 3 eagles have round bodies, no wing indicated on the far side, and long, erect necks. In contrast, type 4 has eagles with long bodies, the right wing indicated on the farther bird, and S-shaped necks that curve back from the chest'. She suggests that the coins were separate in time or products of different mints.
31. Compare *BMC Ptolemies*, pl. XXX, 2 (Sv. 1813) and 3 (Sv. 1875) with plate 1 nos. 1 and 6. The similarity in style suggests that Sv. 1813 is a coin of Cleopatra perhaps produced before type 1 coins with monogram; it is unlikely that (as proposed by *BMC*) it as early as the time of Ptolemy of Cyprus before his death in 58.
32. Regling in Svoronos, IV, col. 507-8.
33. Note however that the pages and plates use the old nomenclature Ptolemy XIII (= Ptolemy XII in present day terms).
34. Cox, *Curium*, p. 107, realised the error; she states 'Although these coins [types 3 and 4] are cataloged by Svoronos under Ptolemy XII, in his text (Sv. iv, p. 358) he attributes them to Cleopatra in Cyprus'.
35. See Hölbl, *History*, chapter 8, for a general review of this background.
36. Dio Cassius, *Roman History*, 39.12.1; Suetonius, *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*, 'Julius Caesar', 54.3.
37. Dio, 38.30.5; 39.22.2-3.
38. Plutarch, 'Antony', 3; Dio, 39.12.1-2; 39.55.1-3; 39.58.1-3.
39. Dio, 42.35.4-6.
40. Hölbl, *History*, p. 231; see also R.A. Hazzard, *Imagination of a Monarchy: Studies in Ptolemaic Propaganda*, (Toronto, 2000), p. 149.
41. Appian, *Civil War*, II, 84-89; W. Huß, *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit 332-30 v. Chr.* (München, 2001), p. 711.
42. Caesar, *Civil War*, III, 107; Dio, 42.34.4-42.35.6.
43. Dio, 42.35.6.
44. Dio, 42.36.3-4.

-
45. Dio, 42.39.1-4.
46. Caesar, 'Civil War', III, 112.
47. Dio, 42.41-43; 43.19.2-4.
48. Dio, 42.44.1-2.
49. Huß, *Ägypten*, p. 721, ref 162.
50. Appian, 'Civil War', II, 90; Huß, *Ägypten*, p. 721.
51. There is little current doubt that Caesar was his father: see Hölbl, *History*, p. 238, n. 80; Huß, *Ägypten*, p. 722, n. 4. Arguments that Caesarion was born in 44 have not generally been accepted; if his birthdate were changed from 47 to 44, or if a corresponding change for the time of Cleopatra's control of Cyprus were made, the relative chronology of coins discussed here would not change. They are dated in relation to the large Cleopatra/Caesarion coin (Sv. 1874) from Cyprus which would then be dated to 44 or shortly thereafter: see M. Chauveau, *Cleopatra, Beyond the Myth* (Ithaca and London, 2002), p. 33.
52. Dio, 43.27.3
53. Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 25, 89.
54. Hölbl, *History*, p 239; Hazzard, *Imagination*, p. 151; E.R. Bevan, *A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty* (London, 1927= Chicago, 1968), pp. 369-70; Huß, *Ägypten*, p. 727.
55. F. Feuarent, *Collection Giovanni di Demetrio, Égypte ancienne* (Paris, 1869), pp. 116-18. Poole, *BMC Ptolemies*, p. 120, 52-3, and p. lxxxii.
56. Although Cleopatra had formal co-regencies with her brothers, marriages probably never took place; see L. Criscuolo, 'La successione a Tolemeo Aulete ed i pretesi matrimoni di Cleopatra VII con i fratelli', in L. Criscuolo - G. Gerac (eds), *Egitto e Storia Antica dall'ellenismo all'età araba* (Bologna, 1989), pp. 325-39. Certainly on her ascent to the throne Cleopatra moved rapidly to take sole command (Hölbl, *History*; p. 231 and nn. 47, 49), she issued orders in her name alone and, until near the time she was forced from Egypt, her brothers were always subordinate in documents (Criscuolo, pp. 334, 330).
57. Hazzard, *Imagination*, p. 150 (see Hölbl, *History*, p. 231) indicates that she ruled alone for approximately 18 months and that Ptolemy XIII was prominent by the middle of June 49.
58. The time from Caesar's gift of Cyprus to them and their becoming his enemies is a matter of months; see Nicolaou, *Paphos II*, p. 115; Poole, *BMC Ptolemies*, p. lxxxiii.
59. Poole, *BMC Ptolemies*, p. lxxxiii; Nicolaou, *Paphos II*, p. 115.
60. Hölbl, *History*, p. 236.
61. *BMC Ptolemies*, p. lxxxiii.
62. Nicolaou, *Paphos II*, p. 115.
63. Huß, *Ägypten*, p. 721 and n. 161, concludes that Cleopatra reigned alone.
64. Kromann and Mørkholm in *SNG Copenhagen* (table 1, nos.12, 21) assign them to Cyprus in the late 2nd-early 1st century. Their drawing of the rotated monogram on *SNG Copenhagen* 682-3 (= Sv. 1842) is not quite accurate, and they did not recognize its association with the monogram on Cleopatra's large bronze with Caesarion from Cyprus.
65. Following Feuarent (n. 55 above), Poole (*BMC Ptolemies* in 1883) suggested co-regencies (with two eagles) for Ptolemy II with Arsinoe II (*BMC*, p. 32, 102-03, p. xxxvii, and p. lxxx); Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II and III, p. 96, 94-5 and pl. lxxi-lxxii); Ptolemy IX with Cleopatra III (*BMC*, p. 105, 5-6, p. lxxviii, p. 106, 24-35 and p. 108, 57-58); Ptolemy X and Cleopatra III (*BMC* p.114, 68-9, p. lxxii); and Ptolemy XIV and Arsinoe IV (*BMC*, p. 121, 1-5, p. lxxxiii, p. lxxxiv). Poole also gave two eagle coins to Ptolemy III, *BMC*, p. 49, 29-30, p. 51, 49-50.
66. M.L. Strack, *Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer* (Berlin, 1897), pp. 21-2.

67. Regling in Svoronos, IV, col. 492-3 and his n. 1.

68. Regling in Svoronos, IV, col. 509.

69. *HN*, pp. 856-7.

70. M. Thompson, 'A Ptolemaic Bronze Hoard from Corinth', *Hesperia* 20 (1951), pp. 355-67.

71. The suggestion that the two eagles denote a double denomination is negated by characteristics of the coins. M.J. Price in *The Sacred Animal Necropolis at N. Saqqâra* (London, 1981), Appendix J, 'Coins', p. 160, seems to be the only published suggestion (this without further support) that two eagles might be a denominational marker (a double unit). However, coins of the same module, i.e. same weight and size range and therefore the same denomination, were produced by Ptolemy II (with co-regent) and show two-eagles while those produced by Ptolemy III (without co-regent) show one eagle; e.g., see SNG Cop. 144-151 (Ptolemy II) av. 68.62 g, 40-42 mm and SNG Cop. 171-172 (Ptolemy III) av. 69.60 g, 41-42 mm. Such coins of the same denomination (i.e., same module B showing either one or two-eagles) circulated together in the third century as in the Newell hoard; see Newell 3-7 (Ptolemy II), av. 65.85 g, 40-41.5 mm and Newell 30-37 (Ptolemy III) av. 61.82 g, 42-43.5 in E.T. Newell, 'Five Greek bronze coin hoards', *ANS NNM* 68 (1935), pp. 54-8. Since coins of the same modular weight (some with one eagle, Ptolemy III, and some with two eagles, Ptolemy II and co-regent) circulated together as the same denomination, the two-eagles cannot have been denominational markers. Moreover, two eagles are found on each and every different denomination of coins in a unified series (Sv. 1424-8) with greatly differing weights and sizes (Ptolemy VI and Ptolemy VIII, SNG Cop. 305-320; 36.4 to 5.8 g, 33 to 18 mm, all with cornucopia symbol). The conclusion must be that two-eagles do not indicate any specific denomination.

72. Bevan, *History*, p. 286, notes that two eagles, possibly indicating co-regency, appear on coins of co-regents Ptolemy VI and VIII; see also Sear 7900.

73. W. Otto, *Zur Geschichte der Zeit des 6. Ptolemäers* (München, 1937), pp. 58-9.

74. Production of two-eagle coins might, however, continue past the time of a co-regency, e.g., to give consistency to the current money supply or because of inefficiency at the mint.

75. Two-eagle coins assigned by Poole (*BMC*, p. 106, 24-35) to Ptolemy IX and Cleopatra III are now firmly attributed to Ptolemy VI with co-regent Ptolemy VIII, see n. 70 above. Other two-eagle coins (*BMC* Ptolemies, p. 49, 29-30, p. 51, 49-50) are now given to Ptolemy II, not Ptolemy III, see, e.g., *SNG* (Cop.) and nn. 2, 7, 22, 23 above.

76. Huß believes that this 'son' of Ptolemy II was a son of Lysimachus and Arsinoe II and adopted by Ptolemy II. After the rebellion of the son in 259 he lived on and had an amiable relationship with Ptolemy II; see Huß, *Ägypten*, pp. 311-12.

77. Weiser, *Katalog*, p. 82, gives Ptolemy V (who was married to Cleopatra I) the two-eagle coinage that Svoronos and *SNG* Copenhagen attribute to Ptolemy VI with co-regent Ptolemy VIII (170-164 BC; Sv. 1423-1426). Hazzard, *Imagination*, p. 124, noted that Cleopatra I remained subordinate to Ptolemy V until the end of his reign and that there is no good evidence for a co-regency of Cleopatra I with Ptolemy V; therefore, two eagle coins for Ptolemy V would not be consistent with the two eagle idea. However, Weiser's attribution of these bronze coins to Ptolemy V, based on undescribed weight standards, has been questioned by C.C. Lorber, *AJN*, 7-8 (1995-96), p. 273, and cannot be regarded as established.

S.M. Huston and C.C. Lorber, 'Hoard of Ptolemaic bronze coins in commerce, October 1992 (*CH* 8, 413)' (*NC* 2001, pp. 11-40) have re-dated the assignment (M. J. Price, *CH* 8, 1994, p. 47, n. 413) of a hoard containing two-eagle bronzes (Sv. 1423-4) from a burial c.175 to burial before 180. They thereby assigned a variety of Sv. 1423 to the reign of Ptolemy IV or early Ptolemy V (c.205) rather than Ptolemy VI (180-164). Their re-dating is based on their assignment of c.207-6 as the time that coins in the hoard were countermarked. However, the standard method to determine the time of countermarking was not used (i.e., that a *terminus post quem* is provided by the latest coin countermarked, see C. J. Howgego, *Greek Imperial Countermarks*, London 1985, p. 65). The latest coin that shows the same countermark was produced after 180 in the time of Ptolemy VI (i.e., Sv. 1375, see M. J. Price, Appendix J, 'Coins', in *The Sacred Animal Necropolis at N. Saqqâra*, London 1981, p. 160). The countermarking must therefore have occurred, not c.207-6, but after 180. Their method of re-dating is incorrect and inconsistent with the assignments of Svoronos, Mørkholm (SNG Cop. 304-310 = Sv. 1423-4), Thompson (n. 70 above) and Price, the latter two from studies of other hoards, that all place the two-eagle coins Sv. 1423-4 to after 180 and into the time of Ptolemy VI with Cleopatra II. For a detailed review see <http://www.ptolemaic.net/coinex> .

78. Poole assigned this coin to Cleopatra III; Svoronos, followed by Regling, gave it to Cleopatra I. Hoard evidence also shows that it belonged to Cleopatra I: see Thompson, p. 251.

79. Svoronos, IV, col. 280.

80. Hazzard, *Imagination*, p. 126. Huß, *Ägypten*, p. 540, n. 17, doubts that Cleopatra was initially only a 'Reichsverweserin' before she became co-regent; rather, she became co-regent straightaway (possibly by the will of her husband on his death, see p. 537); see also J. Whitehorne, *Cleopatras* (London, 1994), pp. 86-7.

81. Regling argued that two eagles with the legend ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ on a lead coin (Sv. 1430) produced during the siege of Alexandria could not apply to a king and queen (in this case the co-regents Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II). However, since it is accepted that Sv. 1380, with two eagles, is a coin of the co-regency of Cleopatra I with Ptolemy VI, the dual eagles on Sv. 1430 also seem suitable to symbolize the co-regency of Ptolemy VIII with Cleopatra II who were besieged by Antiochus (allied with Ptolemy VI). See also n. 83 below.

82. Mørkholm, *Antiochus IV*, pp. 80-9. Mørkholm does not refer to the two-eagle reverses on Sv. 1422 and 1430.

83. Regling (in Svoronos, IV, col. 493) used Sv. 1422 (table 2, n. 6) as an argument against the two eagle/co-regency theory. He could not believe that the two eagles symbolized two kings, Antiochus and Ptolemy VI, when the legend ...ANTIOXOY referred only to one. However, on slightly earlier coins, Sv. 1380 (here Pl. 1, 12; table 2, n. 5) with the name of Cleopatra I and Sv. 1383 without her name, a reverse with two eagles and the traditional legend ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ was used for co-regents with different names (Cleopatra I and Ptolemy VI). This two-eagle reverse type continued into the joint regency of Cleopatra I's sons, Ptolemy VI and Ptolemy VIII (Sv. 1423-6) and was apparently taken over by Antiochus who simply replaced Ptolemy's name with his own. See also n. 81 above.

84. Sv. 1695 (two examples); 35-40 mm, c.33 g; see also Malter II (23-24 February 1978), 253 (35mm, 37.4 g).

85. P. Rylands dem. III 20; see Samuel, *Ptolemaic Chronology*, pp. 148-9; Hölbl, *History*, p. 205; Whitehorne, *Cleopatras*, p. 130.

86. Compare the similar use of falcons: Hathor was often characterized as a falcon in association with the falcon Horus, the symbol of kingship: R.H. Wilkinson, *Reading Egyptian Art*, (London, 1992), p. 83; M. Lurker, *The Gods and Symbols of Ancient Egypt* (London, 1982), p. 49.

87. Note that co-regents need not produce *only* two-eagle coinage and there is no reason why gold or silver coins must also show two eagles.

88. Ptolemy II first introduced two-eagles on the largest denomination (module B) of his newly reformed bronze coinage at the time of co-regency with Ptolemy 'the son' (267-259). From hoard evidence, see C. C. Lorber, 'Large Ptolemaic bronzes in third-century hoards', *AJN* (2000), p. 78, "module B [72 g, with two eagles] was the largest and presumably standard bronze coin during most or all of the latter reign of Ptolemy II. Under his successor [Ptolemy III without co-regent], at least in the first half of his reign the largest and presumably standard bronze coin was module A [with one eagle]." Ptolemy III, without a co-regent, produced no coins with two-eagles at any time.

89. E.g., Walker and Higgs, p. 178, n. 186; M. Grant, *Cleopatra* (St Albans, 1974), pp. 133-6. However, contrary to the common view, P.J. Bicknell, 'Caesar, Antony, Cleopatra and Cyprus', *Latomus* 36 (1977), pp. 330-4, has argued that Cleopatra VII did not achieve control of Cyprus until 44 and that Sv. 1874 would then be minted after 44. Schrapel, *Reich*, pp. 119-21, 256-7, greatly prefers 47 for control of Cyprus by Cleopatra with Sv. 1874 produced shortly thereafter. Also see n. 51 above.

90. Dio Cassius (47.31.5) states that Dolabella 'granted [Cleopatra] the right to have her son called King of Egypt'; i.e., that Caesarion was recognized as co-regent with Cleopatra by the consul Dolabella (who died in the summer of 43). The earliest securely dated document that gives Caesarion as co-ruler is dated 12 April 41: see S. B. IV, 7337 in Huß, *Ägypten*, p. 727, n. 3. See also Hölbl, *History*, p. 239.